

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 10/19/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | There is not an option to choose 16.1 or 16.4. Perhaps this is the incorrect Article for my comment? | Thank you for this feedback. If you continue to experience difficulty entering comments please contact UDO staff. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | 16.1 A1 b & B 3- Cottage Court is not defined unless it's capitalized and references article 14.4 | This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/26/22: A definition of Cottage Court will be added to the next draft UDO. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | 16.1 A 1- Use of the defined term Multi-Dwelling development says you can't have townhomes on the same lot. Why Not? | Staff will adjust language in the next draft UDO to clarify that townhouses don't have to be under single ownership. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | 16.1 B 4 what is Direct access? contract that to 'indirect access' | This language for direct access has been brought forward from the current Subdivision Ordinance. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | Item B.2 does not meet the definition of a Flag lot. | This will be revised to remove the B.2 reference language in the next draft UDO. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | Item C. - prohibition of Flag Lots (as e defined on page 2-19) will increase stream impacts, take gown more trees, & increase impervious surface for stormwater impacts. Item C needs to be deleted | Updated 04/26/22: UDO staff and consultant do not agree that the prohibition of flag lots will result in the suggested impacts. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | Item D Sight triangles: Drawing on page 16-2 is not correct per Session Law 2021-121 | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/12/21: This will be updated in the next draft of the UDO. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | item I on page 16.3 is entirely off base- obviously inserted by the out of state consultant. developer GRANT easements. the easement document spells out in each easement what structures are allowed. Prohibiting Fences will impact most of the city population. Why does the city care if the original property owner and the Utility co have an agreement that allows fences spelled out in the recorded easement. the section needs to be deleted | This language will be revised to remove the prohibition of fences and wall in the next draft UDO. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | <p>I have operated two extended stay ADUs at 6600 Porterfield Road and 6602 Porterfield Road, 28226 since 2018. The ADU was built with the blessing of the city council and zoning department. There has never been a 400' restriction between STRs (short term rentals - which actually I require a 30 day minimum and most stay 90 to 180 days. Had this been an actual requirement when I applied for a permit, I would not have built. You can not retroactively re-term my terms and should you proceed with doing so, I will sue the Charlotte City council. I will leave it at that. Not happy with who is steering our government. I pay my taxes. I always have. I have paid all my short term taxes as required since I incorporated through AirBNB. Don't restrict my livelihood when I am not part of the problem. Don't dis-allow two AirBNBs on the same property when that wasn't a restriction when I built my ADUs. You can't allow things and then yank the carpet out from under those. I need to be grandfathered in. Stop mutating restrictions and allow the rules that applied to home and business owners at the time the legislation was modified.</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining the conditions for short-term rentals for potential modification in the next draft UDO. The UDO team anticipates having a community meeting in the near future about the proposed STR regulations in the draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/11/2022: Staff has heard and received, and continues to hear and receive, a tremendous amount of feedback on the topic of short-term rentals. Perspectives have spanned the spectrum generating both positive and negative comments about the proposed standards. Numerous benefits and drawbacks have been identified.</p> <p>A topic of this significance warrants additional discussion and consideration beyond staff. Staff held two listening sessions on February 24, 2022. Staff has also presented takeaways from short-term rental comments to City Council and has heard Council's initial feedback on the topic.</p> <p>Staff will work with the UDO consultant to update the proposed standards and updated standards will be included in the second draft of the UDO to be released in May.</p> <p>Updated 04/27/2022: Please see the short-term rental regulations update posted on the UDO website at http://charlotteudo.org.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.7 does not exist in the released version of the UDO. What are you hiding? | This is an error in formatting that will be corrected. | Yes |
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1 B 2. is not the correct definition of Flag Lot. Flag Lots a(item C) should not be prohibited. they are necessary to reduce stream impacts & to deal favorably with varying topography | Updated 04/28/2022: 16.1.C will be revised to remove the B.2 reference language in the next draft UDO. UDO staff and consultant do not agree that the prohibition of flag lots will result in the suggested impacts. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1.1 & B.3 Cottage Court is not defined term | Updated 03/12/22: A definition of cottage court will be added to clarify that this is a development built under the cottage court overlay. | Yes |
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.3 C - administrative Manual not available to review. Does the Bonus require a rezoning or is it Administrative? | The components of the administration manuals are under development and will be posted as they are completed. These manuals provide the administrative procedures for implementing the regulatory language in the bonus table. The bonus does not require a rezoning. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | no definition of CLT Business INclusion or of Equitable Energy Efficiency Home Rehab | The are both city programs. Definitions for these will be added for the next draft UDO. | Yes |
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.4 A.1. Federally regulated utilities, mailboxes etc should not be excluded from the area calculated as open space (especially when a 500 sq ft commercial building can be counted) | Updated 03/12/22: Staff does not believe these items should be counted as part of the required open space. The commercial building would be designed to support the intent of the open space. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | table 16-1 when it merges MF with TH does not correctly state that the private open space on TH can not have design criteria (violates state law 160D-702). Some requirements violate ADA standards | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: 160D-702 is not applicable to open space. Staff has not identified any requirements that violate ADA requirements. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | B. Lighting Design Lights on top and in a parking decks have not been adequately covered. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/26/2022: Per 16.2.B.1, all lighting shall be of full cut-off or semi cut-off luminaire design and text will be added to clarify that this standard also applies to parking structures. In addition, this standard will be expanded to apply to multi-family and townhouse development. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | Comments: The following exterior lighting requirements apply to lighting for nonresidential uses on private property. These lighting regulations do not apply to lighting in the right-of-way or the illumination of signs. This needs to be expanded to at least Multifamily uses in all districts. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/22/2022: This standard will be expanded to multi-family and townhouse development. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | <p>Part B. Lighting Design</p> <p>Item 1. All lighting shall be of full cut-off or semi-cut-off luminaire design. Remove Semi Cut-Off Luminaire design</p> <p>Item 4. Change wording to this: "All exterior lighting including non-single family dwellings shall be located, screened, or shielded in a manner as not to cause glare or impair the vision of anyone using the public right-of-way including but not limited to transit users, motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. "</p> | Updated 04/28/2022: Staff feels that semi cut-off luminaire design is appropriate language. The purpose of lighting is to also illuminate the way for cyclists and pedestrians. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 16.3 Development Bonus | Table 16-1: Why would this menu not include some of the benefits listed in section 38.2.c.3.b? | There is some overlap between the bonus table and the EX zoning benefits such as: sustainability standards, and the incorporation of an affordable housing set-aside. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 16.3 Development Bonus | 16.3 B2. With no clarity on Open Space vs. Green Area / Tree Save this section makes no sense. | The reduction is for the open space, when required, in the zoning districts. The language will be adjusted in the next draft UDO to provide clarity. | Yes |
| 10/19/2021 | 16.3 Development Bonus | Failure to provide the Administrative manual for UDO bonus make this section unreadable. | The components of the administration manuals are under development and will be posted as they are completed. These manuals provide the administrative procedures for implementing the regulatory language in the bonus table. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.3 Development Bonus | <p>Height Bonus</p> <p>The effect of additional height on surrounding residential neighborhoods when urban development is allowed to be adjacent has not been adequately considered nor adequate offsetting compensation requested for this bonus.</p> <p>The addition of several floors to a building can completely change the visual character of a neighborhood where place types abut.</p> | Thank you for this feedback. If you have specific suggestions or recommendations we invite you to submit those through the comment portal. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 16.3 Development Bonus | With regards to affordable housing, the fee in lieu currently established is inadequate as a trade-off. Bonus Project are required to provide true affordable housing units, or units/ land for building units elsewhere. The fee in lieu amounts currently scheduled are a fraction of the other required bonus devices, and should be adjusted or eliminated as an option. | Staff believes the fee-in-lieu process, which was established with TOD zoning, has been effective and beneficial to the community. The specific amount of the fee-in-lieu is established annually through the city's budget process. This annual process provides an opportunity to adjust the fee. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.3 Development Bonus | Part B. Bonus Actions: Subsection 2 Open Space Reduction/Height Bonus in relationship to Table 16-1 under Transportation Improvements: Comments: Allowing for open space reduction or height bonus if all or a majority of a mobility hub is built (higher amount of points) or setting aside land for future mobility hubs on primary frontages (lower amount of points). UC District has unlimited height by right, what bonus item(s) beyond open space reduction can be added? UC is not currently included in Article 16.3, missing out on an opportunity to add key "last-mile" infrastructure like mobility hubs, or transit right-of-way, and LEED construction. | Updated 05/01/2022: The second draft UDO will include new height bonus provisions that support multimodal options and transportation demand management. City Council decided that the height in Uptown should be unlimited during the Comprehensive Plan process. Staff does not believe that bonuses should be added to UC, as development in Uptown will typically support alternative modes of transportation because of its location and intensity. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | Public open space requirements do not generally garner meaningful open space. We have all seen this over time. I propose regulations that allow for offsite mitigation of open space, not unlike tree save or storm water. The mitigation would aim to allow multiparcel developments to combine open space requirements and would require design standards for onsite and offsite open space. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 06/01/2022: The open space requirements have been amended to provide for open space dedication and a fee-in-lieu alternative. A development bonus will also be available for providing additional open space above the required amount. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | 16.4 A #2 & #3 makes no sense. Mailboxes are exempted from local ordinances as they are federally regulated (i.e. can't count in impervious area calcs by law) | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: The standards are not regulating mailbox design or location of mailboxes which are addressed by federal regulations. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | Landscape yards, stream buffers and tree save areas are all very appropriate Open Space. they needs to be allowed as Open Space (once it's defined) | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining language for potential modification in the next draft UDO to clarify when overlap of these may be utilized. Updated 03/12/21: The open space allowances will be updated in the next draft to clarify where overlap is allowed. Areas like amenitized tree areas are allowed to be counted toward open space. Any similar areas that are usable will also be allowed to count toward open space. However, landscape yards, as an example, would not count toward open space as they do not meet the intent of the zoning open space. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | 16.4.A 3 - you can count commercial structures but not mailbox kiosk? that makes no sense | Updated 03/12/22: Staff does not believe these items should be counted as part of the required open space. The commercial building would be designed to support the intent of the open space. | No |
