

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/11/2022	10.1 Purpose	(As described in the 2040 Plan this should be the ‘heart’ of the 10 minute neighborhood— but the UDO requirements do not fit a number of very well defined and thriving “ Neighborhood centers” in existing parts of the community)	Thank you for your comment. If you have specific recommendations for revisions, we invite you to input them in the comment portal.	No
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Row A- a minimum height requirement makes many existing buildings ‘non-conforming’- yet those non- conforming buildings define this heart of the neighborhood. Why a minimum?	Updated 03/10/2022: Reduce minimum building height to 16 feet in the NC zoning district. Minimum height requirement would not apply to existing buildings.	Yes
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Row B- as written, this makes NB-1 properties behind Neighborhood Centers see a huge increase allowed over current ordinance height.	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	‘Note 3’ provides as written a 62% increase in base height over existing OFFICE and BUSINESS zoning, which are the likely current zoning adjacent to NB-1 PlaceType locations.	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Note should be changed to read “ The maximum building height of any structure within 200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type is limited to 65 feet (40’ limit if the property abuts residential use or NB-1 Place Type). These standards apply only to.....	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/11/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Also this definition needs to be examined—see “ contiguous area of two or fewer parcels...” The word ‘contiguous’ needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/10/2022: UDO staff and consultants will update language to clarify the intent.	Yes
1/12/2022	11.1 Purpose	Article 11 - Community Activity Center for PID 17513103 makes no sense. Should be Neighborhood 1 or 2	Thank you for this feedback. We have forwarded this comment to the comprehensive plan team working on the Policy Map.	No
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Row B- as written, this makes NB-1 properties behind Community Activity Centers see a huge increase allowed over current ordinance height.	This comment is still under review.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	'Note 3' provides as written a 62% increase in base height over existing OFFICE and BUSINESS zoning, which are the likely current zoning adjacent to NB-1 PlaceType locations.	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Note should be changed to read " The maximum building height of any structure within 200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type is limited to 65 feet (40' limit if the property abuts residential use or NB-1 Place Type). These standards apply only to.....	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/11/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Also this definition needs to be examined—see " contiguous area of two or fewer parcels..." The word 'contiguous' needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/10/2022: UDO staff and consultants will update language to clarify the intent.	Yes
12/9/2021	12.6 General Development Standards	It says that the max height is 65' if within "200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 Place Type". My house backs up to a property that would be RAC under the proposed UDO. And despite being a single family home, it would be zoned NAC under the proposed UDO. Does that mean that my house (because its not a Neighborhood 1 zoning) could have a 250' tower literally in my back yard or would any development be limited to 65'? The wording isn't entirely clear but any person with a brain could realize a 250' abutting single family is unimaginable...to say the least.	These heights are appropriate for a typical RAC adjacent to a typical NC. Parcel specific concerns, such as the appropriateness of a single-family home being located in a NC, would be best served through feedback on the policy (place type) map.	No
1/19/2022	13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Part B Building Height - Table A: Minimum Building Height Comment: Bringing this topic up given conversations during the ACRC centering around flexibility in height minimums.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/11/2022: Staff will add provisions to add provisions to allow flexibility for smaller buildings. Buildings 2,000sf or less or buildings on sites 1/3 acre or smaller exempt from minimum building height requirement.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/11/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	This section should be modified to provide greater protection and definition for the historic districts adopted by City Council.	Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations we invite you to submit those through the comment portal.	No
1/11/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	The thinking in the UDO is that the HDC overlay will govern. While legally that is true, the Place Types overwhelm, with pressure of development, the HDC volunteer review that is established. The question for City Council in adopting the UDO is do we want historic districts and their controls, or not?? As currently written the UDO as a whole will destroy the historic districts and their character.	Thank you for this feedback. We have forwarded this comment to the comprehensive plan team working on the Policy Map. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations for UDO language we invite you to submit those through the comment portal.	No
1/11/2022	14.1 HDO Historic District Overlay	Short of adding a section to every Place Type protecting the historic district, a 40 foot maximum base height in or abutting a historic district boundary should be the minimum change adopted.	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/24/2022	14.4 CCO Cottage Court Overlay	The width requirements for the Cottage Court Overlay District's common space should be revisited. Although the current common space width of 50 feet is more than appropriate for large, wide parcels this width can create limitations for smaller, narrower parcels. Perhaps a common space width that is proportionate to the development lot size or number of dwellings on the development lot would address some of these limitations that the smaller, narrower lots face when having to have a 50-foot-wide common space.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/11/2022: UDO staff and consultants will add language to address narrow sites.	Yes
1/24/2022	14.4 CCO Cottage Court Overlay	In Article 14.4 Section D Number 5a should be revisited -"The common area shall maintain a minimum width of 50 feet, shall be contiguous and centrally located, and shall front a public or private street." Specifically, the portion about the common area needing to front a public or private street. A common area is necessary but requiring it to front a public or private street creates limitations that would eliminate the potential for some parcels to be used in the cottage court overlay especially with parking not allowed to be in front of the cottage dwellings.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/11/2022: UDO staff and consultants will add language to address narrow sites; however, staff and consultants do not recommend changing the requirement that open space fronts a street or the prohibition on parking between the street and the dwelling.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/18/2022	14.5 MHO Manufactured Home Overlay; 14.6 MHP Manufactured Home Park Zoning District	<p>(Part 1 of 2) The Cottage Court overlay is 14.4 not either of these drop selections. Needs to be corrected.</p> <p>The proposed regs are much too restrictive to get maximum use of the land area.</p> <p>Specifically :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A 50ft wide open space is much too wide for infill parcels where the cottages would be valuable resources for Affordable housing 2. The rear set backs require too much land area for the small space concept. No more than 15 ft set back is suggested 3. Having the common space face a city street is not necessary and it is much too restrictive 4. the 25% land bonus for building units less than 800 sq ft should be increased to 50% as in small parcels this would not add diffident new units to overcome high land costs 5. Interior streets can be built under private driveway regs not city/state standards. 15 ft wide driveways is sufficient for a small cottage style community 6. Parking should be permitted in front of each building or at the rear of each residence as the residents of these units need to be close to their cars due to age health restrictions and extreme weather events 	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/31/2022: The standards have not been created to allow “maximum use of the land area,” but rather to allow for an alternative development form, and an increase in permitted density that blends with the surrounding neighborhood.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A minimum width is needed to ensure it is of substantial size to serve the residents. 2. This setback is for the development as a whole, not individual residences, so the rear setback serves as a perimeter yard to buffer against “standard” residential development next door. 3. It is allowed to face a public or private street. The requirement for common space to front on a street is intended to ensure that Cottage Court Development maintains a street presence that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood context. 4. 50% would be a significant increase, especially since we allow duplexes and triplexes. We don’t recommend increasing this based on the rationale stated in the comment. 5. We cannot find where this is controlled in these standards. Street standards are regulated separately in the UDO and separate standards should not be created for Cottage Court. 6. We disagree that parking in front of the structure should be allowed. The form of a cottage court is intended to focus on the arrangement around green space, not an auto-orientation. The standards already allow for parking to locate to the rear of each unit, or in a common location. <p>Many of these changes aren't recommended because they lose the intent to CCO, but there may be other districts that may work better for unusual sites.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/18/2022	14.5 MHO Manufactured Home Overlay; 14.6 MHP Manufactured Home Park Zoning District	(Part 2 of 2) 7. Guest parking should be permitted in a logical location based on land availability and not restricted or regulated to a specific site on the land parcel 8. There should no restrictions for carports or garages or storage units as many of these smaller dwelling units will have residents who have had to downsize from much larger homes	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/17/2022: 7. We have not controlled the location of “guest parking” specifically - just locations of common parking areas. Guest parking may be provided as a component of the Cottage Court development, subject to the standards regarding placement of parking spaces. 8. Garages and carports are regulated universally as follows: “... shall not be located in an established setback along a frontage. ...shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the right-of-way or back of sidewalk, whichever is greater.” We don’t think an exception is needed. We don’t recommend including any special provisions for “storage units” as a component of a Cottage Court development.	No
11/4/2021	14.5 MHP Manufactured Home Park Zoning District	On a property zoned RMH (residential mobile home) it should be modified to include the ability to live in a travel trailer. A travel trailer is a mobile home.	A travel trailer is not considered a residential use. It is considered to be a recreational vehicle.	No
11/11/2021	3.1 Purpose and Applicability	Multifamily is not permitted in CG or CR (commercial place types). While I understand the intent of these two districts to be for auto oriented places in our City, I.e., car dealerships on Independence, apartments already exist on many auto-oriented roads. There should not be a blanket ban of multifamily developments along these roads. They should be considered in some cases.	The CG and CR districts were developed to implement the adopted policies of the Commercial Place Type, which does not include residential uses. However, there are many locations along arterial streets that will be mapped as other Place Types such as Neighborhood 2 or Centers, which would allow multi-family dwellings.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/20/2022	3.2 Zoning District Translation	In Table 3-1, currently it show B1 and B2 becoming CG district. Should B2 become CR? CR is not listed under the UDO column	Updated 03/12/22: There are many sites currently zoned B-2 that would not be appropriate for CR zoning because of the intensity of development allowed under CR. After the UDO is adopted, and in conjunction with Area Planning, an assessment of CG and CR sites will be performed and some sites may be recommended to be rezoned to CR.	No
12/7/2021	3.2 Zoning Districts	It looks like Place Types and Zoning Districts contain some of the development requirements within the UDO. Will development of a property be governed by Place Type and the a subset of the that place type (the Zoning District)? What is the purpose of the Place Type in the UDO?	Development of a property is controlled by the requirements of its zoning district. Some zoning standards in the UDO are based on the adopted policies of the Place Types, which are part of the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Place Types are not a "subset" of the UDO. Place Types are policies, while the UDO is the regulatory tool that implements the policies.	No
10/29/2021	3.2 Zoning Districts; 3.3 Zoning Map	Per section 3.2 "ZONING DISTRICT TRANSLATION" it appears that "CC" Commerical Center Zoning district (along with MX-1, MX-2, and NS) are missing from the table and the rest of the chapter. If they are presumably translating to one of the new districts or relating Placetypes it might be important to add them to avoid confusion or describe their current status.	The translation table (Table 3-1) only applies to current conventional zoning districts, not conditional districts. The CC, MX-1, and MX-2 districts are all conditional districts.	No
11/15/2021	3.3 Zoning Map	Is there a proposed land use map or planned zoning for the land just north of Northlake Mall?	The Policy Map currently being developed will designate each property with one of ten possible Place Types. Recommended future zoning districts will be based on the designated Place Types.	No
11/24/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations	The definition of + needs to be made here (as well as in the CSM). Plus means median not an additional lane. for example: 4+lane is not clear without that knowledge	Updated 03/12/22: Clarification of + will be made in the next UDO draft.	Yes
11/24/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations	The statement that a Local street is only Local if it's in a Neighborhood 1 Place type is incorrect and misleading. Remove the N1 limitation.	We think this is a misunderstanding of the language in Article 3.5. The reference is only to local streets abutting N1 Place Types. There is no proposed N1 limitation.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/24/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations	D on page 3-6. The Hierarchy of frontage types is not rational and is confusing. Look at the table note 1 on page 5-7. Needs serious re-thinking to make Frontage Hierarchy work in reality.	Thank you for your comment. Are you able to suggest any specific changes to this section?	No