| 10/20/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | 16.4B Uses exempted omitted Single family & thus conflicts with 4.4 and 5.4 | In the next draft UDO staff will clarify that the exemptions at Section 16.4.B are in addition to the exemptions in zoning districts as may be applicable. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | Table 16.1 contains violations of § 160D-702 in the requirements of private open space of SF, TH, etc | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: 160D-702 does not apply to open space. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | 16.5 mandating any width for the walkway from driveway or sidewalk to the entrance violates § 160D-702 as it is a Building Design Element (not regulated by Building code - so it is purely aesthetic) IN addition why would you want or need a 4' (or 5') lead walk to a 3' door? | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: 160D-702 doesn't apply to sidewalks. Sidewalks are for mobility, not aesthetics. 4' is a typical standard for on-site sidewalks. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.5 On Site Pedestrian Connectivity | 16.5 A needs to be deleted | Staff believes pedestrian connections from buildings to public sidewalks, paths, and other facilities are an important component of mobility in the community, and that these standards are consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.6 Performance Standards | Under the UDO section 16.6 'Noise' is says something like 'uses cannot generate noise' but much noise is not generated by 'uses' as defined. Fans, generators and equipment are not 'uses' — but the noise they generate beyond the property line should be regulated under 16.6. Either modify the definition, or change 16.6 to say 'uses and equipment' shall not..... | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/28/2022: In the context of Article 16.6.A, the term "use" is inclusive of any noise generated by equipment on the site. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.6A removed the construction time prohibition of 9pm to 7am. Construction & development make noise and vibration and can not be prohibited. Match muni-code Section 15-63 | The current zoning ordinance does not reference such time prohibitions. Section 15-63 of the city code of ordinances references time period prohibitions. The UDO process will not make changes to this section of the city code. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 16.6 Performance Standards | Article 16.6 B is missing | This is an error in formatting that will be corrected in the next draft UDO. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 16.6 Performance Standards | Article 16.6D (Dust) is too broad as to be unenforceable. We actually get Sahara dust in CLT during some times of the year. making it illegal doesn't make it stop | Updated 03/28/2022: Article 16.6.D is intended to mitigate dust generated "within lot boundaries", in other words, generated within the site itself and not from external sources. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.6E Odors & Fumes is not authorized in the ETJ per 160A-193 (only City plus 1 mile). Examples of the extent of the over-reach as written this makes it a violation of the UDO for CMU to vent sewer gas, or to have a BBQ grill or wood-burning fireplace | Updated 5/19/2022: Please provide information for the contention that this Section could not be enforced in the ETJ. This Section would only be applied in egregious situations as determined by the Zoning Administrator. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 16.6 Performance Standards | A.Noise The term 'no use' should be revised to reflect that most noise is not from 'use' but from 'things'- generators, pumps, HVAC equipment, fans. This should read: No use, equipment, or activity shall be operated..... | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/28/2022: In the context of Article 16.6.A, the term "use" is inclusive of any noise generated by equipment on the site. (same answer given in Row 35) | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.1(B): This is very restrictive and very problematic for large-scale, phased adaptive reuse projects. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/28/2022: Staff feels the current proposed language is appropriate. The language allows for accessory structures to be constructed as long as the building permit for the principal building has been obtained, or the principal use has been approved. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | the edification of Accessory structure as incidental & subordinate doesn't help with the Article 17.1 C. A lot of incidental & subordinate structures do not take a building permit & should not require a Zoning permit- i.e. mailboxes, light poles, fences, walls). Change the wording in item C | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/27/2022: The second draft UDO will have language to create exceptions for these type structures as allowed in required setbacks. Additionally, as multiple of the listed examples do not currently require zoning permitting that will carry forward. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.1 D 2 - Clarify that an ADU is not an Accessory Structure. | An ADU is a use and not, in itself, a structure. However, an ADU as a use may be located within an accessory structure. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.1.E. why this size limitation? Older homes are small and generally have out building. this section needs to be removed | Staff believes the current proposed language, which increases size allowance from language in the current zoning ordinance, is appropriate. The size limitation is to ensure that accessory structures remain accessory in nature to the principal structure on a lot. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.2 D (Fences & Walls) - the prohibition of vinyl is over restrictive. it's a popular fence material (regardless of zoning category) because it is low maintenance. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/28/2022: The restriction on vinyl as a fence material will be removed. Vinyl slats in a chain link fence are still not permitted. | Yes |
| 1/11/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | prohibition of chain link with fence slats makes no sense. Fence slats when used on construction yards reduce the theft | Updated 03/12/21: Fence slats for chain link are disallowed because they easily deteriorate over time. They are also not allowed under current regulations. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | page 17-5 itemK - requirement to screen a back flow preventor or a duke transformer, or an AT&T box is excessive. Prohibition of the same type structures in the setback is ridiculous. Where else are they going to go? under the building? You tell Duke to put transformers on the back property line & see what reaction you get. | Updated 03/28/2022: The screening of such structures is required in many zoning districts in the City's current Zoning Ordinance. Smaller utility structures, such as a CATV box or small backflow preventer, need to be screened per Article 17.2.K.c). Above ground utility structures may be allowed in established setbacks but not in required setbacks per Article 17.2.K.a. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | Page 17-4 Retail Shipping Lockers regulated Cluster mailbox units in violation of federal & State law. Definition needs to specifically exempt federal mail boxes. | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Retail shipping lockers are not mailboxes and are not federally regulated. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | GS 160D-908 makes fence wraps EXEMPT from zoning regulation. page 173- (section 17.2 D.b needs to reflect that law | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Fence wraps for construction will be added to be consistent with state law. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 10/27/2021 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | <p>The current draft does not allow ADU’s to be built on lots where a duplex is the principle residence. I believe that 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 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>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</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 04/28/2022: Staff will amend the next draft UDO to allow an ADU in conjunction with a duplex dwelling in any zoning district when each unit is not located on a subplot.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.2(D)(1)(b). Why regulate aesthetics like this? Why limit waiver to materials "deemed to be similar" - what if there's a different but aesthetically helpful fencing material? | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 4/28/2022: Staff feels the list of materials is broad and the zoning administrator has sufficient flexibility. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.2(H)(1) - what does "permitted only in association with" mean? What part of a particular mixed use development is "associated with non-residential uses"? | This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.2(I)(2): A 40' dimension here is based on a suburban land use density. | The 40' dimension is to safely allow for the safe stacking of two average size vehicles. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | 17.2(K)(2): Need an exception reading "unless otherwise impractical" --- for example, go visit 1701 N Graham St and 1801 N Graham St, where utilities had to go on the street-facing facade. | Updated 04/26/2022: Language will be added to say "to the greatest extent practicable." | Yes |
| 1/11/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling | 18.2 B adding at grade patios to the definition of what is an extension of a principle structure makes no sense. Greenhouses are not part of the principle structure and should not be in the list either | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: The standards are for architectural features that may extend into required setbacks, not extensions to the principal structure. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling | table 1-1 should remove Patios as an architectural feature | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: For the purpose of this article, patios are considered an architectural feature. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling | table 18-1 should remove Patios as an architectural feature | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: For the purpose of this article, patios are considered an architectural feature. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling | page 18-2 if breezeways are not permitted why do they have Building Design elements ascribed to them? | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: Breezeways may be permitted but they may not extend into required setbacks, as indicated in Table 18-1. | No |
| 1/14/2022 | 19.10 Valet Parking Requirements | 19.10: Exception for existing/historic buildings? | Updated 03/12/22: Staff believes that these standards are appropriate for existing buildings. | No |
| 1/7/2022 | 19.11 Commercial Vehicle Storage | 19.11: Is vehicle storage a defined term? | This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. | Yes |
| 1/7/2022 | 19.11 Commercial Vehicle Storage | Also, 19.11(B) is not clear to me - what does this mean? | This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/7/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | <p>(Part 1 of 2) Bicycles are vehicles as defined by NC DOT. Although vehicles as stated are motor vehicles with delineation between bicycles and motor vehicles there should not be a distinction. Motorized vehicle parking minimums need to abolished. There is no free parking. What if the only free parking was for bikes, motorcycles, electric vehicles i.e. the vehicles we would like to encourage. Paid parking would be for internal combustion engines. What if the closest parking were for those aforementioned preferred vehicles? What if the closest, easiest, free parking and drop off were for public transit and preferred modes of transportation. We must create the world we want. Eliminate valet service for motorized v; Bicycles are vehicles as defined by NC DOT. Although vehicles as stated are motor vehicles with delineation between bicycles and motor vehicles there should not be a distinction. Motorized vehicle parking minimums need to abolished. There is no free parking. What if the only free parking was for bikes, motorcycles, electric vehicles i.e. the vehicles we would like to encourage.</p> | <p>The proposed parking standards in the draft UDO are designed to recognize the community's current development and transportation context while furthering multi-modal transportation options. Some of these suggestions are beyond the scope of the UDO, such as free v. paid parking. The UDO team has forwarded these comments to the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) for consideration in its initiatives.</p> <p>Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CDOT.</p> | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|----------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/7/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | (Part 2 of 2) Paid parking would be for internal combustion engines. What if the closest parking were for those aforementioned preferred vehicles? What if the closest, easiest, free parking and drop off were for public transit and preferred modes of transportation. We must create the world we want. Eliminate valet service for motorized vehicles. Mandate those spots furthest away and charge for them. Encourage drop off zones for ride hailing services. Discourage single occupancy vehicles. Bike parking standards should accommodate all types of bikes with racks, bags, recumbents, cargo bikes. Adequate clearance and spacing is needed. U locks must be usable on such racks. Bike lockers and shower facilities should be mandated for all parking garages and some for public use. | The proposed parking standards in the draft UDO are designed to recognize the community's current development and transportation context while furthering multi-modal transportation options. Some of these suggestions are beyond the scope of the UDO, such as free v. paid parking. The UDO team has forwarded these comments to the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) for consideration in its initiatives. Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CDOT. | No |
| 1/7/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Part D Section 2 - Public Parking Credit Add the option for nongovernmental ownership if there is a shared parking agreement in place. More shared parking is called for in the draft plan of Center City Vision Plan in section 2D-1. | The proposed UDO language does not preclude a development meeting parking requirements through a parking agreement in a non-governmental parking facility. The UC zoning district in Center City does not have parking minimums that need to be met. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/7/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | <p>Part A Section 1-C and Table 19-1 - Vehicle Parking Requirements</p> <p>Changes to:</p> <p>Tier 1: N-2B moves to Tier 2</p> <p>Tier 2: CAC-2 is marked in both Tier 2 and Tier 3, needs to be removed from Tier 2. The application of Maximums in the table states "Does not apply to parking structures" this should be replaced with the exclusion of the districts like IC-2 OR CR and apply to lots and structures in all remaining districts.</p> <p>Tier 3: More aggressive parking maximums in or near rapid transit stations. The number should be less than 1 per unit and not per bedroom while being more aggressive at the ¼ mile distance from rapid transit. The number of parking spaces can increase at the ½ mile distance of a rapid transit station.</p> | <p>This comment is still under review.</p> <p>Updated 06/01/2022:</p> <p>Tier 1: N2-B has been moved from Tier 1 to Tier 2</p> <p>Tier 2: The duplicate of CAC-2 has been corrected. CAC-2 is in Tier 3. No change recommended to exempt parking lots and parking structures from parking maximums.</p> <p>Tier 3: No change recommended to parking maximums for residential.</p> | Yes |
| 10/27/2021 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | <p>19.2 - Car Parking minimums shouldn't exist for most building types. Design a city for people, not cars.; 19.4 - Table 19.3 leaving Stadiums as "conditional zoning" doesn't sit well. With having both our stadiums in the city center, we should have some sort of minimum but be able to scale up. I also think it's worth including electric scooters in this. As much as I don't like them/people use them irresponsibly, it's better than more cars.</p> | <p>The proposed parking standards in the draft UDO are designed to recognize the community's current development and transportation context while furthering multi-modal transportation options. Some of these suggestions are beyond the scope of the UDO, such as free v. paid parking. The UDO team has forwarded these comments to the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) for consideration in its initiatives.</p> <p>Updated 02/08/2022: This comment has been referred to CDOT.</p> | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | <p>Section 19.3 - EV-Capable and EV-Ready space calculation should be clarified that they are cumulative requirements vs concurrent requirements (ie 10% EV-Ready doesn't fulfill half of the 20% EV-Capable requirement).</p> | <p>Updated 03/12/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 5/31/2022: EV Ready requirements removed from Article 19.3.</p> | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 11/26/2021 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | Section 19.3 - 20% EV-Capable seems excessive and cost-prohibitive for public parking structures (think it's fine for residential). For example the current Panther's deck at Mint St would need 444 spaces EV-Capable, another 222 spaces EV-Ready, and 45 spaces EVSE-Installed. They currently have 24 EV spaces and the deck is owned by Duke Energy (ie if anyone is leading the way on installing chargers they should be). I would suggest going from 20/10 to 10/5. | Updated 03/12/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 5/31/2022: EV Ready requirements removed from Article 19.3. For parking decks over 50 spaces, the 2nd draft UDO requires 20% to be EV Capable and 2% EV Installed. | Yes |
| 11/26/2021 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | Table 19-2 Comment: In the 0-9 spaces category of off-street parking, there are zero types of EV charging stations called for in the current draft. If EVs are the future we will need at least 1 EV-Ready space in the 0-9 segment or 1 EV-Capable is preferred. | Updated 03/12/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 5/31/2022: No change recommended for 0-9 parking spaces. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; | Section 19.3 - there should be a requirement that parking for office buildings also include EV charging. I would recommend 10% EV-Capable, 5% EV-Ready, 2% EVSE-Installed. | Updated 03/12/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 5/31/2022: No change recommended to add office to the uses that require EV parking at this time. This use and others may be added at a future date. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots; 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | 19.3(c)(1) - why are we not following regular math, where we round down up to .49 and round up from .5? | Updated 03/12/22: UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 04/28/2022: Staff will amend the second draft UDO to strike Section 19.3.C.1. Rounding will conform to the fractional standards found in the Rules of Construction in Article 2. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 10/27/2021 | 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | With regard to parking space requirements for Self-storage Facility: min 1/25 storage units. This is a significant increase over the previous standard of 0.25 per 1000sf. A 100,000sf self-storage facility typically will have 30 trips in a 24hr period. Dedicating this much space for parking is a wasteful use of land area, increasing development costs and more impervious area that is not used. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: We believe this is a reasonable minimum parking requirement for self-storage facilities where parking minimums would apply. | No |
| 1/7/2022 | 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | Part C: Comment: This line should be removed: "In no case are more than 30 short-term bicycle parking spaces required to be provided." | Updated 03/12/22: This standard is included so that the required number of bicycle parking spaces does not significantly exceed demand. This does not prohibit providing more spaces. | No |
| 1/7/2022 | 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | Table 19.3 Bicycle Parking Requirements in relation to Public Park at 2 per Acre Comment: Suggestion: Urban parks can tend to be smaller but more heavily used with more people biking to them. Example 1st Ward Park is a 2-3 acre park and would have 4 to 6 required bicycle spaces. | This comment is still under review. Updated 03/29/2022: We will update the minimum bike parking requirement for Public Park to 4 per acre. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | 19.6(A)(2)(b)(II)(A): Recommend clarifying when existing lots need to be improved or removed entirely - just restriping? renovating part of building that uses an existing, non-conforming lot? If just part of the building is renovated, how much of the lot has to be upgraded or removed?; 19.7(B)(2): Why must garage screening resemble adjacent buildings? Stop regulating aesthetics. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language to provide clarity on nonconforming parking in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: The section referenced applies only where there is no principal building. Updated 4/28/2022: The intent of the screening language for garages is to mitigate their visual impact. We invite you to provide specific suggestions or recommendations for alternative approaches. Staff will add provisions related to nonconforming parking lots to clarify that maintenance such as seal coating, resurfacing, and restriping alone do not require them to be brought into conformance. Renovation of a building that does not require an increase in parking would not require the parking lot to be brought into conformance. | Yes |
| 10/7/2021 | 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | 19.6A 1. a. i. needs to say single-family detached | The UDO does not use the term single-family detached. Refer to "Dwelling - Single-Family" in the use definitions in Article 15. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | 19.6 A. 1. a. 1. (c) would remove the allowance for on street parking to count for a % of required parking. Why remove that? | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/29/2022: This section is only for the design of surface parking. On-street parking spaces will still count toward required parking as indicated in Article 19.2.D.1. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | 19.6A 1. 1.iii. (c) appears to remove the flexibility of a 3-car garage or a circular driveway . Why remove that owners option? | The current proposed language limits driveway width to 20 feet in width in the established setback along a frontage. The proposed language does not prohibit 3-car garages or circular driveways as options. The standards do limit duplexes, triplexes, and quadraplexes to one driveway cut per street frontage. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 10/27/2021 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | 19.7(B)(3): Any openings, including those not facing a street? | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining parking structure screening language. Updated 03/29/2022: Any openings that face a frontage, which is typically but not always a street. | No |
| 11/26/2021 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | 19.7(B)(3): This rule presumes a large, flat, suburban site with few constraints. It is also regulating aesthetics. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining parking structure screening language. Updated 03/29/2022: The requirement that all floors of a parking structure that fronts onto a frontage be level is feasible regardless of the slope of the site. The requirement is intended to have floors align with the architectural openings on the facade so that sloped floors are not visible through the openings. | No |
| 1/11/2022 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | 19.7(B)(4) - can any garage meeting these screening requirements meet the air-flow requirements to be non-sprinkled? It seems like not. If there must be a 4' tall wall AND 50% of the opening above the wall must be blocked by the features specified, it seems like all garages in charlotte will need sprinklers. | This comment is still under review. Updated 03/29/2022: These standards are similar to those already in effect in some of the current zoning districts. Parking structures must comply with all applicable building and fire codes. | No |
| 10/25/2021 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | 19.7(C)(1)(c): What does it mean to require a fully wrapped parking garage to be articulated? | Building articulation standards that must be met are found in the applicable zoning districts. | No |
| 10/25/2021 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | 19.7(c)(2)(c): Exclude fire stairs from the calculation? 90% will be very hard to reach otherwise. | This language will be revised to provide clarity for fire stairs as an exclusion in the next draft UDO. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/6/2022 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | Section 19.7 - consider unintended consequences of only applying parking deck screening to facades abutting a frontage. Decks should be screened on all sides not already screened by an adjacent building. FNB tower is screened on all frontages but has exposed deck that is highly visible to the whole city on the two sides next to the Mint St deck. Portman's the Line in South End has a massive parking deck that only has one frontage on Hawkins St. The side facing the Rail Trail should absolutely have parking deck screening on the entire deck, as well as the part that faces the recording studio (which isn't on any frontage but is still visible to everyone in South End. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining parking structure screening language. Updated 04/28/22: At this time we don't believe that screening on all facades is appropriate. The draft UDO does include standards for screening along the Rail Trail. | No |
| 1/6/2022 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | Lighting of parking structures can be disruptive to adjacent residential areas and streets. I suggest adding: Internal deck lighting which is visible from adjacent property or streets shall be shielded to meet the 'semi cut off' standard of these regulations in 16.2. Lighting for covered driveway entry/exit shall be full cut off shielded. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining parking structure screening language. Updated 04/28/22: Staff added a reference to required exterior parking facility lighting, but zoning does not control the internal lighting for structures and buildings, including parking decks. Staff believes the current standards that allow semi-cut off lighting are appropriate. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 10/27/2021 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking | The distinction between short- and long-term bike parking is basically whether it's covered or not. For someone who commutes to work, simply having a roof over your bike is insufficient. Long-term bike parking must be secure (restricted access via key, passcard, etc), and ideally, it would be accompanied by a facility with personal lockers and showers. Simply requiring buildings to have the small amount of space required to park a bike is not sufficient to encourage more people to bike to work. Additional infrastructure is needed, and the UDO is the place to put teeth into regulations that address how our city is built. Why spend time and effort to write a code that doesn't go nearly far enough in addressing the gaps in our built environment? | Updated 04/26/22: The proposed UDO standards do not prohibit the elements requested. The development bonus provisions include incentives for micromobility lockers. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 20.1 Required Loading Spaces; 20.3 Required Solid Waste Service Areas | title of 201. needs to change to read Required Loading Spaces/ Areas | This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. | Yes |
| 10/27/2021 | 21.1 Purpose | 21.2(a) Why is City regulating all plant material? Needlessly controlling. | The UDO allows for the selection from a wide variety of shrubs and trees appropriate for the Charlotte environment. | No |
| 10/27/2021 | 21.10 Landscape Yard for Residential Subdivisions Abutting Limited Access Roads | 21.10 B - setbacks should be allowed to included Landscape yards | Updated 03/12/22: This standard only applies to residential subdivisions (single family, duplex, and triplex) abutting limited access roads where additional landscaping and space is warranted due to the character of and noise from the road. This is consistent with existing standards. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/11/2022 | 21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas | <p>(Part 1 of 2) My comment is in relation to 21.12 (not Article 17) . We would like to see some language that allows for landscape screening in lieu of opaque wall and gates. The old code allowed for landscape screening of waste containers but the UDO does not. That is understandable when considering the traditional dumpster but this is a newer technology and has a lot of benefits that traditional waste containers don't. I am specifically talking about waste containers that are partially in the ground such as EnviroBIN. Molok or Sutera. I am sure there are other brands as well. Both Knoxville and Nashville had recently written text amendments to use in-ground waste containers as alternate without opaque screening and gates. We are willing to provide the language that Nashville Metro used. This is also a common way of handling trash in Europe and in Canada. Here are some websites that show these types of containers www.ingroundwastecontainer.com www.sutera-inground.com www.molokna.com</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/12/21: Alternative screening requirements for small dumpsters that are of a minimal height will be included in the next draft of the UDO.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 10/27/2021 | 21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas | <p>(Part 2 of 2) Here are some of the benefits to in-ground waste containers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easier to load No run-off of “dumpster juice” Helps meets Sustainability goals No access for pests/ rodents / vermin Rotomolded PE container, will not rust. More attractive design. No gates to maintain. In-ground waste stays cooler therefore the odor is reduced Gravity locked lid, no bulky items in container (mattresses, tires, etc) <p>We have, of course, a lot more supporting documentation that we can send including pictures from at least 1500 projects to date.</p> <p>Contact Info: Greg Carmichael greg.carmichael@binovagroup.com 865-244-9312</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/12/21: Alternative screening requirements for small dumpsters that are of a minimal height will be included in the next draft of the UDO.</p> | Yes |