10/8/2021	3.5 District Dimensional and Design Notations; 3.4 Applicability of Frontages	In article 4, part 4.3, section D Point #1: "Building height setback plane" - This seems to be too short of a sidewall height requirement. At 12' and if there is no room for extra setback possible to increase the additional height, asking for a permit seems to be adding on to the permitting process for new construction, leading to longer delays. Most new constructions will need to be 2 floors, and with even the basic 2 floor home, you will need at least 20', even considering if there is no car garage added. Being that the maximum allowable height is 40'-48' dependent on the zoning, I believe this should be revised to a higher sidewall height.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade. Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.	Yes
10/11/2021	4.1 Purpose	I am against permitting duplexes and triplexes on any available lot. I live in Dilworth which has taken great care to manage and limit its commercial development and this would undermine the fabric of the community. Stop the madness!	The allowance for duplexes and triplexes is based on the policies of the City Council-adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No
10/20/2021	4.1 Purpose	Overall statement of this section is " Respect the character & Development patterns...of established residential neighborhoods...and reuse of existing neighborhood commercial establishments under prescribed conditions."	Is there a suggestion to change the purpose statement?	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/12/2021	4.1 Purpose	This is just a general comment about the UDO. Though all of these changes will make housing more expensive, I'm confused on why there is no mention or motivation for addressing climate change. Yes, addressing climate change adds even more cost to buildings but the added expenses of this current plan will do nothing to help the planet save for a few trees. As a builder, I was one of the first Energy Star certified builders when I couldn't get a customer to give a hoot. Now, everyone wants an efficient house. So, now we are building in the infrastructure for solar powered roofs. It will not be very long before solar powered NEW houses are common yet there is no incentive in here to bake this in. I understand my point might be viewed to be beyond the UDO's mission but I urge the city to add incentives/breaks for builders to help combat climate change.	We would appreciate any specific recommendations you have. The draft UDO currently includes multiple sustainability provisions, such as electric vehicle charging stations, environmental height bonus, tree regulations, transportation standards that more support multimodal travel, and mixed-use zoning districts designed to reduce vehicle trips.	No
12/23/2021	4.1 Purpose	There should be a scorecard which evaluates the suitability of any specific location for affordable housing which looks at aspects such as proximity, income diversity, access and neighborhood change. This would be similar to that adopted by City Council on Jan 16t, 2019 entitled City of Charlotte Affordable Housing Location Guidelines.	Updated 03/12/22: The UDO is designed to maximize the number of locations where affordable housing could be built as the construction of affordable housing is a high priority for the city.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
10/20/2021	4.1 Purpose	<p>The new UDO reclassified R3, R4, R5, R6 and R8 to N1A, N1B, N1C, N1D, N1 E. Does this reclassification still carry all the requirements in old zone code? For example R3 zone requires the maximum density to be 3 per acre. Under this restriction, we then have all the other criteria such as minimum lot area, lot width, etc.</p> <p>Now in the UDO draft, N1A didn't specify the maximum density per acre. Instead it just states that the minimum lot area is 10000 s.f..</p> <p>Does this mean the N1A will remove the requirement of maximum density to be 3 per acre?; I also notice that the UDO reclassified RMF12, RMF 17, RMF 22, RMF 43 to N2B. With the old code each one has the maximum units requirement per acre thus all of them are different regarding the density. With the new code of N2B, how can we make the difference? Or we just make all of them to be equal?</p>	<p>While the draft new UDO zoning districts include many of the standards of the current districts found in the current zoning ordinance, they are not all identical. Maximum density is not specified in the UDO. Instead, other standards such as setbacks, heights, and maximum building coverage determine the amount of development permitted on a site.</p>	No
11/6/2021	4.1 Purpose	<p>In the current ordinance Single Family Development Section 9.205 there is language, "Density is the first standard."</p> <p>Even if there is enough land to create two conforming lots that are compatible in every respect to the neighborhood you cannot do it unless you have enough gross acreage that is 1/3 acre for R3</p> <p>Does the new ordinance eliminate this provision: The first test is density.</p>	Yes, the draft UDO does eliminate density as a standard.	No
11/12/2021	4.1 Purpose	Residential Clustering is an important option of the Ordinance, I not not see the Cluster Ordinance in the draft UDO.	Residential clustering has been replaced by a conservation residential development alternative.	No
1/5/2022	4.1 Purpose; 4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	4.1: I am extremely supportive of the inclusion of 1-3 unit buildings in our residential neighborhoods! However, I do wish that fourplexes were also allowed by right in these same neighborhoods. And as someone who is somewhat familiar with development financing, it's hard to see how a fourplex would ever get built with the requirement of an affordable unit.	The allowances for quadraplexes are based on the policies of the City Council-adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
10/8/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	*Need clarification on this point* - article 4, part 4.3, section C: Front/Corner side setbacks - Can you confirm if this is truly from the street or from the right-of-way (property line)?	These setbacks are measured from the right-of-way as indicated per the table on page 4-3 of the draft UDO.	No
10/20/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Can any non-residential bldg in N-1 be up to 300' long? I'm concerned that does not 'reflect the character'?	Yes, a non-residential building in an N1 Place Type can be up to 300' long. This is to accommodate uses such as schools and religious institutions.	No
10/20/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	This article allows the adjustment of setback based on existing structures nearby— how does this affect the Historic District?	An alternative setback adjustment in a historic district would be allowed if the alternative setback complies with the setback standards of Charlotte's Historic District Design Guidelines.	No
11/17/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Limiting duplex height to 12' at the side setback will reduce the number of duplexes that can be built. This will hurt affordability. a two story building is the most cost effective way to build an affordable duplex. ; Am I correct that lots of record will not be grandfathered as it relates to street improvements, SWIM buffers, Post Construction buffers etc? If so this will reduce the affordability of housing .	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade. Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>(Part 1 of 2) Table 3-1: R-8 should convert to something allowing higher density. Currently due to the restrictions of N1-D this would be a MAJOR downgrade to R-8 zoning. On smaller 1/3 acre lots or 1/2 acre lots you can get a 35' tall quadruplex. This new zoning change to N1-D would be devastating to growing neighborhoods that are already sprawling with dense, tall duplexes. This change alone could be devastating to the Charlotte housing market increasing scarcity and increasing costs of housing even further.</p> <p>Maximum in N1 district is a triplex unless you add an affordable unit and its on a thoroughfare. Currently R-8 allows a quadruplex in all locations. R-8 should be converted to something that AT MINIMUM allows the same density it currently does.</p> <p>N1-A through N1-D max height limit for duplexes and triplexes is 12' tall at the side wall. This will be absolutely devastating to development and growth. I personally design many, many 2 story or 3 story duplexes on R-8 lots (future N1-D). 2-3 story duplexes on R-8 property is providing housing in neighborhoods that otherwise would be abandoned by developers.</p>	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 04/15/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff has reexamined this and believes that R-8 zoning on a lot classified for Neighborhood 1 Place Type is appropriate to translate to an N1-D Zoning District to be consistent with the policies of the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan. However, any parcel zoned R-8 and classified as a Neighborhood 2 Place Type would be appropriate to be rezoned to an N2-A Zoning District. Additionally, the sidewall height will be increased from 12' to 20' for duplex and triplex forms to provide increased development opportunity.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	(Part 2 of 2) The cost of land is already way too high to simply build a single family home in these neighborhoods. Developers would have to sell a huge single family home unaffordable for the majority of the charlotte population where before with current R-8 zoning they could build a duplex, triplex or quadruplex for a much more affordable cost to future home buyers. The 12' height limit at the side wall is just too low. Most lots are maybe 1/4 acre or smaller and when building a duplex the building is close to the setbacks. The VAST majority of lots will limit the duplexes to 1 story. No developer would waste their time or money on properties like this. THis WILL KILL the housing market in Charlotte. Trust me. We already cannot build enough housing for how fast Charlotte is growing. If you have to keep the height limit for N1 then at minimum have an exception for currently zoned R-8 properties to allow 40' tall like it currently does. R-8 could change to an N2 district or maybe make some changes to N1-D but this cannot be allowed to remain as is.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/15/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff has reexamined this and believes that R-8 zoning on a lot classified for Neighborhood 1 Place Type is appropriate to translate to an N1-D Zoning District to be consistent with the policies of the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan. However, any parcel zoned R-8 and classified as a Neighborhood 2 Place Type would be appropriate to be rezoned to an N2-A Zoning District. Additionally, the sidewall height will be increased from 12' to 20' for duplex and triplex forms to provide increased development opportunity.	Yes
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Requirements for private open space should clearly state that it is allowed on a rooftop terrace or patio like the current zoning code does. There are many properties and projects that rely on this to be able to be a developable property.	Private open spaces via rooftop terraces or patios is still permitted as per Section 16.4.B of the draft UDO.	No
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	The 6 unit maximum for attached housing doesnt make sense. I know the purpose is to not have long expanses of buildings however units can come in all different shapes and sizes. I can have 6 units at 16' wide which will look quite small. Then i can have 6 units at 35' wide which will be more than double the size of the other one. Limiting units just doesnt make sense.	Updated 03/11/2022: Staff and consultants recommend elimination of the standard for maximum number of units per building and replace with a maximum building length.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
12/19/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Requiring units to be 1'-5' above sidewalk will cause major issues. There are so many properties where the entrance has to be very close to the sidewalk or it is right beside it. How do you comply with ADA? Nashville Tennessee has the same rule and it caused a HUGE problem with a townhouse project I worked on. It delayed the project a month because the zoning administrator just couldnt understand that ADA laws required a flush entrance. Zoning argued "you can just build a ramp" but there was no room. The entrance was just 1' from the sidewalk and there was litterally no room for a ramp. We had to go all the way up the ladder to the boss's boss just to talk common sense and waive the requirement. Its sad that a city zoning code can conflict with federal law.</p>	<p>Updated 03/11/2022: UDO Staff and Consultant will revise language to provide alternative to vertical separation - horizontal separation of 10' or more from back of sidewalk.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
1/4/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>(Part 1 of 2) I'm concerned that the sidewall requirements will greatly limit the ability for people to build duplexes in Charlotte. I was under the impression that the goal of the UDO was more middle/diversity of housing products. The new sidewall agreement actually makes it harder to build duplexes than is currently possible in the R-8 zoning district.</p> <p>It will be nearly impossible to build any duplexes on lots that are only 50 ft wide. There are many 50 ft wide lots in Charlotte that are located near transportation nodes and higher density areas in Charlotte. This is because a 1 story product is very cost prohibitive and a 2 story product could only be 20 ft wide.</p> <p>Unfortunately, a majority of lots with 60' of width in Charlotte currently have larger homes on them. With larger homes the cost to purchase will be driven up to a point where the only duplexes that can be built will be in ultra high end areas.</p>	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/4/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	(Part 2 of 2) Currently, prices are soaring in Charlotte due to a lack of supply. We have a real opportunity to make a difference in this supply if we address the sidewall requirements. My recommendation would be to adjust the sidewall requirement to 22ft. This will allow for standard 2-story products while preventing 3-story boxes from taking over a neighborhood. This will significantly increase the supply of homes while having a balance within the character of neighborhoods.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade. Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.	Yes
1/5/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	4.3: I am concerned that the maximum building coverage % on all lots is too low. If a duplex is to be built on 40% of a lot, it could make said development financially unfeasible. I am extremely supportive of the inclusion of duplexes/triplexes in our neighborhoods, and I fear this may deter them from being developed in some neighborhoods. I also do not understand the need for such maximums at all when the setback rules already exist.	Updated 03/11/2022: Will update to increase maximum lot coverage to 40% on lots of 10,000 square feet or more and 50% on all other lots. Setbacks are not adequate to address maximum building coverage because accessory structures are allowed to be built in established setbacks in many cases.	Yes
1/6/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Increase maximum height from 48 feet and remove all minimum setbacks. Require all vehicular access be to the rear of the property.	The current draft N1 standards in the UDO are designed to preserve the current character of neighborhoods and generally reflect the standards of the current zoning districts transitioning to N1.	No
1/11/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 4-3, Item C, Siting— —Why is the front setback modified to be less than the current Charlotte Ordinance? It appears the current ordinance requires generally 30' (or 42' from 'local' streets) while the UDO states 27' in a similar situation?	Staff believes the setbacks of the draft UDO are generally the same or very close to the setback standards of the current zoning ordinance. In the current ordinance the base standards are 27' and 17'.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/11/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 4-4, Item D Height- Why is maximum residential base height 48' on N1-A and N1-B when current ordinance is 40' base height? Note that in NB-2A base height max is 40'	The current zoning ordinance allows a 48' maximum building height at the front building line for the R-3 and R-4 zoning districts. Staff believes the proposed heights in the draft are generally very close to the height standards of the current zoning ordinance.	No
1/18/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>(Part 1 of 2) Density is a critical factor in the approval of any project that requires a rezoning petition and public hearing. Under this provision, the concept of determining density using units per acre legislated in every major North Carolina city is eliminated. In its place the only controls on density are minimum lot areas and maximum lot coverages. Minimum lot areas do not effectively control density so that a developer will have the right to build "as of right" significantly more structures and units on lots zoned N1-A through N1-E. This makes Charlotte an outlier regarding similar cities across the US in the method of controlling density. As an example of the impact of these provisions in the first draft of the UDO, consider the number of units that could be built on a 1 acre parcel in Zoning District N1-A, or currently R-3. The minimum lot area is 10,000 sq. ft. in a parcel containing 43,560 sq. ft. Assuming this parcel could be subdivided into 4 lots containing 10,000 sq. ft., 4 structures could be built. If Duplexes, the number of units would be 8, if Triplexes the number of units would be 12, and if Quadraplexes the number of units would be 16.</p> <p>In Zoning District N1-E, or currently UR-1, the number of structures would be 13, and the number of units would increase to 26 for Duplexes, 39 for Triplexes and 52 for Quadraplexes.</p>	Updated 03/11/2022: It is true that the overall density standards have been eliminated and the main control that relates to density is that of minimum lot area. The Comprehensive Plan has established policy that allows duplexes and triplexes in all districts that allow for single-family dwellings, in addition to quadraplexes on arterials, in order to increase the supply of diverse housing options and affordable units; a density cap would work explicitly counter to such policy, artificially limiting the number of dwelling types/units that could be built. The lot area standards set the minimums for all dwelling types, which are then subject to compliance with other standards such as setbacks, parking requirements, coverage, etc. These additional standards, working together, are intended to create compatibility between this mix of dwelling types.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/18/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	(Part 2 of 2) To control density assuming duplexes, triplexes and quadraplexes are permitted in N1 neighborhoods, this provision should be revised to limit the number of structures permitted in N1-A through N1-E. It is possible to allow duplexes, triplexes and quadraplexes to be built if there were stringent maximum lot areas applied to these types of structures and you limit the number of duplexes, triplexes and quadraplexes for a parcel in a specific Zoning District. For example in N1-A, N1-B and N1-C, limit duplexes to 2 structures per acre and triplexes and quadraplexes to 1 structure (the equivalent to 4 units/acre). For N1-D, N1-E and N1-F, limit duplexes, triplexes and quadraplexes to 3 structures (the equivalent 6, 8 and 12 units/acre). In summary, this draft of the UDO radically eliminated the concept of units/acre and fails to control density. In addition because these provisions provide for building "by right" City Council, the Planning Department and the surrounding neighborhoods have no input in this uncontrolled development. The technique currently used by City Council of conditional rezonings (CD) to tailor development impacts including density are eliminated completely.	Updated 03/11/2022: See response above	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	N1-F is the same thing as N2-A. Why? What is the reason for having 2 identical districts?	They are not identical. N1-F has no frontages and is limited in scale. Frontages apply to N2-A and is not as limited in scale. There are also dimensional differences, such as lot area.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Unlabeled table on page 4-2 (dimensional table) points out several problems when combined with unlabeled table on page 4-3	Thank you for this feedback. Can you further help staff by elaborating on the problems you have identified?	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	(setbacks): if the goal is to increase density then the dimensions and setbacks and coverage ratios need to allow the greater density.	These standards are designed to protect the character of our existing neighborhoods. However increases in density will be accommodated by the allowance of additional housing types such as duplexes and triplexes.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	the height requirements in N1 C to F should be above 48' not dropped to 40'	The maximum heights in the Neighborhood 1 zoning districts are consistent with the height maximums in the corresponding current Residential zoning districts. The intent is to have lower heights in the districts with smaller minimum lot sizes.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	You can't reach the Building coverage ratio for N1D, E or F because the setbacks are too big. Reduce the side and rear setbacks.	The standard is designed to be more flexible for smaller lots. Building coverage ratio includes accessory structures, which can be located in required setbacks, and if those exist on the lot it is possible to approach maximum building coverage.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	N1-F for TH has a 13 ft deep building site. You can't build a home 13' deep. Both the rear and front setbacks are too large	N1-F does not have a requirement for a 13' deep building site.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	The Note 2 on the unlabeled chart on page 4-3 conflicts with the definition of Lot Width on page 2-20 (drawing on page 2-21) which allows a variance of 30'. 30' variance makes sense, Note 2 does not.	Note 2 on 4-3 defines alternative setback and is not related to lot width. The next draft will include language to clarify this.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Note 5 on the unlabeled chart on page 4-3 needs to change. Having a greater SIDE setback on a corner when the FRONT faces an arterial has no rationale. if it SIDES to an Arterial, maybe, but likely when it fronts to an arterial it sides to a local & the doubling of a side setback is not important	The note is intended for when the side faces an arterial street, not the front. Text will be revised to clarify in the next draft.	Yes
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Building Height page 4-4. there is no minimum heights listed so it should not say it governs minimum heights	We will remove the reference to minimum height in the next draft.	Yes
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Definition on page 2-8 changes the current measurement to the structure wall not the setback. (as reflected in Note 3) Setback is the correct place to measure relative to the impact on adjacent uses (which is the purpose of this section)	Updated 03/31/2022: Staff believes this is an incorrect reference and cannot locate the referenced text. Staff recommends retaining the proposed UDO standards.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Unlabeled table page 4-4: all 40' heights need to be at least 48' and an argument can be made to go higher since density is the objective.	The maximum heights in the Neighborhood 1 zoning districts are consistent with the height maximums in the corresponding current Residential zoning districts. The intent is to have lower heights in the districts with smaller minimum lot sizes.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Note 1: there is no reason to have setbacks for 'structures integral to the operation' of the structure setback the distance equal to the height. And since we are talking ABOUT N1, then are you not saying all setbacks are equal to the height. Clearly the wording is wrong and needs a change	Updated 03/11/2022: This note will be eliminated in the N1 zoning districts.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	D 1 a. page 4-4 restricts duplexes to single story (12' side wall)except is a "SURVEY" is given at permitting. A survey shows horizontal improvements and would not show height. What do you propose to do with said "Survey" . To get a 2-story duplex/ tri-plex you'd have to have side setbacks of 5' plus 12' = 17'. What greater good is achieved by wasting that much of the lot (aka lowering density)?	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade. Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.	Yes
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Building articulation requirements on N1-F can not be applied to TH as such aesthetic requirements are prohibited by § 160D-702. TH's, Duplexes & tri-plexes in NC Building Code are 'A Single-Family dwelling unit constructed in groups of three or more attached units separated by property line in which each unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on not less than two sides' & can have no regulation in Section E or F on page 4-6;	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Only building length applies in the articulation section. This is not a design element covered by 160D-702. The application will be clarified in next draft.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	section G mandating garage location and Primary Pedestrian entry AND Section H (Building Design Standards) are aesthetic requirements and are prohibited by § 160D-702. TH's, Duplexes & tri-plexes in NC Building Code are 'A Single-Family dwelling unit constructed in groups of three or more attached units separated by property line in which each unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on not less than two sides'	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: The standards do not apply to townhomes.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Limiting the # of units in a row of One- & Two Family dwellings is a violation of § 160D-702. ; In addition to violating § 160D-702, the mandating of foundation heights is an ADA violations. Homes need to be able to meet wheelchair accessibility if the customer so chooses; in section 4.4 - there is not enough clarity to figure out how Open Space conflicts or overlaps with Green Area. And there is Zero clarity on how it will be applied to all expansions of buildings. And since Open Space is not required for Single family detached the section 4.5 A (conservation Residential) has no reason for being written)	UDO staff will review the limit on number of units with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: The maximum number of dwelling units in a row is not addressed by 160D-702. Standards related to the foundation height will be revised in the next draft so that residential buildings can be setback and remain at grade. Also, the Zoning Administrator may allow adjustments to standards to meet state and federal law. Updated 03/12/22: (Response to the remainder of the comment.) Open space requirements, including overlap and building expansion, will be addressed in the next UDO draft. The conservation residential option work without an open space requirement.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	4.5A is not needed since there is no required Open Space in N1A to N1D.	Article 4.5 provides an alternative development layout with smaller lots and setbacks and the addition of common open space and additional tree save areas.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Assuming there is some clarity you could add that makes this section usable the following also need changes: the setbacks need some variability from the base requirements on page 4-3	These are minimum setback requirements. Alternatives are provided for recorded plats and for setback averaging.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	the Voluntary Mixed-Income Development still has provisions that will make it unable to achieve the Mixed-Income Objective. Changes needed: The 50% + Affordable Units is too high (3 a & 3 c). that number needs to be 20%.	Updated 03/11/2022: Text will be clarified to indicate that only 50% of the additional units must be affordable, not 50% of all units in the development.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	4D- the required 'dispersion' of units can not be done when you have only 1 or 2 affordable units.	Staff believes the distribution of affordable units is an important aspect of the proposed zoning regulations.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	4e - requiring that the product type not be altered for the Affordable Units isn't how the real world works. Adding Townhouses/ Duplex would naturally be affordable relative to the Single Family detached. & you can't disperse a TH or Duplex..... so conflicts with item D again	Staff believes the form of affordable units provided through this voluntary bonus provision should be consistent with the surrounding community.	No
11/27/2021	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 4.4 Open Space Requirements; 4.5 Alternative Development Options; 4.6 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	On-site pedestrian connectivity in Section 16.5 can not require the lead walk to homes be a certain standard as it is an aesthetic requirements and are prohibited by § 160D-702.	UDO staff will review this with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Sidewalks are not addressed by 160D-702.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/12/2021	4.4 Open Space Requirements	Open space is good, but not all open space is good. To make a blanket requirement all development should have open space is a taking of land by government. This type of taking also make Affordable/Market Rate Houses more unattainable. Example, R-3 land is zoned for 3 houses per acre. The additional open space/tree save actually lowers the density down to about 2.25 DUA.	Updated 03/11/2022: N1-A through N1-E districts do not have open space requirements.	No
12/13/2021	4.5 Alternative Development Options	In 4.5 section B (Voluntary Mixed-Income Residential Development), part 3(a) stipulates that the period of affordability for rental properties is 15 years. I believe that a longer period of affordability, perhaps 30 years or even longer, would better protect the mixed-income nature of the residential development in this section and preserve affordable housing in Charlotte.	Staff believes 15 years is an appropriate time period to ensure program viability.	No
1/19/2022	4.5 Alternative Development Options	Part B Voluntary Mixed-Income Residential Development Comment: Add the N1-E/F and N2-A/B Districts to subsection 1. Applicability. These districts are left out of Article 16.3 Development Bonus and Article 4.5.	Updated 03/11/2022: UDO staff and consultants do not recommend changing this. The structure of these districts do not lend themselves for inclusion in this development option.	No