| 10/27/2021 | 21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas | <p>Re: screening for dumpsters, etc... consider doing away with the gate/ door requirement. The gates/ doors seem to almost always not get the maintenance they need, and they quickly sag, break, or start to fall apart, often at the hands of abuse from waste haulers. They also dont always get closed, which pretty much negates their existence.</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/29/2022: Poor maintenance of the required gate or door does not remove the need for such screening of these areas and no change to the draft text is recommended.</p> | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| 1/16/2022 | 21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas | <p>(Part 1 of 2) RE: Article 21 Screening for dumpsters</p> <p>I was able to join the virtual session (Jan 6th) regarding Parking, Landscape Screening etc. and had asked about using landscaping in lieu of opaque walls when using in-ground type waste containers. Other cities in the area have adopted this; Nashville, Knoxville, Spartanburg, Greenville SC, along w smaller towns because they can see the advantage of these type receptacles over traditional dumpsters. Removing the enclosure requirement incentivizes contractors/designers to use this system because it is more cost effective. The question on the chat came down to considering the removal of the requirement for gates on the enclosures if CLT isn't willing to change the wall requirement. Arista - CAMIROS asked if we could give some reasons for removing the gate requirement. I will attempt to do that here:</p> <p>Dumpster Enclosure gates are by definition very high maintenance</p> <p>Gates are more-often-than-not, left open</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">When left open they are often a hazard to pedestrians and traffic in the parking lot</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Gates not secured can blow open/shut causing injury to someone in the way</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Gates require more room on a site plan as does the enclosure itself.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Gates are often damaged by the waste hauler and become very unsightly</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/12/21: Alternative screening requirements for small dumpsters that are of a minimal height will be included in the next draft of the UDO.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/20/2022 | 21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas | <p>(Part 2 of 2) Sustainability: An enclosure with gates takes 3 min longer to service by a waste hauler. Time, Risk to driver, and fuel burn add up to be very costly over a city the size of CLT. One truck services 100 dumpsters a day typically. 50% of those will have gates. 50 stops X 3 min is 2.5 hours for one truck, on one route, for one day. How many dumpster trucks are servicing CLT every day? Likely 75 or more.</p> <p>If the container inside is a low profile and aesthetically pleasing then there is no reason to hide it.</p> <p>I have not touched on the merits of using in-ground waste containers, as I have sent this prior, but property developers and contractors will not use a better/premium solution if they have to spend the same amount to enclose it. Without the enclosure in-ground containers are much less investment and provide many more benefits to society than traditional dumpsters. Here are some brands of this type container: www.binovagroup.com/envirobin sutera-inground.com molokna.com</p> | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/29/2022: See response above.</p> | Yes |
| 1/19/2022 | 21.2 Selection, Installation, and Maintenance | 21.2(E) Why are existing plantings only counted sometimes? | This proposed language is to ensure that existing plantings are of the size, type, and condition that meet the intent of any required landscape or screening. | No |
| 1/20/2022 | 21.5 Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape | 21.5(B) - "Native" is not a specific enough term - I recommend rephrasing as a prohibition on plants listed on (a particular list) of invasive plants. | This language will be revised to provide clarity in the next draft UDO. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/19/2022 | 21.9 Landscape Yard | 21.9 - this scale is inappropriate for dense, urban locations. A 100' landscaped yard! Even a 40' landscaped yard is unreasonable in an urban location. Example: as I read this, a "corner store" in a residential district would need a 40' landscaped yard between the store and the adjacent houses ---- that's not a walkable corner store! Similarly, requiring a 100' landscaped yard between TOD district and the adjacent district makes it less comfortable and pleasant to walk from those adjoining areas to the transit stop. | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/12/21: A corner store in N1 would be an existing building and would not have to provide a landscape yard. TOD never requires a 100' landscape yard. The maximum landscape yard for TOD is 25' when next to an N1 Place Type. | No |
| 1/19/2022 | 22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit | 22.6(B)(1) - only one accessory use sign no matter how big the project? No matter how many frontages? No matter how many buildings?; | UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO. Updated 03/31/2022: Accessory uses are subordinate to principal uses. As such, signage for such uses is intended to be subordinate to signage for principal uses. It is not the intent of accessory signage to be equal to or surpass the allowances for primary signage at a site. | No |
| 1/19/2022 | 22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit | 22.6(G)(6) - recommend carving out from these limitations signage for wayfinding within a development. At least, consider clarifying whether wayfinding is advertising.; | UDO staff will review these requirements with the City Attorney's Office. Updated 03/10/22: Site circulation sign standards will be adjusted to accommodate wayfinding for large sites. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/19/2022 | 22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit | 22.6 C why are banner not allowed in residential uses? they would be very appropriate for the residential portion of a mixed use development | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 03/31/2022: The most likely, and most practical, use of banners for residential uses, especially in mixed-use developments, is to advertise a property for sale, lease, or rent. The turnover rate in the residential portion of a mixed-use development is high enough that a banner would become a defacto permanent sign. That is not the intent of a banner sign.</p> <p>Additionally, the UDO has other sign allowances for real estate activity.</p> | No |
| 1/20/2022 | 22.8 Summary of Sign Permissions | 22.8(D)(2)(a) - why are you regulating aesthetics such as by requiring that all ground signs be "of monument type construction."; | The proposed language places limits on height, not aesthetics. Staff believe the height of monument-type construction is more appropriate for pedestrian oriented environments. | No |
| 1/16/2022 | 22.9 Signs Requiring A Permit | Table 22-3: Consider allowing taller signs if the provide rain protection to someone standing at the sign (such as a wayfinding kiosk) | Staff believes the current maximum height allowances for signs are appropriate to serve the intent and purpose of signage. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/28/2022 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | <p>(Pat 1 of 5) UDO 16.2 EXTERIOR LIGHTING COMMENTS 1 and 2 Suggested changes to: 16.2 EXTERIOR LIGHTING</p> <p>The following exterior lighting requirements apply to lighting on all properties except lighting in the right of way that is for the sole purpose of illuminating the right-of-way, or the illumination of signs.</p> <p>WHY? on all properties except Exempting residential areas supports systemic environmental injustice. High, unshielded lights are typically installed on the grounds of multi-family naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) while higher-rent multi-family or townhome properties get low, partial or full cut-off lights that are equally or more effective. The flood lights produce unsafe glare and unhealthy light trespass. This harm is well documented: The American Medical Association Committee on Science and Public Health analyzed multiple studies worldwide and reported in 2016 that exposure to bright artificial light at night:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases the risk of physical and mental disorders including inattention and learning problems in children, impaired daytime functioning and sleep disorders; | <p>UDO staff and consultants are reexamining this language for potential modification in the next draft UDO.</p> <p>Updated 04/26/2022: Per 16.2.B.1, all lighting shall be of full cut-off or semi cut-off luminaire design and text will be added to clarify that this standard also applies to parking structures. In addition, this standard will be expanded to apply to multi-family and townhouse development.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1/28/2022 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | <p>(Part 2 of 5) • Is associated with cancer and with chronic adult diseases including diabetes, cardiovascular disease, obesity and depression.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the form of glare causes temporary glare blindness outside at night. <p>References: Light pollution: adverse health effects of nighttime lighting (summary) CSAPH report 4-A-12; Human and environmental effects of light emitting diode (LED) community lighting CSAPH report 2-A-16. This harm disproportionately affects very low-income people, including a high percentage of our city’s new immigrants who are helpless to prevent flood lights from shining into their bedrooms all night long and from blinding them if they need to move around outside their homes at night. New immigrants are often afraid to advocate for their own health and safety for fear of being evicted or deported, and they cannot afford to install expensive light-blocking drapes.</p> <p>NC statute that limits the City’s ability to set residential design standards does not seem to apply to health and safety hazards such as improperly shielded exterior lighting.</p> | Updated 04/26/22: See response above. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 1/28/2022 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | <p>(Part 3 of 5) WHY? that is for the sole purpose of illuminating the right-of-way, Duke Energy currently installs unshielded flood lights higher than 22' in the public right-of-way for the illumination of (and presumably paid for by) private businesses. This creates excessive glare and thus impairs the vision of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and motorists.</p> <p>Unconditionally exempting the right-of-way from UDO exterior lighting parameters allows this practice to continue.</p> <p>All illumination of private businesses regardless of where the light pole is placed should adhere to the UDO-mandated 22' height limit with cut-off fixtures. (Can CDOT revise Duke's Utility Right-of-Way Master Permit to specify this?).</p> <p>COMMENT 3 Suggested changes to: 16.2 EXTERIOR LIGHTING B. Lighting Design 1. All lighting including walls-packs shall be of full cut-off or semi cut-off luminaire design.</p> | <p>Updated 04/26/22: See response above. Also, the UDO does not manage lighting in the right-of-way. Suggest reaching out to CDOT to discuss this concern.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/28/2022 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | <p>(Part 4 of 5) WHY? including walls-packs Unshielded or flood-type wall-pack lights shine horizontally into the eyes of people approaching the building, causing night blindness, and they cause glare to adjacent properties.</p> <p>COMMENTS 4 and 5 Suggested changes to: 16.2 EXTERIOR LIGHTING B. Lighting Design 4. All exterior lighting including residential shall be located, screened or shielded in a manner as not to cause glare or impair the vision of but not limited to motorists, transit users, cyclists, and pedestrians. WHY? including residential but not limited to... transit users, cyclists, and pedestrians. This suggested change supports Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan and Charlotte Strategic Mobility Plan by reducing discomfort and disability glare for all persons and for all places, not just for people driving cars in commercial areas. The result will be safer and more sustainable mobility throughout our city regardless of age, ability, income and so forth.</p> | Updated 04/28/22: Standards for lighting will be expanded to apply to added multi-family and townhouse development and requires semi or full cut-off. The purpose of lighting is to also illuminate the way for cyclists and pedestrians. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 1/28/2022 | 16.2 Exterior Lighting | <p>(Part 5 of 5) Establish a measurable, enforceable threshold for “glare”. Otherwise, 16.2 B. 4 is meaningless, in practice. WHY? In my experience, citizen complaints about glare are dismissed by field inspectors who are not personally bothered by the glare. These subjective findings fail to consider that, based on Charlotte demographics, at least 15% of citizens have natural changes in eye function that amplify discomfort and disability glare from improperly shielded lights, inhibiting their safety and comfort moving about our city at night. This is especially vital with the increased use of LEDs. Blue LED lighting scatters within the human retina more than yellow incandescent light, causing even greater glare (2016 American Medical Association Report of the Council on Science and Public Health). UDO Section 16.2 A. appropriately recommends foot-candle to measure the quantity of light trespass at a property line. But other means are required to measure glare, which has to do with quality of light. Consult Dark Sky Association Darksky.org and Illuminating Engineers Society IES.org .