10/14/2021	4.7 General Development Standards	Can existing Single family Homes in Home Owner Association areas be converted under the new UDO? Will the new UDO rules override existing Home Owner Association rules? Or will HOA's have the ability to prevent duplex conversions? Also for some reason I cannot search the UDO documents for key phrases. Perhaps the document can be released so keywords can be searched in it?; will the UDO allow a deed restricted single family home in a single family Home Owners Association to be converted to a duplex? Or do the HOA's bylaws override the UDO's authority?	UDO standards typically apply to all development, even for properties subject to HOA covenants. However, if HOA covenants are more restrictive than the UDO, then those covenants would prevail.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
10/15/2021	4.7 General Development Standards	<p>(Part 1 of 2)The current draft does not allow for ADU's (Accessory Dwelling Units) to be built on lots with duplexes (existing or new) as the principle structure. I believe this to be inconsistent with the desired goals of the City for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. Affordable Housing – Allowing ADU’s to be added to existing duplexes would enable hundreds of current older NOAH units (of which I own two) to potentially add a third rental unit to the property. This would encourage owners of these affordable units to resist the offers to tear them down for newer, more expensive housing. The City wants to keep as many NOAH units as possible and this would be a logical incentive, consistent with that objective. Otherwise, it puts tremendous economic pressure on these owners to sell the properties to builders and developers as tear downs.</p> <p>2. Logical Consistency – The current draft would enable owners to tear down the existing structure and build a triplex in its place but it won’t allow a third unit to be added to the current duplex. That seems illogical. If an attached ADU was added to an existing duplex (or built unattached) it would look similar to a triplex, yet would probably have cheaper rents on the two older units because newer units cost more.</p>	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this requirement for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 05/01/2022: The 2nd draft UDO will be revised to allow an ADU with a duplex building, as long as the duplexes are not on sublots.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
10/15/2021	4.7 General Development Standards	(Part 2 of 2) 3. Increased Density – Increasing the density in older neighborhoods enables the City to provide services at reduced costs per person. By adding these smaller units throughout the community that objective is accomplished without encountering the typical resistance toward new development. 4. Housing Variety within Communities – enabling ADU’s to be built on lots with duplexes, increases the variety of housing types available within a community. Typically, the ADU’s are small and appeal to single people (both younger and much older) not interested in apartment living for any number of reasons. This demographic has trouble finding housing currently as the supply is very limited. Mixing this type of housing in neighborhoods with larger housing provides a welcome mix. Also, I would appreciate feedback on how the staff views this suggestion. Should they opt not to include this provision I would like to hear the reasons against it, so I better understand the thought process. If there are practical reasons for excluding this option, that I am overlooking, I would appreciate knowing what they are. Thanks.	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this requirement for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 05/01/2022: The 2nd draft UDO will be revised to allow an ADUs with a duplex building, as long as the duplexes are not on sublots.	Yes
10/11/2021	5.1 Purpose	I am against building duplexes and triplexes on any available lot. I live in a Dilworth where we have carefully managed development. Please stop the madness!	The allowance for duplexes and triplexes is based on the policies of the City Council-adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No
1/5/2022	5.1 Purpose	5.1: I love the density that is being sought in N2-A/B/C! More -plex buildings and apartments distributed throughout our neighborhoods and not just on crowded, loud arterials is great for renters and lower-income people!	Thank you for this feedback.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
12/19/2021	5.2 Uses	Current R-8 zoning should be bumped up to N2 district. It is a HUGE mistake leaving R-8 as an N1 district with its current restrictions.	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 04/15/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff has reexamined this and believes that R-8 zoning on a lot classified for Neighborhood 1 Place Type is appropriate to translate to an N1-D Zoning District to be consistent with the policies of the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan. However, any parcel zoned R-8 and classified as a Neighborhood 2 Place Type would be appropriate to be rezoned to an N2-A Zoning District. Additionally, the sidewall height will be increased from 12' to 20' for duplex and triplex forms to provide increased development opportunity.</p>	No
10/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	If the goal of allowing commercial uses in a neighborhood district is to support the notion of a 15-minute city, why is the minimum lot size for a commercial use so big? A 12,000sf lot with a minimum width of 50'-80' is not a "corner store"	Commercial uses in an N1 include not only retail but other uses such as schools and places of worship. Neighborhood commercial establishments in both the N1 & N2 place types have their own standards on p. 15-24.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/11/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	I know that height limits will be based on zoning but are the 48' height limits for multifamily buildings in N2-B stop at 4 stories (assuming each story is 12') and what about multifamily over a commercial use? It seems that the 48' limit might force flat roofs especially if a developer wants to go the maximum height. How will roofs play into the height limit?	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining the maximum height requirements for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 05/02/2022: There is a height plane for a mixed-use building that allows height to be increased to 60' feet on a 1:1 basis for every additional foot of side setback. Staff will add a height bonus provision for the N2-B zoning district allowing a maximum height of 80' with that bonus.	Yes
12/13/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	In section 5.3 section A part 3, I am skeptical as to why public paths, public parks, and transit stations are not considered frontages for N2-A and N2-B districts. Shouldn't development orient itself toward these uses as frontages in order to encourage development that is friendly to pedestrians, transit, and green space?	Updated 03/11/2022: Staff believes projects will be designed to orient to these adjacent facilities where possible. Requiring this standard for residential dwellings in N1-A and N1-B may not always be feasible.	No
1/11/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 5-5- Chart should be modified to show 40' maximum for Row B, N2-A and N2-B— subject to 'Note 4K'— which then allows a height bonus increase to 65' within 200 feet.	Updated 03/16/2022: The 48' height for non-residential and mixed-use buildings allows for a taller ground floor, which is typical of that building type.	No
1/11/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Page 5-5 'Note 3' - "contiguous area of two or fewer parcels..." The word 'contiguous' needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.	Updated 03/10/2022: UDO staff and consultants will update language to clarify the intent.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/18/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Density is currently controlled in zoning districts R-8MF through R-43MF based on units/acre, and is eliminated in this draft of the UDO. In its place, minimum lot areas are used. For N2-A and N2-B zoning districts, the minimum lot area is 3,000 sq. ft. for townhouses (TH) and multi-family attached (MF-A), and 12,000 sq. ft. for multi-family stacked (MF-S). These minimum lot areas do not effectively control density. Instead increase the size of minimum lot areas particularly for N2-A and N2-B, and limit the number of structures/acre similar to units/acre under the current R-8MF through R-43MF. See comments to Article 4.3 in Part III regarding density under zoning districts N1-A through N1-E. This proposed change in the method of determining density significantly increases the density of N2 neighborhoods, and is contrary to the method of units/acre used in all major North Carolina cities.	Updated 03/11/2022: For the N2 districts, it is correct that the overall density standards have been eliminated. Development is controlled by minimum setbacks, maximum building heights, maximum building coverage, and required landscape yards. These standards better manage the scale of development than density, as density doesn't take into account the size of units.	No
1/19/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Comment: Concerned the height may not be adequate for townhome development/multifamily stacked. The solution could be achieved using the additional footage by using the side setback up to 42' in N2-A and 52' for N2-B. This would provide flexibility in ceiling heights up to 10' ceilings and a greater height on the ground floor up to 14'. This additional building height would not apply if adjacent to HDO or NCO.	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section C & C continue to indicate that the Staff is not aware that state law classifies ANY housing unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on not less than two sides as a One- and Two-Family Dwelling. The UDO may not impose requirements not allowed by Law on One- and Two-Family dwellings whether part of a mixture of dwelling types or Not	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: 160D-702 does not prohibit building siting standards.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	5.2 B - what is the rationale for 2/3 maximum unit type?	The intent is to create a diversity of dwelling types on large sites.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section D page 5-5 says it's minimum and maximum heights but no minimum is listed. change the language	The reference to minimum height will be removed in subsequent drafts.	Yes
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	in the unlabeled table on that page you again reference the FAA regs. (see page 4-4) it would be simpler to add this note ONLY in districts that actually have a possibility of getting over 200'	The intent is to maintain some consistency in tables and footnotes across zoning districts for clarity.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section E page 5-6 - the maximum building length is too short. Explain the reasoning for such a limitation	The intent is to avoid long monolithic buildings that are out of character with the surrounding context.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Section E (articulation) pg 5-6 through 5-8 contain Building Design Elements that are not legal on all allowed uses in N2-A, B, & C. Housing Units regulated by the North Carolina Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings can NOT have regulations on Building Articulations (especially footnote 3).	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Building length is the only standard that applies to townhomes, and building length is not addressed by 160D-702.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Note on Transparency section F is the only time UDO correctly excepts townhouses.	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: No change requested.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	Item G page 5-10 can not regulate building length on Townhomes as they are regulated by North Carolina Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings.	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Building length is not addressed by 160D-702.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	page 5-11: Building design Standards for entrances, grade heights, sidewalk width to the entrances, facade variations, architectural features all violate § 160D-702 when the product is a townhome (Roof & foundation connected on no more than 2 sides)	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: These standards apply to multifamily, but are not applicable to townhomes/single family attached.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	page 5-13 section I (Building Material Restrictions) can not be applied to triplexes, quads etc regardless of if they are on sub-lots. § 160D-702 does not differentiate based on how you plat it.	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Triplexes and quadplexes that are not on sublots are not two-family and 160D-702 does not apply.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	pg 5-13 Except for trying to raise the cost of structures what would be a legitimate reason to regulate exterior building materials	The purpose of regulating exterior building materials is to ensure and encourage quality, variety, and durability. Even limited, these materials are permitted to be used for up to 25% of a façade.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	section 5.4- please explain how you intend to regulate the addition of Open Space for a change of use or expansion?	UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/07/2022: Staff will amend the language in the second draft UDO to eliminate change of use as an open space trigger and to change the expansion trigger from 1,000sf to 5,000sf.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	For new Development what is Open Space if not Green Area / Tree Save?	Open Space in the UDO is defined as usable space, which is different from tree save areas and other Green Space.	No
11/27/2021	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 5.4 Open Space Requirements; 5.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements	The requirements for sidewalk onsite aesthetics (width) are not legal when applied to Townhomes, Duplex, Quads & triplex per § 160D-702	UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Sidewalks are not covered by 160D-702.	No
10/27/2021	6.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	In Section E (Building Articulation), exceptions should be built in for historic/existing buildings. As written, the section makes every large, long commercial building non-conforming... and means you can't improve those, because it "worsens" the non-conformance.	The UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this section for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/18/2022: Existing buildings that do not meet the articulation standards are considered to be legally nonconforming. The standards apply to new development, including expansion and additions. Any expansion or addition must not decrease the nonconformity. This is consistent with current practice for legal nonconforming structures. Properties in historic districts are subject to the standards of the Historic District Overlay.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
1/17/2022	6.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	IN 6.3 A 2, why should public parks, off-street public paths, transit-stations, etc. not be considered frontages? Orienting such development towards corridors that aren't auto-intensive seems like the right move here.	Updated 03/31/2022: The typical form of development in the Commercial zoning districts does not lend itself to buildings having multiple orientations and staff does not believe this would be feasible in most cases.	No
1/11/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Page 7-5- 'Note 3' provides as written a 62% increase in base height over existing OFFICE and BUSINESS zoning, which are the likely current zoning adjacent to NB-1 PlaceType locations.</p> <p>Note should be changed to read " The maximum building height of any structure within 200 feet of residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type is limited to 65 feet (40' limit if the property abuts residential use or NB-1 Place Type). These standards apply only to.....</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD
1/11/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Also this definition needs to be examined—see " contiguous area of two or fewer parcels..." The word 'contiguous' needs better definition. The intent to not let just two parcels by themselves dictate is understood, but when part of a larger context, two should be sufficient.	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/10/2022: UDO staff and consultants will update language to clarify the intent.</p>	Yes
10/27/2021	9.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Innovation and Mixed-Use Districts should allow greater density than shown here. See, for example, the Innovation District in Winston-Salem that council just visited.	Updated 03/31/2022: The maximum heights are based on the IMU Place Type from the Comprehensive Plan. The 6 stories recommended in the Place Type can be accommodated using the IMU maximum height standards.	No
2/3/2022	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	The UDO limits the use of "exposed aggregate concrete wall panels" but there's not a definition anywhere that I can find. Taken literally, just about every precast concrete office building in Charlotte would violate the proposed limits. What is really meant by this term?	Updated 04/07/2022: Staff will eliminate exposed aggregate concrete wall panels from the language in the second UDO draft.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/4/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>In section 4.3 there are restrictions on building materials such as corrugated steel, plastic, vinyl and others. Is there any reason behind those restrictions? Do they pose any issues with safety and structural integrity of the buildings? or Are they not approved by the state's building council?</p> <p>If our policy is to make Charlotte city housing affordable, these restrictions act against that policy. Moreover the city should remove these restrictions that do not make any sense and encourage and allow eco-friendly buildings that are made of shipping containers(where the siding is corrugated steel) , recycled plastic, and other options. The city should leave the appearances and looks of the buildings to HOAs and individual property owners to decide.</p>	Updated 04/07/2022: The materials restrictions do not apply to residential single-family and duplex development.	No
2/17/2022	3.2 Zoning District Translation	There is no N1F in table 3.2 but it is in 3.3	Updated 03/12/22: That is correct. There are not existing zoning districts proposed to be translated to the new N1-F zoning district in the UDO.	No
2/16/2022	4.1 Purpose	I understand the reasons behind allowing multi-family housing in single family residential but I believe more information is needed before implementing. We are following in Minneapolis' footsteps without even knowing where it will lead. There are a lot of assumptions about how this will improve things although that is yet to be seen in Minneapolis.	Updated 03/12/22: The allowance for duplexes and triplexes is based on the policies of the City Council-adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/17/2022	4.1 Purpose	<p>4.1 Purpose</p> <p>Triplex and quadruplex should not be allowed in the N1-A, N1-B, and N1-C districts period. It is a terrible way to allow for infill in older established neighborhoods. The word "typically" should never be followed by the words "intended for application" in an ordinance. It leaves too much open interpretation in the sentence for N1-F allowing allowing all dwelling types in N1-A through N1-E zoning districts, as well as small scale townhouse and multi-family dwellings, and is intended for application typically on arterial streets within Neighborhood one place type.</p> <p>What exactly is small scale here?!?!</p>	<p>Updated 03/12/22: The allowance for duplexes and triplexes is based on the policies of the City Council-adopted Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The use of "typically" and "intended for application" are an appropriate for a Purpose Statement which describes the intent of a district. The standards in later sections govern what is allowed to be built. Small scale is defined by what is allowed in N-1F.</p>	No
2/17/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>4.3. D. 1. a.</p> <p>I think there are some serious issues here with the amount of restrictions on duplex/triplexes. In the 2040 plan the themes expressed include "the need for missing middle, diverse, and affordable housing options". You don't get to that by severely limiting the number of plex's that can be built. It makes zero sense to limit plex's where a single family house wouldn't be limited. How does a two story duplex next to a one story house ruin the character of a neighborhood while a single family detached house in the same location and same two story height doesn't? In fact (if I'm not reading this wrong) the single family house could be built up to the maximum allowable height of 40 or 48 ft. You're already limiting buildings to about 3 or 4 stories, why add more restrictions on the plex's? My recommendation is to remove the distinctions between plex's and single family all together. We won't be able to improve access to housing opportunities (as mentioned in the 2040 plan) if we proceed to kneecap the ways we create more housing. N1 zoning is a huge part of the land in Charlotte and if we restrict it so much to prevent multi-unit/missing middle housing, the scarcity of housing and thus the housing crisis will continue to get worse.</p>	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.</p>	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/20/2022	3.2 Zoning District Translation	The Zoning Districts appear to have been developed from and influenced by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Place Types. I have heard it said numerous times that Place Types are “general principles” while zoning districts are “legally enforceable rules”. Can a parcel in a Neighborhood 1 Place Type have a non-Neighborhood zoning district?; The current zoning map includes zoning districts that existed prior to the current Zoning Ordinance that was approved in 1992. The obsolete zoning districts were grandfathered in with the current Zoning Ordinance. Some of those had a (CD) designation but not all. Those obsolete districts that appear on our current zoning map include: R-6PUD, R-9PUD, R-9CD, R-12PUD, R-12CD, R-15CD, R-15MF(CD), R-15PUD & R-20MF. What happens to those zoning districts?	Updated 03/12/22: It is possible that zoning for properties in an N1 Place Type is not aligned with that Place Type. A zoning district that is conditional, like those listed, will remain in place until rezoned to a new zoning district. After adoption of the UDO, zoning of parcels will be reviewed and staff will recommend rezonings for some parcels to bring them in alignment with current policy.	No
2/21/2022	14.4 CCO Cottage Court Overlay	I had previously commented that I would like to see infill developments like Cully Green (https://www.cullygreenpdx.com/) allowed in Charlotte. I hadn't read this section yet and it appears this overlay would be the most logical way for this to happen. However, it appears the hang up would still be the parking minimums. It would be good to see some kind of exceptions to the parking minimums for this overlay. A suggestion for such exceptions would be a parking reduction if the development is within a certain distance from a transit stop or there are some kind of bike facilities provided as part of the development (community long term secure bike parking and maintenance or something).	This comment is still under review	TBD
2/25/2022	5.2 Uses	5.2B limitation to 2/3 of the total units conflicts with pg 15-24 which says 90% of one product type	Updated 03/12/22: This inconsistency will be corrected in the next draft of the UDO.	Yes
3/1/2022	4.2 Uses	Retain the R3 zoning designation!	Updated 03/12/22: The R-3 zoning district will translate to the new N-1A zoning district which is based on the policies of the Council adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/1/2022	5.2 Uses	Retain the R3 Zoning designation!	Updated 03/12/22: The R-3 zoning district will translate to the new N-1A zoning district which is based on the policies of the Council adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No
3/1/2022	4.1 Purpose; 4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	There is mention of certain uses being allowed on arterial streets - how are arterial streets determined? they do not appear to be listed as "arterial" streets on the streets map and in the frontage types. ; 4.3.2 - grammar/sentence structure. perhaps missing plural forms of these frontages in the list, or an "a" and "and" in the sentence?; 4.1 - is there a definition for "small-scale townhouse and multi-family dwellings"? who will interpret "small scale"? ; 4.1 - when "multi-family dwellings" are mentioned as allowed in the N1-F district, does this imply multi-family stacked and attached? it may be helpful to specify (unless there is a definition for multi-family dwellings that classifies both as such).	Updated 03/12/22: An explanation of arterial streets is on page 2-31. 4.3.2 will be corrected. Small for N1-F is defined by the standards of that district, as are the allowances for that district.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/3/2022	4.1 Purpose; 4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Section 4.1 "The Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts also allows... ..for the reuse of existing neighborhood commercial establishments under prescribed conditions."</p> <p>First, I don't see any description of those prescribed conditions.</p> <p>Secondly, and more importantly, it appears that corner stores (small commercial establishments) are not allowed in N1. This is counter to the 2040 plan goals of 10-minute neighborhoods or safe and equitable mobility. If amenities, goods, and services aren't allowed to be built in 50% of the city's land area, how can we reach this goal?</p> <p>Here are two of my ideas to help fix this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Combine the two neighborhood place types. Add in a new N2-A zone to handle single family, duplex, and triplex homes. This zone could require slightly larger minimum lots and shorter build heights. or 2. Add in provisions for non-residential facilities within these zones. Such as requiring the building heights to not exceed 12 above adjacent structures or the building must be on a corner or along an arterial. 	<p>Updated 03/12/22: The prescribed conditions for neighborhood commercial are found on page 15-24. The NC place type and zoning districts are intended to be the primary tool to support the 2040 goal of 10-minute neighborhood.</p> <p>To maintain consistency with the 2040 Plan and Policy Map, staff does not recommend combining zoning for the N1 and N2 place types.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/3/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Section 4.3 D Building Height 1. Building Height Setback Plane</p> <p>Imposing sidewall height restriction</p>	<p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/17/2022: Change 12' to 20' measure from finish floor elevation of ground floor. Finish floor can be no more than 4' above adjacent grade.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will change the language from 12' to 20' for the sidewall measurement, and the language for the finished floor being no more than 4' above adjacent grade will be struck.</p>	Yes
3/9/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>For N1-C the minimum lot width should be at least 60 feet--not 50. This is because there should be a minimum of 10 feet on each side between houses and the property line. The current (and proposed) 5 feet is totally inadequate. At 5 feet one is literally on top of ones neighbor. Further, in situations where plantings have been made right up to the property line, the plantings are destroyed and sunlight is totally blocked when new construction or expansion occurs. Further, if there is a roof gable or dormer that sticks out, there needs to be at least 10 feet between the gable edge and the property line. Also, regarding maximum building coverage... there needs to be consideration of swimming pools, tennis courts, driveways, etc. which are non-permeable. When too much of the site is non-permeable this creates damaging excess water run-off for the neighbors in rainstorms.</p>	<p>Updated 03/12/22: Most of the standards of the N1-C districts are those of the current R-5 district and are consistent with the housing that exists in areas zoned R-5. With respect to runoff, there are drainage requirements in the Storm Water and Natural Resources articles to address run-off.</p>	No
3/10/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>As for Building Height.... 40 feet is too tall. This is equivalent to a 4 story building at 10 feet per story. The maximum allowed height should be 30 feet--not 40. A 40 foot building deprives the neighbors of enjoyment of sunlight and the ability to grow flourishing flowers and vegetables.</p>	<p>Updated 03/12/22: The 40-foot maximum building height reflects existing zoning standards under which many of Charlotte's neighborhoods have been built. The height maximum also includes the roof of a home.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	A 50ft wide open space is much too wide for infill parcels where the cottages would be valuable resources for Affordable housing	<p>Updated 03/16/2022: The minimum lot widths vary by N1 district and are applied only to new development. Existing lots that do not meet the minimum lot width may still be developed provided all other requirements can be met, such as setbacks.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Assuming this comment is in reference to potential cottage court overlay development, staff believes the 50 foot open space width is needed to provide adequate "front yards" and some degree of privacy.</p>	No
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	The rear set backs require too much land area for the small space concept. No more than 15 ft set back is suggested	<p>Updated 03/16/2022: Rear setbacks vary by N1 zoning district, but are generally less than the rear yard minimums in the comparable existing Residential zoning district.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Assuming this comment is in reference to potential cottage court overlay development, staff believes the currently proposed language is appropriate. Setback requirements apply to the periphery of the parent lot, not internally amongst the individual cottages.</p>	No