</p> | <p>Updated 4/28/2022: The standards include full and semi cut-off lighting to minimize glare.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 2/2/2022 | 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | <p>(Part 1 of 2) I love the fact that there are parking maximums for Tiers 2 &3.</p> <p>In light of the aspiration to encourage more bikes as a means of transportation, I am really happy to see the bike parking requirements. It is a little less aspirational to me to have the min bike parking be half of the min car parking and a 6th of the max car parking. The lower bike parking requirements are understandable since currently not many bike, but this is something that we should reevaluate in 5-15 years once more bike infrastructure has been implemented and more people are able to bike comfortably.</p> <p>I also think some of the industrial uses (and a few other uses) that currently don't have bike parking should be Updated with some requirements (if only a low number). For example, I don't necessarily understand why we don't want employees and patrons to be biking to places such as airports, crematoriums, domestic violence shelters, public transportation facilities, etc.</p> | <p>Updated 03/29/2022: Nothing in these requirements would prevent or discourage the installation of bike parking facilities in some of the uses that do not have a required minimum, should there be a need or desire for such bike parking.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 2/2/2022 | 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | <p>(Part 2 of 2) For example, if/when then Silver Line light rail and associated rail trail gets built to the airport, that would open up the possibility and ease to bike commute for a huge number of employees and passengers (both of which would greatly benefit by having long term bike spaces).</p> <p>I don't think we should be capping the bike spaces required so much. I don't understand why a large (>5000sf) wouldn't require long term bike parking spaces, but would require car parking. Seems like an arbitrary line to draw and one that is counter to the goals of moving trips to bikes/sustainable transportation.</p> | <p>Updated 03/29/2022: Not sure to which use this comment refers. However, nothing in this article would prevent or discourage the installation of bike parking facilities in some of the uses that do not have a required minimum, should there be a need or desire for such bike parking.</p> | No |
| 2/2/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking; 19.7 Design of Parking Structures; 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking | <p>Parking minimums should be completely removed. Let the market determine how many spaces are needed. This allows small time developers to build affordable developments. It also reduces unneeded parking that takes up valuable space around the city.</p> <p>On street parking should be limited unless metered in order to put more funds into pedestrian infrastructure. Removing on street parking would also free up space for increased sidewalks and bike lanes/ bus lanes.</p> <p>All parking structures should be hidden from the public view. Exteriors should be screened as to mimic the facade of a issuable building.</p> | <p>Updated 06/01/2022: Staff recommends retaining parking minimums in Tiers 1 and 2.</p> <p>Depending on the frontage type, all parking structures will require some type of screening of vehicles from the public view.</p> | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 2/15/2022 | 21.9 Landscape Yard | In table 21-3, a landscape yard is required between two abutting properties both zoned TOD if one of the parcels has been given a Neighborhood 2 place type. The only exception listed is if the abutting parcel is zoned N2-C. Additional exceptions need to be made for parcels zoned TOD, which is a more intensive zoning district than N2-C. Landscaping yards should not be required between two parcels zoned TOD, regardless of place type. | Updated 03/12/22: The place type for a TOD zoned property should not be N2, but instead should be classified as one of the Center place types. N2 zoned properties would be developed less intensely than TOD zoned properties. | No |
| 2/18/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | The minimum parking requirements should go down for Tier 1 and 2 especially for residential uses. For Tier 2, it probably should just be eliminated entirely. Mandating parking spaces reduces the amount of housing that can be built. We should strive to allow projects like the Cully Green project in Portland, OR here in Charlotte. https://www.cullygreenpdx.com/ This project would have to pair down the number of units provided while also increasing the number of parking spaces provided under the current draft of the UDO. That's not what we should be doing to help fill in the missing middle housing. | Updated 06/01/2022: The minimum parking for duplex dwellings in Tier 1 has been reduced. | Yes |
| 2/19/2022 | 19.1 Purpose | Table 19.1 Nightclubs are the most intense parking use and should have a more restrictive parking requirement. Areas like Midwood and NODA already struggle with parking issues and these requirements will add to the problem.; 19.3 LT Bike parking. No one will be using LT bike parking at a golf course and other uses. This section should be looked at closer. Retail should have more than 25%. | Updated 03/29/2022: Not sure if you are suggesting more or less parking should be required for nightclubs. We believe the requirements are appropriate. Many patrons will take ride share or transit to a nightclub. For bike parking at a golf course, it is quite possible that employees of the course or any bar or restaurant located on the premises would ride a bike and need to store it in a long term bike parking area for the day. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking | <p>If Charlotte wants to reduce its reliance on single vehicle occupancy commuting, one of the solutions is to make it easier for people to ride their bikes to work. And one of the things that keeps people from biking to work is lack of secure bike parking. Our current zoning and development guidelines go into great detail about how many bicycle parking spots are required for this and that building use, but there is nothing in 19.9, section C, regarding *secure* bike facilities. While having a roof over long-term bike parking is a start, it is not sufficient (e.g., most bike commuters are prepared to bike in the rain, so a roof is nice but not ultimately that helpful). No one wants to leave work at the end of the day to find their transportation has been stolen. Many other cities' zoning and parking regulations require secure bike parking -- for example, both Minneapolis, MN and Madison, WI use the same language ("Required long-term bicycle parking spaces shall be located in enclosed and secured or supervised areas providing protection from theft"). There is ample guidance on this matter at https://sustainablecitycode.org/brief/bicycle-parking-minimums-3/.</p> | <p>Updated 4/28/2022: Text will be added to the 2nd draft UDO concerning bicycle parking security.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking | <p>If Charlotte wants to move away from car-centricity, we have to actually effect change through all of the means at our disposal -- not just "wish" things were different. Charlotte needs a set of development regulations that have teeth and do something more than the current status quo.</p> | <p>Updated 03/12/22: Thank you for your comment. We believe that the UDO does provide development regulations consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's established vision for the city. If you have specific recommendations for change, we ask that you submit them.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Table 19-1:Vehicle Parking Requirements. It is imperative to maintain some minimum parking in Tier 3 to alleviate pressure on older Neighborhood 1 place types which abut high density areas. In those locations, on street parking creates a conflict if some level of minimum parking is not required. | Updated 06/01/2022: Parking minimums have been retained for certain uses in Tier 3 and the 200' separation distance has been increased to 400'. | Yes |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I'm an HOA board member with mixed housing types including detached and attached homes similar to duplex, triplex and quadplex. My understanding is city ordinance long ago defined "single family" as being related persons OR up to 6 unrelated persons to live in a "single family zoning". As housing costs increase we are seeing an increase in rentals and sublets with unrelated parties. This is starting to create problems with private parking as most units were originally built with 2 spaces. We are also seeing an increase in parking on public street as a result of rental patterns. A concern is for pedestrian and biking safety as well as trash/recycle bin services. Does the UDO consider the impact on parking for sublets or the current definition "single family" occupancy? | The UDO bases residential parking requirements on the housing type which is determined at the time of permitting. Managing sublets and associated parking is not within the scope of the UDO. | No |
| 3/9/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.1 D. 2.a. says accessory structures shall be located a minimum of three feet from a lot line. This is totally inadequate. It places the neighbors' structures on top of ones lot. Further, it encourages the neighbors to put sheds or pool pump houses as far away from their own home and as close to the neighbor as possible. There should be a minimum requirement of 12 feet of distance from the property line. | Updated 03/29/2022: Side setbacks in all Neighborhood 1 zoning districts is 5', so the 3' minimum for accessory structures is appropriate. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/9/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.1 E. This section limits square footage of all accessory structures but excludes structures open to the sky. This is a mistake. Pools and tennis courts are not permeable. Therefore, when these structures are built, it often creates serious drainage problems for the neighbors when there are rainstorms. If structures open to the sky are excluded from the calculations, the permitting process must include a provision that the impact on the neighbors from drainage changes be considered. Also, if there are changes in grade related to pools or tennis courts (i.e. the grade is raised and there is a slope created that runs onto the neighbors' property), this needs to be remediated up front as part of the process. In these times of climate change, when storms are much fiercer, it is not right to ignore the impact of drainage changes on the neighbors. Also, it should not be up to the neighbors to enforce. The City and/or County should include these requirements in the permit process. | Updated 03/12/22: Drainage is addressed in the UDO with new standards found in Article 24. | No |
| 3/9/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | Regarding F.. Mechanical Equipment, such as swimming pool pumps and motors... ground-mounted mechanical equipment should not be allowed to encroach into a setback at all. If an owner wants equipment... it should be within the confines of his or her property. | Updated 03/29/2022: Side setbacks in all Neighborhood 1 zoning districts is 5', so the 3' minimum for accessory structures is appropriate. The rear setback for these items are consistent with current regulations. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions | Article 16.1 D & E all contain incorrect wording and drawings for how to measure sight triangles. See Session Law 2021-121. | Updated 04/26/22: This section will be updated to be consistent with the recent session law. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/11/2022 | 16.3 Development Bonus | <p>Table 16-1 page 16-6: clarify what it means ' Additional height PER FLOOR" when you say: "Height Bonus: Additional height per floor up to the "Maximum Height with Bonus" standard indicated in the zoning district standards - Where an average of 80% Area Median Income (AMI) or less, with up to 20% of the affordable units set aside for households earning above 80% up to 110% AMI. Additional height per 1.5 times floor up to the "Maximum Height with Bonus" standard indicated in the zoning district standards - Where an average of 60% Area Median Income (AMI) or less, with up to 20% of the affordable units set aside for households earning above 60% up to 110% AMI"</p> <p>Above that it says 25 points. To get from 10 floors in RAC to 20 floors (250') that's 120 points. What are the points attributed to that 10% 'per floor'?</p> | This comment is still under review. | TBD |
| 3/11/2022 | 16.3 Development Bonus | <p>Article 16.3 Development Bonus: given that without a bonus outside of Urban Core the majority of districts are capped at 6 floors & only 2 Place Types (RAC & UE) have 10' max building heights, is it the intent to cap ALL OTHER buildings outside of uptown at 20 stories? Please demonstrate with examples what you have to include to get the needed 120 points to use the maximum allowed Bonus. Most of the proposed building in South End today are above 20 stories and the math on the Bonus Chart does not appear to allow half the proposed buildings to be constructed. Base height needs to be increased outside of UC</p> | Updated 04/26/22: The draft includes multiple incentives to increase height. The affordable housing fee in lieu could be used, without any of the other bonus options, to reach the maximum height of any district. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| 3/11/2022 | 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space | <p>Article 16.4 and table 16-1 (page 16-8) A.2 says "...and tree save areas do not count toward on-site open space requirements." Yet 4 inches below that the table says "...If trees are planted, such trees shall not be counted toward the tree save requirements of Article 29."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If trees don't count as Open Space then it shouldn't matter if they are planted. Poor sentence structure. - Tree save area should be counted as open space. | <p>Updated 05/01/2022: Text will be changed to allow tree save areas, if designed to include amenities, to count toward a percentage of required open space.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | <p>Article 17.2 D. restrictions on fence materials is an aesthetic over-reach. The list in item b has several problems that need to be corrected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vinyl fences are a popular choice because of their durability and aesthetic and there is no reason to limit to only the two lowest density residential N2 categories. - NCDOT right-of-way fencing is now prohibited. The City can't do that. And why would we remove 'wire' fencing as an allowed type even if it isn't NCDOT, as it is a common practice to put wire fencing inside Split Rail fencing to contain pets? | <p>Updated 03/29/2022: The restriction on vinyl as a fence material will be removed.</p> <p>Updated 4/28/2022: Staff feels the list of materials is broad and the zoning administrator has sufficient flexibility.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/11/2022 | 18.1 General Requirements | Article 18.1 pg 18-1: 18.1 D – it is not possible or plausible that “All trees shall be protected from encroachment of architectural features.” How do you define ‘protect from encroachment’? For how long? How do you prove I didn’t protect the tree but instead the tree grew? Example 1: Bay window gets built but 3 years from now the tree is rubbing on the bay window. Is it because of the window? Example 2: If I need a handicap ramp – at a wheelchair accessible grade & construction involves removing a tree- CLT really going to tell me that my medical need for a wheelchair into my private residence from my private yard is less important that one scrawny tree on my private property? How do you reconcile that with ADA? #D should be struck as poorly written and unable to be achieved. | Updated 4/28/2022: Staff will add language to make this standard more flexible. Staff believes that the current draft language allows for compliance with all applicable ADA standards. | Yes |