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Having the common space face a city street is not necessary and it is much too restrictive	Updated 03/18/2022: It is allowed to face a public or private street. The requirement for common space to front on a street is intended to ensure that Cottage Court Development maintains a street presence that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood context.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	The 25% land bonus for building units less than 800 sq ft should be increased to 50% as in small parcels this would not add diffident new units to overcome high land costs.	Updated 04/01/2022:50% would be a significant increase, especially since we allow duplexes and triplexes. We don't recommend increasing this based on the rationale stated in the comment.	No
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Interior streets can be built under private driveway regs not city/state standards. 15 ft wide driveways is sufficient for a small cottage style community.; Parking should be permitted in front of each building or at the rear of each residence as the residents of these units need to be close to their cars due to age health restrictions and extreme weather events	Updated 04/01/2022: We cannot find where this is controlled in these standards. Street standards are regulated separately in the UDO and separate standards should not be created for Cottage Court.	No
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Guest parking should be permitted in a logical location based on land availability and not restricted or regulated to a specific site on the land parcel.	Updated 03/18/2022: We have not controlled the location of "guest parking" specifically - just locations of common parking areas. Guest parking may be provided as a component of the Cottage Court development, subject to the standards regarding placement of parking spaces.	No
3/7/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	There should no restrictions for carports or garages or storage units as many of these smaller dwelling units will have residents who have had to downsize from much larger homes.	Updated 03/18/2022: Garages and carports are regulated universally as follows: "... shall not be located in an established setback along a frontage. ...shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the right-of-way or back of sidewalk, whichever is greater." We don't think an exception is needed. We don't recommend including any special provisions for "storage units" as a component of a Cottage Court development.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/24/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>My concern is the elimination of the units-per-acre standard for density. The tools used to promote density in the proposed Charlotte UDO are maximum lot area and maximum building coverage, which apply to structures/parcels and not units. The impact in zoning districts N1-A through N1-E means that these structures can be built in these zoning districts by right. As an example, on a 1-acre lot where the minimum lot area is 10,000 square feet, and a structure is over 40,000 square feet, in N1-A this structure could be divided into 4 units, 8 duplexes, 12 triplexes, etc. In N1-E, it could be 13 units, 26 duplexes, etc. Why not increase the minimum lot areas? They do so in Raleigh. For attached houses in Raleigh, their minimum lot areas range from 20,000 in R-2 to 4,000 in R-10. That's one way to lessen the density. Another way is to regulate my structures per acre. The proposal that I made is that one way to compromise on density limitations would be to talk about structures per acre - the number of structures per acre would depend on the classification N1-A through N1-E. I made a comment in the portal many months ago and I was wondering when I might receive a response.</p>	<p>Updated 03/11/2022: It is true that the overall density standards have been eliminated and the main control that relates to density is that of minimum lot area. The Comprehensive Plan has established policy that allows duplexes and triplexes in all districts that allow for single-family dwellings, in addition to quadraplexes on arterials, in order to increase the supply of diverse housing options and affordable units; a density cap would work explicitly counter to such policy, artificially limiting the number of dwelling types/units that could be built. The lot area standards set the minimums for all dwelling types, which are then subject to compliance with other standards such as setbacks, parking requirements, coverage, etc. These additional standards, working together, are intended to create compatibility between this mix of dwelling types.</p>	No
2/24/2022	4.1 Purpose	<p>I think that preservation of neighborhood character is an important aspect of this plan for these areas, as well as the ability to introduce new types of housing like duplexes and triplexes. My general concern is that often it's not the duplexes/triplexes that are changing the character of the neighborhood and really introducing types of housing or elevations that are inconsistent with what's already there - it's the single family houses where people are tearing down ranch houses and building giant new houses, and I don't see any of the same types of restrictions and regulations on single family housing as there are on multi-unit housing. Is that a misunderstanding on my part or is that just an aspect of the plan that I'm uncomfortable with?</p>	<p>Updated 03/18/2022: Two new proposed voluntary overlay districts are available in Neighborhood 1 place types that can help regulate the scale and height of new dwellings. They are the Neighborhood Character Overlay (NCO) and the Residential Infill Overlay (RIO). Both districts are in Article 14 of the draft UDO.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/24/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	I have a question about the edges and the translation between residential districts and higher density uses. I looked at the Policy Map, and it looks like there a lot of high-density uses in North Charlotte right up next to single-family zoning - Neighborhood Activity Centers and Community Activity Centers right up against Neighborhood 1. For those high density areas right up next to N1 districts, what will that transition look like for those properties?	This comment is still under review.	TBD
2/24/2022	4.2 Uses	I had a clarification question: Are small commercial or mixed-use buildings (ie corner stores) allowed in N1 zoning districts?	<p>Updated 03/18/2022: The N1 zoning districts allow Neighborhood Commercial Establishments with Prescribed Conditions per Table 15-1: Use Matrix. The prescribed conditions are in Article 15.3.HHH and include a provision that, in the Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 2 Zoning Districts, neighborhood commercial establishments are allowed within existing structures that are nonresidential in their original construction and/or current use as of the effective date of the UDO. Such structures cannot be expanded. There are also additional prescribed conditions that would apply to this use in a Neighborhood 1 district.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - The provided response applies only to the N1 Zoning Districts. There are different standards in the N2-C Zoning District.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
2/24/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	I have 1.7 acres of land in West Charlotte, and I'm wondering if desired aesthetics/architectural features (inspired by a trip to Dubai) will be permitted on our lots. There's popularity across the globe with shipping containers being repurposed, and the conversion of these to living spaces is not a new concept and I'm not sure if this is something that's a discussion in the UDO. Is it possible to have the container as a permitted use due to its desired aesthetics and environmental benefit.	<p>Updated 03/18/2022: The proposed restrictions on building materials would apply to non-residential development as well as mixed-use, triplex, quadraplex, and multi-family. It does not restrict the use of these materials, only limits them to 25% of the facade. The restriction of corrugated metal siding in this section was not intended to apply to the re-use of shipping containers.</p> <p>Updated 04/13/2022: To clarify the previous update - Staff will amend the language of the second draft UDO to clarify this building material restriction does not apply to the reuse of shipping containers.</p>	Yes
2/24/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Had a few comments 1- Could the Non-residential building height that allows for additional height to 60ft be applied to residential heights in N1-E AND N1-F. Could also allow the sidewalls to be higher in those districts; Allowing the voluntary Mixed-income to be allowed in N1-E AND N1-F.	<p>Updated 03/18/2022:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 60' maximum height is only available for non-residential and mixed-use buildings in the N1 zoning districts. 2. We are recommending increasing the minimum sidewall height for duplexes, triplexes, and quadraplexes from 12' to 20'. 3. Because this bonus allows for development to use the standards of the next highest district, and because there are no proposed N1 districts with greater intensity than the N1-E and N1-F districts, we would not support making this change at this time. 	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/11/2022	4.7 General Development Standards	Article 4.7 requires: Loading and Service Area for Single Family Homes Article 20. Absurdity on single family homes. Please clarify that it's only for certain product types and project sizes on attached multi-family stacked homes in N1-f.	Updated 03/18/2022: There are no loading or service requirements for single family homes. Table 20-1 in Article 20.1 indicates loading spaces are required only for multi-family or mixed-use having 50 residential units or more. Article 20.3 indicates solid waste service areas are only required for multi-family and townhome development of more than 11 units.	No
3/11/2022	4.7 General Development Standards	Article 4.7 requires: Architectural Features Article 18. Standards on architectural features (article 18-2 #C page 18-2) specifically exterior architectural ornamentation such as sill, cornices, etc- cannot be regulated on North Carolina Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings (per §160D-702). North Carolina Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings includes all townhomes regardless of the # of units joined by sidewalls	Updated 03/18/2022: The proposed vertical clearance restriction on sills, cornices, etc. in Article 18.2.C.6 only applies to that portion of these architectural features than encroach into the required setback, which is controlled by Table 18-1. The alternative to having a minimum vertical clearance would be to not allow these features to encroach into setbacks at all. 160-D does not limit dimensional standards for architectural features.	No
3/11/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 4.3 G. requirement for no more 2 MF-Stacked structures on a Lot does not work with Condos (stacked flat) with parking lots not garages. Problem is exacerbated with the requirement for entries facing a frontage (Section 4.3H). Please produce drawing of why this requirement works & is desired or change the requirement. Please explain what will happen to all of the condos without garages not facing a frontage when you make then non-conforming. How will the owners get mortgages?	Updated 04-01/2022: The section referenced only applies to N1-F districts. Since no current conventional zoning districts will translate to N1-F, this standard will not create any nonconformities.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/11/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Transparency requirements in Articles 4 to 13 are problematic for certain uses that require limited visibility. Since you intend to over-reach into aesthetics, where are the provisions for uses that need limited transparency. Easily identified examples are banks, mini-storage, telecommunication buildings (e.g AT&T switching station) and jails.	Updated 04/01/2022: Alternate requirements for transparency for uses such as telecommunication buildings and jails will be added in the next draft UDO for districts that have such requirements. Updated 04/07/2022: Staff and consultants believe the draft UDO has adequate language to accommodate the transparency standards for the uses it applies to.	Yes
3/11/2022	6.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 6 appears to be the appropriate category for large commercial uses such as the Outlet Mall but when you look at Article 6 #D, # E, #F (Transparency when retail faces a pedestrian plaza (aka Open Space)), #G (bldg. Design Standards especially the doors have to be 4ft above or below grade) it's clear that the Outlet Mall and The Arboretum (as examples) will be non-conforming. Please change the standards to better reflect what large commercial uses actually look like and how they have to function to comply with federal ADA requirements	Updated 03/18/2022: The requirement is that one prominent entrance is required at grade (same level as adjacent sidewalk). All other ground floor entrances shall be between 4' above and 4' below grade, which means they could be at grade or any elevation between those limits. We don't believe the examples cited would be nonconforming.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/11/2022	7.1 Purpose	<p>Article 7 identifies the purpose as “needs and impacts of large-scale institutional campuses, including governmental, educational, medical, social service, continuum of care residential developments, and religious campuses, which may include associated supportive uses...” clearly calls out CCRC as the intended use--- BUT when you look at the requirements for Article 7 #D (Building Articulation especially the chart notes), # E (Transparency), #F (site layout standards especially the limitation to 8 units per building), #G (bldg. Design Standards especially the ‘over 5 stories’ requirements since the height limitations are 4 stories in IC-1 and OFC, 6 stories in IC-3 & Bonus is not appropriate for a CCRC) (& mandatory grade height for entrances that don’t meet wheelchair or walker requirements) it’s clear that no one thought how you’d do another Sharon Towers/ Aldersgate/ South Minster with only 8 units in a 4 story building with no handicap entrance.</p> <p>Apply the same 4 standards to government owned Affordable Housing. Doesn’t work. Apply the same 4 standards to college dormitories. Doesn’t work</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/16/2022	5.1 Purpose	<p>Thank you for your response to my prior question about TOD zoned properties receiving Neighborhood 2 place types. I thought your response provided very clear guidance that TOD properties should receive one of the Centers place types, and I appreciate the clarity of your response. Despite this, there are still TOD properties that have been changed to Neighborhood 2 place types (I am happy to provide a list of addresses). Can you please provide some additional color on the reasoning why TOD zoned properties need to receive one of the Centers place types so I can take it back to the Place Type team? Your prior response was not enough to have them make the necessary changes and there are still TOD zoned properties with a N2 place type, which will make the UDO conflict itself in a variety of areas.</p>	Updated 04/01/2022: Place Type mapping will be discussed again during the community area plan process to be led by the Comprehensive Plan team.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	It is unclear from the information provided how the following districts and/or existing entitlements in the URP and UCP translate to new districts: oNotwithstanding the fact that conditional districts have been largely eliminated in the UDO, the standards and use options that are found in NS, CC, RE-3 have not been accounted for and appear not present in the translation table. Some sense of the translation of the form and entitlements of those districts should be approximated in a UDO district, even if it is intended to be conventional.	Updated 03/24/2022: NS, CC, and RE-3 are all conditional districts, and any parcels currently having these zoning designations will retain their conditional zoning. These districts will not translate with adoption of the UDO. Only conventional zoning districts will translate to a new UDO district.	No
3/18/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	oThe dimensional standards and intent of the range of current Office districts O-1, O-2, O-3, B-P, RE-1 and RE-2 are not translated to an applicable level of parity in new UDO districts. They all translate to OFC. If the Campus placetype is designated in the URP as the predominate future land use, only one future UDO district has been provided to account for any and all development (existing, entitled or desired) outside of the two Campus districts which are appropriate for single ownership land assemblages like CMS school campus locations and UNCC in the UCP/URP area.	Updated 04/01/2022: The UDO consultant and staff will develop an additional campus zoning district.	Yes
3/19/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	There does not appear to be a translation or rationale on how and where MUDD would translate to CAC-1. The intent statement of CAC-1 would suggest that its use in the UCP area would be appropriate.	Updated 04/01/2022: Properties with conventional MUDD zoning will translate to CAC-2 because of the comparable intensities between MUDD and CAC-2.	No
3/20/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	Although the CC district is conditional can it be assumed that it would likely translate to standards similar to CR?	Updated 03/25/2022: Only conventional zoning districts will translate to a new UDO district (See Table 3-1 in Article 3). Since CC is a conditional district, it will not translate to a different district upon adoption of the UDO.	No
3/21/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	The location of an Industrial-based Placetype and the possibility of introducing ML-1 and ML-2 into the future built environment of UCP is incongruous with the publicly supported future vision of the area.	Updated 03/25/2022: The location of Manufacturing & Logistics place types is recommended by the Policy Map. This is not addressed in the UDO.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/22/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	Current zoning district translation and direction on appropriate locations where IMU is to be used appears to be absent.	Updated 03/25/2022: There are no current zoning districts that will translate to IMU. IMU zoning would have to be sought through a rezoning petition.	No
3/23/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	It is unclear how the OFC district appropriately translates the RE-1 and RE-2 districts	Updated 04/01/2022: The OFC district standards are the closest district to the RE districts in terms of development standards. However, there will be additional opportunities to adjust zoning from OFC including through future alignment rezonings.	No
3/24/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	Direction on how and where the translation of MUDD and other "urban" legacy districts to CAC-1 and CAC-2 is needed.	Updated 04/01/2022: Properties with conventional MUDD zoning will translate to CAC-2 because of the comparable intensities between MUDD and CAC-2.	No
3/25/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	The Predominant Existing Districts in URP (exclusive of existing SF neighborhoods) are:RE-1, RE-2, RE-3, MUDD, O-1, O-2, UR-2, R-17MF, B-D. The available districts that translate, if the Campus Placetype is to remain (which is not supported) is not adequately covered by the OFC district as presented in this draft.	Updated 04/01/2022: The UDO consultant and staff will develop an additional campus zoning district that will be appropriate for rezoning in certain campus place types.	Yes
3/26/2022	3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	The IMU district should be added to the menu of applicable districts available for the Campus Placetype if the URP continues to be classified as Campus on the Policy Map.	Updated 04/01/2022: The proposed UDO does not preclude the application of IMU zoning in an area such as URP.	No
3/18/2022	3.4 Zoning Map; 3.3 UDO Zoning Districts	Given President Biden, and other relevant members of congress', position that the housing shortage is a result of the failure of local zoning ordinances, I would like to suggest this be rereviewed to allow for more open planning. Specifically, more open, single family housing and the lowering of fees to encourage the building of homes and offset of construction prices.	Updated 03/25/2022: The Neighborhood 1 zoning districts in the UDO will allow single-family, duplex, and triplex dwellings on any lot. Fees are not controlled by the UDO.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	3.2 Zoning District Translation	Section 3.2 - The direct translation of the PED overlay to NC is inconsistent with the land use recommendations in the adopted Sunnyside Pedscape and Land Use Plan. This has been partially addressed in the latest iteration of the Policy Map, but the ECA Land Use and Development Committee wants to ensure that the adopted plan recommendations and underlying zoning are not affected by a broad-brush application of NC in PED designated area through the UDO adoption, as would occur if the direct translation was made as proposed.	Updated 04/01/2022: The translation of PED Overlay will be adjusted in the next draft UDO when the underlying zoning is residential.	Yes
3/16/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 4: Section 5 - Sub. Section B - Voluntary Mixed-Income Resident Development Allowing the voluntary Mixed-income to be permitted in N1-E, N1-F, and N2 districts. Adding additional benefits for providing affordable housing (1) reducing required parking minimums in Tier 1 and 2, (2) giving a reduction of Minimum Rear Setback (3) giving ability to reduce the minimum lot area/width including the mixed-use components. All three bonus recommendations can apply to the denser districts N1-C to N1-F and N2.	Updated 04/05/2022: UDO staff and consultants do not recommend changing the applicable zoning districts. The structure of zoning districts listed in the comment do not lend themselves for inclusion in this development option. The ability in using this option to develop under the standards of the next more intense zoning district will bring the benefit of smaller lot sizes, reduced setbacks, etc. Regarding parking standards, they are being reviewed on a comprehensive basis across the draft UDO.	No
3/16/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	() Article 4: Section 4 - Open Space Requirements Sub. Section B - Nonresidential and Mixed-Use On-Site Open Space Giving the ability to convey open space land to the Mecklenburg County in exchange for additional building height (w/ some increased side setback if needed) or reduced parking minimums. It could apply to N1-C and higher.	Updated 04/13/2022: Planning staff is working with Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation regarding these issues.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/16/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Article 4: Section 4.5 - Sub. Section A - Conservation Residential Development Part B - Common Open Space under item ii: ii. Common open space may be conveyed as follows: (A) To Mecklenburg County in support of the Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation Department, if accepted by the County. Comment: This needs to be tiered or incentivized with the development bonus similar to the voluntary mixed-income bonus, this will be the best way to increase small urban parks. The county is willing to and recognizes the need for more land. This option could be applied in districts N1-D TO N1-F.</p>	<p>Updated 04/13/2022: Planning staff is working with Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation regarding these issues.</p>	<p>TBD</p>
3/16/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>(4) Article 4: Section 3 - Dimensional and Design Standards - Part D Building Height: N1-F Building Height should be higher than 40 feet (increasing it to 48ft+) and increased sidewall height without taking the average of adjacent building sidewalls. This will allow more flexibility for quads. Part C Building Siting: Allowing more flexibility for N1-F with Min. Front/Rear Setback. Allowing 10 ft for Front and 20 ft for Rear.</p>	<p>The sidewall height standard does not apply to quadraplex development. Staff will amend the language of the second draft UDO to increase the sidewall height from 12' to 20' for duplex and triplex development thereby allowing more development opportunity.</p> <p>Staff will amend the language of the second draft UDO to allow for a 48' building height for residential uses in the N1-F Zoning District.</p> <p>Staff will also amend the language of the second draft UDO to allow for a 20' rear setback for development in the N1-F Zoning District. However, regarding the front setback, staff feels the current 17' setback (as measured from the right-of-way) is appropriate given that typical development in the N1-F Zoning District is intended to occur on arterial street corridors.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/16/2022	5.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Article 5 Section 3 Dimensional and Design Standards Part D Building Height Comment:</p> <p>Building Heights for N2-B should be increased to at least 52 feet to provide a better ground floor experience by having a higher ceiling height.</p> <p>Building Heights for N2-B with Mixed-Use should have additional height with bonus of up to 60 feet. Multiple bonus requirements could be required.</p>	<p>Updated 05/02/2022: There is a height plane for a mixed-use building that allows height to be increased to 60' feet on a 1:1 basis for every additional foot of side setback.</p> <p>Staff will add a height bonus provision for the N2-B zoning district allowing a maximum height of 80' with that bonus.</p>	Yes
3/18/2022	4.7 General Development Standards	<p>What happens if you begin the rezoning process for development of triplexes or other multi family housing before the UDO comes into effect? Will the developer have to make last minute modifications or will the existing developments or plans for development be grandfathered in?</p>	<p>Updated 04/01/2022: Any conditional zoning petitions underway will be able to proceed through the process in a timely manner. These petitions will be able to be approved under the current (pre-UDO) zoning ordinance.</p>	No
3/14/2022	6.1 Purpose	<p>(Part 1 of 2) The continued existence of these types of employment zoning districts is a disaster for equity and the safety of non-car drivers. So if I understand Article 6 as a whole, the CG districts are (at least pretending) to be more accessible to pedestrians whereas CR is for absolutely nothing but cars. The economic, safety, and equity impacts of this will be devastating.</p> <p>A huge goal of the 2040 plan and the UDO is supposed to be about building "10-Minute neighborhoods" but this spits in the eye of that. The focus of our 2040 plan should be taking the employment centers outlined in Article 6, breaking them down to smaller commercial centers, and integrating them into mixed-Used, N2, and transit centered developments. Zoning like this will create areas like near where I live off Freedom Drive. Where you have no rail access, no bike lanes, parking requirements that inhibit walkability and deter pedestrians. This leads to the empty big box stores that you see on Freedom Drive.</p>	<p>Updated 04/05/2022: The proposed commercial zoning districts do not create auto-centric areas but simply acknowledge that they exist today and the zoning districts recognize that not all areas will have the same level of walkability. We believe the standards in the CG and CR districts will improve walkability over time.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/14/2022	6.1 Purpose	These types of zoned areas limit economic opportunity for our communities by limiting these business to those who have cars. Even though the CG districts are paying lip service to having pedestrians, they're often the most dangerous places to walk because of speeds upwards of 50-60 mph (yes, even if the posted speed limit is 35-45 mph). This creates a stressful environment for drivers and a dangerous one for pedestrians. The best move is to zone the currently existing employment districts as either through fares or streets that have the same retail scaled down to a pedestrian and transit oriented size. To sum this comment up in one sentence: Learn what Stroads are, and stop making them.	Updated 04/05/2022: See above response.	No
3/16/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 7 Campus Zoning Districts, 7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	7.4 Open Space Requirements	The IMU district should be included in this Article as an option to modernize and replace the legacy RE districts. It, with little revision would be appropriate to transition the URP from its original inception into a mixed use research based center. ; While the intent statement may describe the original concept of the URP, current development trends, existing zoning and future vision for the URP is not compatible with this statement and use of this district should not be widespread in the URP. ; 7.3.B: The combination of the Setback and BTZ would promote a setback of 44-60ft. On large parcels found in the URP and UCP where new streets are required to meet block length standards, the setback would not create an appropriate frontage for a suburban to urban transition. ; 7.4.c: The total open space standards as proposed are half of what is required in the current RE districts and should be increased to 20% minimum.	Updated 04/13/2022: UDO staff and consultants will be developing a new campus district which will address many of these concerns.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Article 7 Campus Zoning Districts, 7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 10 Neighborhood Center, 10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 12 Regional Activity Center 12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 7 Campus Zoning Districts, 7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/16/2022	9.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Graphics show 'step backs' and other articulation of the vertical form, but are there regulations and standards for those?	Updated 03/30/2022: There are no step back requirements in the IMU district.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/16/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>B. Building Height, Note 4–</p> <p>After the second sentence, this should be added. Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in Neighborhood 1 Place Type is limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/16/2022	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>The graphics show stepbacks and ‘wedding cake’ type designs, but are there regulations that make this happen to reduce overall height appearance from the street? If not, why not since they were in the TOD ordinance recently adopted.; Article 12, B. Building Height Note 5 should be changed to add after the second sentence — Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 Place Type is limited to 40’ height within the first 50 feet distance.</p> <p>This returns the decades old height restriction next to “single family” zoning.</p>	<p>Updated 04/01/2022: The only stepback requirements in the draft UDO apply to parking structures, in some instances. The renderings are for illustrative purposes only.</p> <p>The comments concerning height are still under review.</p>	TBD