| 3/11/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling Types | As written Article 18.2 applicability on existing and proposed Single family attached & detached homes violates §160D-702 in that items C.1 (bay windows) and 6. (sills, belt courses, eaves, cornices & ornamental features) are clearly architectural features. If you meant for these Aesthetic controls to only apply when encroaching into a setback, then the section needs to be re-written as part of subsection ‘B’ and this would not be a separate section ‘C’ | Updated 4/28/2022: Staff will delete the standards related to C.1 bay windows, however, vertical clearance is a safety issue for item C.6. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/11/2022 | 20.2 Design of Required Loading Spaces | 20.2 Minimum vertical clearance of 14' for Loading will require ground floor heights of at least 16' if integral to the structure. Given the new requirement for loading areas on all projects the current rules should be reviewed for common sense: Loading areas should be allowed in the setback since the purpose appears to be to remove the idling vehicle from a lane of travel for that brief period | Updated 03/29/2022: Loading spaces are NOT required on all projects. Refer to table 20-1 for when they are required. Loading spaces are often used by large trucks such as moving vans and box trucks, which often need 14' of clearance. Loading spaces are intended to provide an on-site location for deliveries as well as move-ins, which may require an extended period of time. Typically vehicles would not be left idling while parked in a required loading space. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 20.2 Design of Required Loading Spaces | 20.2E further aggravates the issue by requiring the loading area to START no closer than 16' behind the setback. Do that in a N1-f and you're in the rear yard. There is NO reason for that 16' requirements. It's typically a use that lasts no more than a few minutes. Are these loading spaces not also called 'Quick-commerce delivery vehicles' in the UDO with no such requirements? | Updated 03/29/2022: Loading spaces are not required in any N1 district. Please see Table 20-1 which indicates when they are required. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 20.2 Design of Required Loading Spaces | 20.2 B allows private cars to maneuver in the driveway but not UPS or USPS truck. Why the distinction? It also appears to prohibit the use of a vehicle 'reverse' into a local or collector road & that is an overreach. | Updated 03/29/2022: There is a distinction between how private vehicle are able to maneuver and larger delivery vehicles. It is CDOT's opinion that allowing delivery vehicles to back out into streets creates a hazard. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | Page 17-5 K says Above Ground Utility structures (AGU) (see definition page 2-35) allowed in the side or rear setback – not the front setback (unless it fully enclosed on 3 sides and one side is the principal structure or less than 3' square). | Updated 03/29/2022: This is correct. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | Have you cleared this prohibition/ requirement with the City Attorney who previously ruled that transformers may not be regulated in the front setback or ROW (Aka frontage)? Does Duke Energy know? There are state building code rules on transformers you are ignoring. | Updated 05/19/2022: Please provide the City Attorney opinion that transformers may not regulated in the front setback or ROW. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | What about Clt Water backflow preventers? – they can't physically go in the back yard but as written they are prohibited in the front setback and exceed 3' square | Updated 03/29/2022: Backflow preventers may be located in the established front setback but outside the minimum required front setback. This could be an area between the minimum required setback and the building face. Backflows could be located in this area if screening is provided as required. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | As written AGU includes EV Charging stations. Screening will be required for all EV Charging stations on three sides with the 4 th side gated. How then do you actually get to charge your vehicle? | Updated 03/29/2022: EV charging stations would not be considered above-ground utility structures. We will clarify this in the definitions in Article 2.2. | Yes |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | And page 16-8 says AGU have to be excluded from Open Space calcs., like mailboxes and back flow preventers, I don't think that is a fair or reasonable way to calculate OPS since they are 'required'. Remove from 16.4.A.2 | Updated 03/29/2022: Article 16.4.A.2 says these areas cannot be counted toward the required on-site open space. Staff believes this is a reasonable standard since these areas are not usable space that meets the purpose and intent of having on-site open space. | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | How does this definition & requirements work when there are private utilities all over the city that cannot be screened or located per the guidelines. Example is tax parcel 199-461-75 or 199-461-21 or 199-422-97 or 199-422-01 | Updated 03/29/2022: Similar standards exist in the City's current Zoning Ordinance. We would appreciate knowing about any specific requirements that cannot be met in the locations referenced in the comment. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | ARTICLE 19.3 requirements are too high: a 300 space lot is 60 EV capable, 30EV ready and 6 EV installed (or 30 EV ready and 36 EV installed). The requirements need to be adjusted for both the current reality and the desired future 2040 (we aren't working on 2440). Current EV's are <1% of all vehicles sold (which means it far less % given all the vehicles driven). What % increase in EV's by 2040 does there have to be to justify a requirement that 12% of all parking spots EV installed or ready? Where do you want the non-EV's to park when 12% of the spots are empty and reserved? | Updated 06/01/2022: The EV parking requirements have been reduced in the 2nd draft. | Yes |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | For the same 300 space parking area Article 19.4 would require 10 short-term and 40 long term bike parking spaces (50 total of which 80% are long-term) in addition to the EV stations. This requirement, again, is well in excess of what the usage would be in N2 districts by 2040. Please change the requirement to differentiate for different place types and be more realistic | Updated 03/29/2022: Required bike parking varies by use, but in no case would a non-residential use be required to provide more than 50 long-term bike parking spaces. This would apply to very large office buildings, for example. For a multi-family residential development, the required bike parking is based on the number of units, not the number of parking spaces (1/5 units, 80% to be long-term). | No |
| 3/11/2022 | 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures | Article 21 has no Applicability Section. Please add that section and make Applicability available for comment. Without Applicability section 21.2 D appears to make it a violation of UDO (with fines in Article 38) to have dead grass or weeds in your personal lawn. | Updated 4/28/2022: Each individual landscape requirement has applicability section. Section 21.2D applies to landscaping requirements of Article 21. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.1 D1, c: Are these dimensions correct? Seems like a typo and I don't understand where this would occur. | Updated 03/29/2022: These dimensions are correct. For example, if a garage is built between the main house and the frontage (typically a street), this standard would allow it if the house was at least 150 feet back from the ROW and the garage was at least 50 feet back from the ROW. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.2 D, a: This becomes a bit of an enforcement issue. Must the homeowner prove the fence won't impede stormwater flow? We often design screens that allow stormwater flow underneath - assuming that would still be allowed. | Updated 03/29/2022: It only becomes an enforcement issue if the fence impedes the flow of stormwater runoff. The screening would be OK as long as it does not block or impede stormwater runoff. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.2 materials: Is this prohibiting PVC fencing except in these districts? What do they mean by vinyl? | Updated 03/29/2022: The restriction on vinyl as a fence material will be removed. B. Since PVC stands for polyvinyl chloride, PVC fencing would be considered to be a vinyl fence. | Yes |
| 3/17/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.2 D, C: If a fence is intended to screen a use on top of retaining wall, this may be excessive. | Updated 03/29/2022: Measuring the fence height from the top of the retaining wall seems to be the logical place to measure from. Have we misunderstood the comment? | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.5 K - Transformers are not listed - is this on purpose? | Updated 03/29/2022: Electrical transformers would fall under the definition of "Utilities, Above Ground Accessory Structures: in Article 2.2. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures | 17.6 - Wind Turbines: Does this use have a setback requirement from the perimeter of a lot based on height, similar to a cell tower? | Article 17.2.L.3 states in part: "Ground-mounted wind turbines are permitted only to the rear of the principal building but may not be located within a required side or rear setback." | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling Types | 18.2 - SF is being listed as part of a cottage court being subject to architectural standards. Need to check this against state statute. | Updated 04/26/22: Section 18.2 references architectural features and the standards, which are primarily dimensional comply with State law. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling Types | Table 18-1: Breezeway not permitted...sounds like if you have a detached garage, it cannot connect to the primary residence w/ a covered canopy. Would be nice if it could. | Updated 03/29/2022: Article 18.2.C.2.a allows breezeways to be located to the side or rear of the principal structure. A breezeway could be used to connect the dwelling with a garage provided the garage was to the side or rear of the dwelling. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 20.2 Design of Required Loading Spaces | Could a loading space be striped parallel parking on a street? More urban sites may warrant this. | Updated 03/29/2022: An on-street loading space would not be counted toward any required on-site loading areas unless otherwise permitted. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 20.2 Design of Required Loading Spaces | 20.3(d): Currently, private haulers are permitted for rollout containers of 12+ MF projects. Does this preclude private haulers? Currently, space is allocated for future dumpster, should the HOA decide to stop private hauling. | Updated 03/30/2022: The UDO does not regulate haulers. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | A. 1a: How do you prove? Written agreement? Formerly, an "integrated development" relaxed rules between parcels that were related but separate. "Integrated development" is a useful yardstick | Updated April 28,2022: Proof would be required during the permitting process. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | 2c - rather strict | Updated 03/30/2022: Thank you for your feedback.We believe the requirement is a reasonable one. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | Screening area should have some flexibility for "Green Screen" and other vertical solutions where space won't allow 5'. Should get credit for any overhang area as root zone for tree plantings. | Updated 03/30/2022: Article 21.5.B.3.b allows a wall to be used in lieu of landscape screening, which reduces the width to 3 feet. Green screens are not always adequate to provide effective screening. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | One shrub per five ft can create spacing issues. | Updated 03/30/2022: The 5' spacing is desired so that when shrubs reach their mature size they will provide full screening of the parking area. The current standard is 3' spacing. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | Screening areas: Opportunity to discuss Green Screen here in lieu of wall | Updated 03/30/2022: Green screens are not always adequate to provide effective screening. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | 21.9 B(2): Any addition to an existing building? What if I'm expanding a 10x10 storage? This seems excessive. | Updated 4/28/2022: This standard will be adjusted such that additions less than 5,000 sf are exempt. | Yes |
| 3/17/2022 | 21.5 Required Screening for Parking Lots | 21.9 C: Puts a lot of pressure on the zoning administrator to adjudicate this. | Updated 03/30/2022: The Zoning Administrator is qualified to make such determinations. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit | 22.6 - M - 2: Section as currently written is acceptable for permanent signage installations, but could benefit from an exception for a specific subset of temporary signage installations. As a mixed-use commercial real estate developer, our projects often include prospective street-level retail spaces that may remain vacant for some time after a mixed-use project is operational. Often, these retail shells are unfinished and have unsightly exposed framing, piping, ducting, and/or other back of house elements that are highly visible to the public navigating the adjacent sidewalks. An exception to the currently allowable percentage of window coverage would provide an avenue to hide these unsightly elements from the general public until the retail space was occupied. 100% coverage would not be required, but a cap of 25% coverage does not allow for adequate screening of these unfinished spaces. Perhaps the "advertising" portion of the signage could be limited to 25%, while a solid color or simple graphic design could constitute the portions of the signage that exceeded 25%. | Staff will propose language in the second draft UDO to accommodate this scenario. | Yes |