3/16/2022	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	The ‘step back’ and vertical height articulation that was in the Council adopted ordinance now seem to be missing, or are they covered elsewhere? How is that need (to reduce massing appearance) regulated and addressed?	Updated 04/01/2022: The only stepback requirements in the draft UDO apply to parking structures, in some instances. The renderings are for illustrative purposes only. There are other design standards intended to address massing,	No
3/16/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After 2nd sentence please add: Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/16/2022	11.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	B. Building Height (p. 11-4) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/16/2022	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Article 12 Regional Activity Center 12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Apologies if this is the 2nd time I've submitted this. This interface is cumbersome to navigate if one wants to go directly to a particular district.</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	9.4 Open Space Requirements	<p>Suggest adding the following language to the IMU district intent statement: The IMU Innovation Mixed-Use Zoning District is intended to accommodate those areas that have typically developed as industrial and research areas, but are transitioning from an exclusively industrial or research orientation to a broader mix of light industrial, artisan industrial, commercial, research and moderate density residential uses, within a more walkable environment. As such, IMU Zoning District standards encourage and accommodate the adaptive reuse of existing structures.; It is suggested that this district be expanded to include Research Uses as fund in the RE districts and be used to replace the RE-1/2/3 districts as urban alternative to the OFC district. ; 7.4.c: The total open space standards as proposed should be increased to 20% minimum to be consistent with development in the URP and the existing RE districts.</p>	Updated 04/05/2022: The IMU district's Purpose statement reflects the IMU Place Type characteristics. A proposed new (fourth) Campus district may be a better fit for some of the current RE districts.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>Article 7 Campus Zoning Districts, 7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 10 Neighborhood Center, 10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 12 Regional Activity Center 12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance...</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	12.1 Purpose	<p>Article 7 Campus Zoning Districts, 7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 10 Neighborhood Center, 10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 12 Regional Activity Center 12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance...</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	<p>under B building height Note 5-after the second sentence please as "Article 7 Campus Zoning Districts, 7.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, C Building Height (p. 7-5) Note 3 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 10 Neighborhood Center, 10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p> <p>Article 12 Regional Activity Center 12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add in the TOD -NC ZONING Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	9.1 Purpose	<p>I dont understand how there is no deliniation in these districts among some of the TOD ordinances. You are seeing up TR, CC, NC and UC to be different types of places with different rolls in a city. Then watering them down together through the street network being the same in TOD in: page 13-3 Frontage Build-To Zone; page 13-6 Minimum Building Length as a Percentage of Lot Width Along Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage with Additional DesignElements, Maximum Blank Wall Area - Horizontal or Vertical; page13-4 Minimum Ground Floor Height – Residential, Minimum Ground Floor Height – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Maximum Prominent Entry Spacing; Page 13-9 Ground Floor Transparency – Residential, Ground Floor Transparency – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Upper Story Transparency – Residential, Nonresidential, and Mixed-Use. Whats the point? These are intricate designs in the pedestrian realm that you are signifying as important across these districts just to smudge them all together through their road type designation.</p>	<p>Updated 04/07/2022: Thank you for these comments. We believe that there is differentiation between the districts when certain street frontages are present, but certain other standards can apply more broadly.</p>	<p>No</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	11.1 Purpose	<p>I dont understand how there is no deliniation in these districts among some of the TOD ordinances. You are seeing up TR, CC, NC and UC to be different types of places with different rolls in a city. Then watering them down together through the street network being the same in TOD in: page 13-3 Frontage Build-To Zone; page 13-6 Minimum Building Length as a Percentage of Lot Width Along Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage with Additional DesignElements, Maximum Blank Wall Area - Horizontal or Vertical; page13-4 Minimum Ground Floor Height – Residential, Minimum Ground Floor Height – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Maximum Prominent Entry Spacing; Page 13-9 Ground Floor Transparency – Residential, Ground Floor Transparency – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Upper Story Transparency – Residential, Nonresidential, and Mixed-Use. Whats the point? These are intricate designs in the pedestrian realm that you are signifying as important across these districts just to smudge them all together through their road type designation.</p>	<p>Updated 04/07/2022: Thank you for these comments. We believe that there is differentiation between the districts when certain street frontages are present, but certain other standards can apply more broadly.</p>	<p>No</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	12.1 Purpose	<p>I dont understand how there is no deliniation in these districts among some of the TOD ordinances. You are seeing up TR, CC, NC and UC to be different types of places with different rolls in a city. Then watering them down together through the street network being the same in TOD in: page 13-3 Frontage Build-To Zone; page 13-6 Minimum Building Length as a Percentage of Lot Width Along Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage with Additional DesignElements, Maximum Blank Wall Area - Horizontal or Vertical; page13-4 Minimum Ground Floor Height – Residential, Minimum Ground Floor Height – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Maximum Prominent Entry Spacing; Page 13-9 Ground Floor Transparency – Residential, Ground Floor Transparency – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Upper Story Transparency – Residential, Nonresidential, and Mixed-Use. Whats the point? These are intricate designs in the pedestrian realm that you are signifying as important across these districts just to smudge them all together through their road type designation.</p>	<p>Updated 04/07/2022: Thank you for these comments. We believe that there is differentiation between the districts when certain street frontages are present, but certain other standards can apply more broadly.</p>	<p>No</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	13.1 Purpose and Applicability; 13.2 Uses; 13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 13.4 Open Space Requirements; 13.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 13.6 General Development Standards	(Part 1 of 2) There is a watering down of your districts in this section....page 13-3 Frontage Build-To Zone; page 13-6 Minimum Building Length as a Percentage of Lot Width Along Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage with Additional Design Elements, Maximum Blank Wall Area - Horizontal or Vertical; page 13-4 Minimum Ground Floor Height – Residential, Minimum Ground Floor Height – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Maximum Prominent Entry Spacing; Page 13-9 Ground Floor Transparency – Residential, Ground Floor Transparency – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Upper Story Transparency – Residential, Nonresidential, and Mixed-Use. All of these sections make the same criteria across all districts getting to the point where they aren't noticeable as districts. The biggest one for me is on page 13-7, Maximum Prominent Entry Spacing. 250' across all districts on all road types. So someone can come in and build their 500' long MF building right in the middle of "Main Street" in an urban core. When you as a pedestrian get off the transit stop or the bus there, you might have to transverse that block with only one point of engagement for a prominent entry?	Under the current standards, there have been significant difficulty in meeting the standard for larger, single-user buildings. Even if the standard is met – they will design additional entrances to be largely inoperable, or closed at certain times to maintain building security and address access concerns. Therefore, it may not make sense to require these single users to provide as many entrances. The draft UDO includes a standard in the draft that each individual tenant space on the ground floor abutting a frontage requires a prominent entrance with a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk – this is not in the current TOD standards, but is intended to address buildings with multiple ground floor tenants (as opposed to large single-user buildings).	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	13.1 Purpose and Applicability; 13.2 Uses; 13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards; 13.4 Open Space Requirements; 13.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 13.6 General Development Standards	(Part 2 of 2) I understand the building is stepping in and out every so many feet and materials are changing but still what could that facade be with entries 75' apart as the current measurement in Main street, UC? 250' to me is a multifamily building, 75' is mixed use with MF above something that is engaging the pedestrian. It could be office, hotel entry, commercial, etc. IT is a street you want to walk down. I know people will build it like that and exceed the 250' But i believe so much is under built in charlotte that someone can come in now around our transit stops and put up crap that will never sell. So that Mixed use building that we want at our TOD's will never come, because someone decided to build a 4 story Multifamily building on a city block, 5 years before the land was worth enough for Mixed use. I believe this ordinance is a way to tell developers, we want more from you. Not in money, but in what youre building. The bad ones will have to spend more money but the good developers are already thinking of the pedestrian realm and enhancing the city. This UDO is a chance to do that, to hold developers accountable. If they cant afford it or are turned off from the ordinance, they will go elsewhere. They will be fine.	Under the current standards, there have been significant difficulty in meeting the standard for larger, single-user buildings. Even if the standard is met – they will design additional entrances to be largely inoperable, or closed at certain times to maintain building security and address access concerns. Therefore, it may not make sense to require these single users to provide as many entrances. The draft UDO includes a standard in the draft that each individual tenant space on the ground floor abutting a frontage requires a prominent entrance with a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk – this is not in the current TOD standards, but is intended to address buildings with multiple ground floor tenants (as opposed to large single-user buildings).	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/18/2022	10.1 Purpose	I dont understand how there is no deliniation in these districts among some of the TOD ordinances. You are seeing up TR, CC, NC and UC to be different types of places with different rolls in a city. Then watering them down together through the street network being the same in TOD in: page 13-3 Frontage Build-To Zone; page 13-6 Minimum Building Length as a Percentage of Lot Width Along Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage, Maximum Building Length Along a Frontage with Additional DesignElements, Maximum Blank Wall Area - Horizontal or Vertical; page13-4 Minimum Ground Floor Height – Residential, Minimum Ground Floor Height – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Maximum Prominent Entry Spacing; Page 13-9 Ground Floor Transparency – Residential, Ground Floor Transparency – Nonresidential and Mixed-Use, Upper Story Transparency – Residential, Nonresidential, and Mixed-Use. Whats the point? These are intricate designs in the pedestrian realm that you are signifying as important across these districts just to smudge them all together through their road type designation.	Under the current standards, there have been significant difficulty in meeting the standard for larger, single-user buildings. Even if the standard is met – they will design additional entrances to be largely inoperable, or closed at certain times to maintain building security and address access concerns. Therefore, it may not make sense to require these single users to provide as many entrances.The draft UDO includes a standard in the draft that each individual tenant space on the ground floor abutting a frontage requires a prominent entrance with a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk – this is not in the current TOD standards, but is intended to address buildings with multiple ground floor tenants (as opposed to large single-user buildings).	No
3/18/2022	10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 10 Neighborhood Center, 10.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height (p. 10-3) Note 4 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD
3/18/2022	12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	Article 12 Regional Activity Center 12.3 Dimensional and Design Standards, B. Building Height p. 12-4 Note 5 After the 2nd sentence please add Structures immediately adjacent to or abutting residential uses or vacant land in a Neighborhood 1 place type are limited to 40 feet within the first 50 feet distance... (no further changes).	This comment is still under review.	TBD

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to Draft UDO?
3/16/2022	14.3 RIO Residential Infill Overlay	<p>Article 14: Special Purpose and Overlay Zoning Districts</p> <p>Overall Suggestion: We propose adding an overlay district to areas of medium to high housing precarity risk utilizing UC Berkeley's Housing Precarity Risk model and applying it within the Charlotte city limits and all of the unincorporated locales within Charlotte's "sphere of influence." Any development built within this overlay district would "trigger" a community benefits table. Developers would be required to choose whether or not to meet the point system of the community benefits table or go through an exception (EX) rezoning process.;</p> <p>Article 14: Special Purpose and Overlay Zoning Districts - Section 3 - RIO Residential Infill Overlay</p> <p>Comment: This overlay is just a larger version of the NCO. We believe most overlays propose, except maybe the CCO are protective of existing neighborhoods. The EX does not apply to N1, so could the RIO transform into a Yes In My BackYard (YIMBY) overlay for creative, innovative, denser residential areas. Allowing more flexibility with lot size, setbacks, heights/sidewalls, parking, and open space. Allowing more attached units with flexibility on primary pedestrian entries.</p>	This comment is still under review.	TBD