| 3/16/2022 | 19.7 Design of Parking Structures | Raleigh is eliminating parking minimums. Please consider dropping parking minimums as they drive up housing costs and contribute to poor air quality and increased emissions. | Updated 06/01/2022: Tiers 1 and 2 will still have parking minimums in the 2nd draft UDO. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking; 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking; 19.5 Design of Vehicle Parking Spaces; 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | <p>(Part 1 of 4) Some zoning districts that are designed to be developed as more walkable pedestrians friendly spaces, such as TOD, should remove parking minimums and replaced with the equivalent as a parking maximum (Article 19: Off-Street Vehicle & Bicycle Parking - Section 3: Table 19-1 Vehicle Parking Requirements)</p> <p>Add the option for nongovernmental ownership if there is a shared parking agreement in place. (Article 19: Off-Street Vehicle & Bicycle Parking - Section 3: Table 19-1 Vehicle Parking Requirements)</p> <p>Public parking should always be credited to a buildings within a 1,000 walking feet of development sites. (19.2: Table 19-1 Vehicle Parking Requirements, Section D)</p> <p>Add teardown/demolition of a building to as bullet d, to Section 19.2 C, of when parking requirements apply. We should encourage some density/improvement rather than allow a building be tore down to become a vacant or surface lot like most of Uptown currently is.</p> | No change recommended. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking; 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking; 19.5 Design of Vehicle Parking Spaces; 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | <p>(Part 2 of 4) (19.2 Section C REQUIRED Vehicle Parking Requirements)</p> <p>EV's should not be exempt from parking maximums (19.2 Section F Spaces Exempt from Parking Maximums)</p> <p>Bicycle parking should be exempt from parking maximums (19.2 Section F Spaces Exempt from Parking Maximums)</p> <p>The facility must be required to charge for public parking when exceeding maximums (19.2 Section G Permissions to Exceed Parking Maximums, section 2, letter d)</p> <p>EV stations should count toward a development parking maximum. EVSE shall count as two spaces towards a parking minimum and maximum. (19.3 REQUIRED ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATIONS Section C)</p> <p>The EV requirement should apply to all sizes of parking spaces, including parking lots with only 0-9 parking spaces. (19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations)</p> | No change recommended. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking; 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking; 19.5 Design of Vehicle Parking Spaces; 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | <p>(Part 3 of 4) The city should continue to expand its electric vehicle, and more importantly it's electric bike usage to reduce emissions. Similar to electric cars, we should encourage and build parking and charging for electric bikes and electric cargo bikes. Those efforts are not enough however, and the private sector and residents should join the efforts. (Article 19: Off-Street Vehicle & Bicycle Parking - Section 3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations)</p> <p>Bicycle parking shall be installed after a demolition or teardown of a building(19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING Part A)</p> <p>Remove limits on the bicycle parking (19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING Part C)</p> <p>All of these should have some required bicycle spaces (19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING - Table 19-3: Bicycle Parking Requirements)</p> <p>Dormitory, Manufactured home park, and public transit facilities should have increased bicycle parking requirements (19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING - Table 19-3: Bicycle Parking Requirements)</p> <p>Any Bicycle parking should count towards all parking minimums and maximum requirements (19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING)</p> | No change recommended. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking; 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking; 19.5 Design of Vehicle Parking Spaces; 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots | <p>(Part 4 of 4) Bicycle parking shall count as two spaces towards a parking minimum and maximum(19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING). Long Term Bicycle parking shall count as three spaces towards all vehicular parking minimums and maximums(19.4 REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING)</p> <p>This should be increased to be up to 50% (19.5 Design of Vehicle Parking Spaces, Section B)</p> <p>Parking lots that connect/cross a sidewalk should be required to be improved to the material of the sidewalk.</p> <p>The parking lot exit should be raised to meet the sidewalk level (19.6 DESIGN OF SURFACE PARKING AND PARKING LOTS, Section B Parking Lot Surfacing)</p> <p>There should be no required setbacks for surface parking (19.6 DESIGN OF SURFACE PARKING AND PARKING LOTS)</p> <p>Short term parking should be closer to the entrance, 30-60 feet (19.9 DESIGN OF BICYCLE PARKING, Section B)</p> <p>Long term bicycle parking shall count towards 3 (19.9 DESIGN OF BICYCLE PARKING, Section B)</p> <p>Bicycle parking located in the public right-of-way should not be subject to approval by the CDOT or the NCDOT as long as it meets all other public right of way requirements (19.9 DESIGN OF BICYCLE PARKING, Section B, Section 2, Section B)</p> | <p>Updated 4/28/2022: The vehicular parking standards are based on current parking demand. These may be amended over time as demand decreases. Similarly, bicycle parking requirements may increase over time as demand increases.</p> <p>Staff believes the standards for surface parking design are adequate at this time.</p> <p>Parking lot requirements meet the current standards in the CLDSM.</p> <p>Staff believes the setbacks should be required to meet the development context of where they are located.</p> <p>The distance between short term parking and site entrance is intended to provide site flexibility.</p> <p>CDOT review and approval of bicycle parking in the public right-of-way is intended to ensure the safety of bicyclists and motorists.</p> | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 19.4 Required Bicycle Parking | Please require secured long term parking such as a bike locker | Updated 04/26/22: Secured parking is included in the development bonus through micromobility lockers. Also, text will be added to the next draft regarding bicycle parking security. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Your parking minimums are still too high! And you need to place parking maximums on all zoning! Look at shopping centers for example: they have too much parking that NEVER gets used! Set parking maximums for all zoning areas. | No change recommended. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Article 19: Section 2 Part F - Spaces Exempt from Parking Maximums The exception to Maximums in Item 2 for EVSE-Installed parking spaces may need a cap not to be abused. | Updated 03/30/2022: We don't believe development will attempt to skirt the parking maximums by installing more EV charging stations. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Article 19: Section 2 - Table 19-1 Vehicle Parking Requirements - Parking Calculations Minimums and Maximums. Ideally, we would want all minimums removed and replaced with maximums using the currently drafted minimums. | No change recommended. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Consider changing how the UDO Calculates the number of spaces using something other than GFA; we suggest using Net Internal Area (NIA): Net internal area is the usable area available to occupants of the building. It's calculated by taking the gross internal area and subtracting floor areas being used by: lobbies/storage/service areas, machinery rooms on the roof, stairs/escalators/elevators/risers, building columns, and bathroom areas. A simple alternative is to change the definition of GFA in 2.3 General Definitions to include more items suggested above. | Updated 03/30/2022: GFA is a widely accepted and available means of calculating building area. Staff does not always have access to detailed project floor plans nor the time to review them to work out the NIA. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Maximums in Tier 2 - Do not apply to parking structures. This needs to be removed; not having parking structures included here would be a big miss. | Updated 03/30/2022: No minimums or maximums are proposed for parking structures in any of the three tiers. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Article 19: Section 3 - Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations as written with the addition of the 0-9 spaces segment of off-street parking, zero types of EV charging stations are called for in the current draft. We believe EVs are the future, and we will need at least 1 EV-Ready space in the 0-9 segment or at the very least 1 EV-Capable. The EV requirement should apply to all sizes of parking spaces, including parking lots with only 0-9 and 10-25 parking spaces. A clear statement of office use is needed to Part C's requirement of EV charging stations. | Updated 06/01/2022: No change recommended for 0-9 spaces. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements Homeless Shelter Parking Maximums (tiers 2 & 3): .2/bed | Updated 03/30/2022: We believe the parking minimums and maximums per Table 19-1 for this use are appropriate. | No |
| 3/18/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Article 19. What are the city-wide regulations/requirements for bicycle racks, locks, covers etc.? And what is the contracting process for bidding? | Updated 03/30/2022: The standards for bike racks and bike lockers are found in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual, found online at the link below. You can learn more about doing business with the City of Charlotte online at CharlotteNC.gov. https://charlottenc.gov/ld/CLDSM/Pages/default.aspx | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | <p>Suggestion to add this type of overlay (PBD - Parking Benefit District) to areas with Tier 3 parking requirements near N1 districts to alleviate the conflict areas that represent the concerns of some of the draft comments posted thus far.</p> <p>Parking Benefit District (PBD) - are defined geographic areas, typically in downtown areas or along commercial corridors in which a majority of the revenue generated from on-street parking facilities (Parking meters, parking permits, or even off-street public parking decks) within the district are returned to the district to finance neighborhood improvements.</p> <p>One KEY part is that funds collected in each district must NOT go into a general fund or be diverted to any other organization. When done right, PBDs build community support b/c funds go back into their neighborhoods, it keeps parking inline b/c parking is never really free, and begins to manage parking for the public good.</p> <p>Articles on PBD: https://whyy.org/articles/ideas-worth-stealing-parking-benefit-districts/ https://www.sullivansgulch.org/uploads/4/0/9/1/40915355/parking_benefit_districts.pdf https://www.mapc.org/resource-library/parking-benefit-districts/</p> | <p>Updated 4/25/22: This suggestion has been forwarded to CDOT as it is not triggered by development and wouldn't be established by the UDO.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/19/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | <p>Why is Raleigh able to fully remove parking minimums, but Charlotte insists on keeping them along with archaic rules such as "1 space per wash bay"? I can't help but question our dedication to making walkable communities when we do things like require that almost all bars and nightclubs in Charlotte require a space for people to park their car (so that they can drive home later).</p> <p>Instead of doing this weird game of breaking the parking rules into tiers and satisfying the car obsessed NIMBYs, why not simply remove the parking minimums altogether and let land owners and developers decide how much parking they need?</p> <p>Buffalo did it and it worked fine: https://usa.streetsblog.org/2021/06/14/what-happened-when-buffalo-changed-its-parking-rules/</p> <p>Raleigh is doing it right now: https://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/article259417504.html</p> | <p>Updated 06/01/2022: Tiers 1 and 2 will still have parking minimums in the 2nd draft UDO.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1 /a /1a: Are single-family detached now allowed in a condominium? | Updated 03/30/2022: Yes | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1 / B/ 2: It's worth confirming with fire this is ok. There's a current grey area between this access width (15') and what fire requires (20'). | Updated 05/18/2022: Staff will update the referenced language to remove the "grey area" and to specify an access width of 20' rather than 15'. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1 / c: No more cul-de-sac flag lots? There should be some discussion about how to better establish efficiency in land planning based on topography and adjacency. This will add quite a bit of cost to SF detached development | Updated 4/28/2022: Staff believes new flag lots should not be created. Cul-de-sac developments remain feasible without flag lots. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1, D, 3ai: What does this mean? Can a building encroach into the sight triangle? | 4/28/2022: Staff will strike permanent buildings from the exceptions language of 16.1.D.3. In addition, new buildings are not permitted in sight triangles. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.1 H: This may be difficult. I understand the intent, but there should be some better accommodation to the realities of topography. This is a vague requirement. The intent is for these structures to not impede maintenance of the utility. The rule should be structured around repair/damage/etc. vs. prohibition. | Updated 03/30/2022: We believe it is a reasonable standard to prohibit permanent structures within a utility easement unless approved by the utility. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | Table 16.1: open space outdoors min dimension: This should be 6'. 7' may create issues with drive aprons vs. fire truck access width. | Updated 03/30/2022: Staff needs more specificity in order to respond to this comment. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | Table 16-1: If trees are planted, such trees shall not be counted toward the tree save requirements of Article 29. / Does this mean Open Space cannot be amenitized Green Space? | Per 16.4.A.2, Amenitized Tree Areas may count toward Open Space. | No |
| 3/17/2022 | 16.1 Lot Development Restrictions; 16.2 Exterior Lighting; 16.3 Development Bonus; 16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space; 16.5 On-Site Pedestrian Connectivity Requirements; 16.6 Performance Standards | 16.5 A1: What does this mean? Sidewalk to nowhere? | Updated 03/30/2022: Sidewalk connections to an existing or future required public sidewalk. In the short term, this sidewalk could end at the property line if the required future sidewalk has not yet been constructed. | No |
| 3/18/2022 | 16.3 Development Bonus | 16.3.C: An additional bonus should be provided in the transportation improvements sub-section to promote and reward development that extend or provide publicly accessible greenway or private trail network connections and/or privately constructed extension or spur trails to an adopted greenway route. | Updated 04/26/22: There are requirements for these connections in the Subdivision, Streets, and Infrastructure Section of the Draft. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | The City of Raleigh eliminated all parking minimums. We're better than them! | Updated 06/01/2022: Tiers 1 and 2 will still have parking minimums in the 2nd draft UDO. | No |
| 3/18/2022 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | <p>(Part 1 of 6) ChargePoint welcomes the opportunity to provide comments to the First Draft of the Charlotte Unified Development Ordinance. The purpose of these comments is to respectfully recommend that Charlotte adopts within its Uniform Development Ordinance, clarifying language that promotes EV-Capable and EV-Ready equipment as well as networked charging and circuit sharing to reduce costs to operators and promote benefits to users.</p> <p>ChargePoint is the nation’s leading electric vehicle (“EV”) charging network. ChargePoint internally designs, develops, and deploys residential and commercial AC Level 2 (“L2”) and DC fast charging (“DCFC”) EV charging stations, cloud-based software applications, and related customer and driver services aimed at creating a robust EV charging ecosystem. ChargePoint’s primary business model is not to own and operate charging stations ourselves, but to provide smart, networked charging solutions directly to businesses and organizations.</p> | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | <p>(Part 2 of 6) ChargePoint is proud to partner with local agencies and businesses in Charlotte to deploy and support EV chargers, such as City of Charlotte, Charlotte Douglas International Airport, Bank of America and SolarWinds. ChargePoint seeks to provide comments to the proposed Parking Standards chapter – specifically Article 19 (Off-Street Vehicle and Bicycle Parking) regarding electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure. Existing language within Section 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations seeks to expand Charlotte’s EV infrastructure through the development of “three types of electric vehicle charging stations” within new parking lots and structures with varying levels of electrification based upon off-street parking spaces.</p> <p>We recommend that Charlotte only include “EV-Capable” and “EV-Ready” methods for meeting 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations criteria. ChargePoint also recommends defining these types of installations as “EV Compliance Levels” as opposed to “types of EV Charging stations”. The definitions below come from the City of Sacramento’s Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Requirements which can be found in the CALgreen Building Code:</p> | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | <p>(Part 3 of 6) EV Capable: Installation of “raceway” (the enclosed conduit that forms the physical pathway for electrical wiring to protect it from damage) and adequate panel capacity to accommodate future installation of a dedicated branch circuit and charging station(s).</p> <p>EV Ready: EV Capable plus installation of dedicated branch circuit(s) (electrical rewiring), circuit breakers, and other electrical components, including a receptacle (240-volt outlet) or blank cover needed to support future installation of one or more charging stations. Numerous studies have been conducted regarding the cost difference between new construction vs. retrofit regarding EV infrastructure. In 2019, ChargePoint and Tesla engaged with the California Electric Transportation Coalition to publish the Plug-In Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Cost Analysis Report, finding that for 10% of spaces at a medium sized office/school parking lot, the costs for new construction were \$901 vs \$4,155 for retrofit construction.</p> | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | <p>(Part 4 of 6) In addition to this, the City of Orlando conducted a study on EV-Ready building costs prior to the passage of the City’s EV-Ready Ordinance in 2021; finding in a case study for ten parking spaces in a commercial parking lot, the new construction costs would be \$916 vs \$3460 for retrofit construction. In the event that the City of Charlotte prefers to maintain an “EVSE-Installed” component in its code, ChargePoint recommends including the following two amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Must be networked. Chargers that are networked are generally defined as a charger connected to a backend network operations center, which at a minimum enables remote diagnostics, remote start, and usage data collection. Networked chargers can also allow users and owners to set parameters on usage, costs, and limitations on who can use stations – whether it be employees, residents, or visitors. Last, networked capabilities will ensure that stations can be reliably maintained over the lifetime of the asset through remote monitoring. 2. Implement circuit sharing between EV chargers. High levels of EV Ready parking can be realized cost-effectively in new developments by allowing designs to ... | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/18/2022 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | (Part 5 of 6) ...use of EV energy management systems (EVEMS, i.e. automatic load management systems, systems to monitor and control of EV charging). EVEMS can facilitate load sharing across branch circuits, sharing at the electrical panel level, electrical service monitoring and associated control of EVSE, and other forms of controlling EVSE loads. Allowing for appropriate use of load sharing between EV Ready parking spaces significantly reduces the electrical capacity required to provide for high levels of EV Ready parking, and associated costs for new developments. Providing a maximum limit on load sharing across branch circuits ensures that all drivers will receive a reasonable quality of EV charging. Jurisdictions will typically establish performance requirements intended to ensure that drivers receive full overnight charge (residential uses) or full day-time charge (workplace parking) the vast majority of the time. Appropriate performance requirements vary with geography, depending on how far households typically drive, climate, and other factors – for explanation of these factors see: (Chandler, 2020). The charging performance requirements in the below proposed table (see email) is anticipated to be adequate for many suburban geographies. | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |
| 3/18/2022 | 19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | (Part 6 of 6) More sharing may be possible in central cities, where on average vehicles travel shortly total distances daily. Conversely, less sharing may be appropriate for areas where vehicles drive relatively far and/or are relatively inefficient/large. | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | (Part 1 of 2) Comments on behalf of Sustain Charlotte. We're happy to see the EV charging stations and bicycle parking regulations in the UDO. Two things about those - we believe we need at least one EV-ready space in the 0-9 segment, or at the very least EV capable. That should also pertain to the 10-25 spot section. It's also a huge miss to not include office use in that. As far as bicycle parking, long-term bicycle parking needs to be secure because of bikes being stolen, so that's a critical word to include. Parking calculations - maximals and minimal - the city should get rid of all minimal and use maximums in place of where the minimal are in the draft, we understand that that might not be possible but that's what we'd love to see. We suggest removing parking calculations by gross floor area and instead use net interior area. Adding a bonus for adaptable parking decks that can be easily converted to usable, people-friendly space. Changing the parking requirements for Tier 3 - having more aggressive parking maximums near rapid transit stations, including uptown core and edge districts. Suggestions on the one-bedroom in the draft are more than what's in the current TOD so adding this section with minimums like we have in single-family districts would be a suggestion | Updated 06/01/2022: Thank you for your comments. | n/a |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | (Part 2 of 2) The CAC-2 was in both Tier 2 and 3, I think that was a mistake - should be in Tier 3 only. Also Neighborhood 2-B be removed from Tier-1 and moved to Tier 2. One other thing - we support electric parking, but we may need to be able to make sure those aren't abused. Also suggest a parking benefit district overlay. | Updated 03/30/2022: CAC-2 should be in Tier 3 only, this was a typo that will be corrected in future drafts. N-2B will remain in Tier 1. | Yes |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I have a landscape screening question related to dumpsters and garbage containers/enclosures. I might have the wrong session. I submitted a lot of comments via the portal back in December. | Updated 03/30/2022: Thank you for attending the listening session. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Wanted to encourage everyone to use this opportunity to speak up | Updated 03/30/2022: Thank you for attending the listening session. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I support the efforts of groups like Sustain Charlotte, green progressive elements. In the past, a lot of ordinances when it comes to parking have focused on how they impact developers. This shouldn't be the primary purpose of things. It seems like we're making headway in moving away from that. One thing with this tiered structure - it's allowed for the growth of paid parking and towing. People make their living through paid parking and towing (commissioners and others that have influence over regulations), and ordinances are shaped through this. I don't want to impact how we view the requirements for EV and bicycle parking and also promoting public transportation, but I'd like to discuss free parking everywhere, regardless of requirements. | This comment is still under review. | TBD |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I would also agree with Sustain Charlotte. I'm excited to see improvements on parking minimums, but I'm disappointed in their remaining existence. For a city that prides itself on affordable housing, sustainability, and business, I think we should rethink parking minimums. The market should dictate the appropriate amount of parking. | This comment is still under review. | TBD |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I've only been here about 2 years, and I love Charlotte because I'm able to walk to things. But as these areas for walkable, transit-friendly living are becoming more expensive, I'm concerned that I'm going to be forced to start driving everywhere because we're not really pushing transit-friendly options. I don't understand why we have parking minimums at bars - why do we think of cars first in these regulations? I'm afraid it'll have lasting impacts, and I think we need to rethink parking minimums. People are starting to move away from car-dependency but we are still creating regulations by thinking about cars first. | Tier 3 requires minimum parking for bars only when within 200' of an N1 Place Type. The intent of this standard is to minimize impact on neighborhoods. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | My questions/concerns are parking around schools, particularly student parking at high schools. In the past 2 years, after the installation of a traffic light, our streets are flooded with students parking at 6am. There are about 100 cars parked in a 5-block area. These are narrow residential streets and not designed for parking. This causes blocked driveways and blocked access for delivery drivers. My major concern is the safety, these are inexperienced drivers and we don't have sidewalks here. This is an accident waiting to happen. We have a petition signed asking that we change parking regulations to those similar to other streets, not allowing for student parking. We've submitted these concerns several times and we feel that people are not listening to our concerns. Will this issue about parking around schools be addressed? Suggestion - can the city work with the school district to figure out if there can be more on-campus parking for students? | The UDO does not address on-street parking. For management of parking in street right-of-way, contract Charlotte Department of Transportation. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Is there a requirement that there be some minimum number of EV spaces that are also Handicap spaces? | Updated 03/30/2022: The UDO includes no such requirement at this time. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Is the EV space capable spaces (20%) cumulative with the 10% Ready spaces? | Updated 03/30/2022: Yes, 10% plus 20%. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Agree with Eric, it will be great if could remove the minimum parking requirements in Tier3 zones, especially in TOD districts. | This comment is still under review. | TBD |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Charlotte Mecklenburg Climate Leaders strongly supports the changes proposed by Eric Zaverl at Sustain Charlotte and in addition we would like to see a use-by use matrix comparing parking ratios proposed for the UDO vs. the existing ordinance. This could be of benefit to planners, developers, the media and others. Thank you, Martin Zimmerman, June Blotnick, former Mayor, Jennifer Roberts and others from Char-Meck Climate Leaders. | This comment is still under review. | TBD |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | Please explain the difference between CAC-1 & CAC-2 in terms of parking. Will CAC-2 prohibit surface parking? This is important in understanding shopping centers with the CAC Place Type. | There is a mistake in the first UDO draft and CAC-2 should be located in Tier 3 parking. CAC-2, as proposed, will not prohibit parking. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | It is imperative to maintain some minimum parking in Tier 3 to alleviate pressure particularly on older neighborhoods that abut high density areas. In those locations parking or lack thereof creates conflict if some level of minimum parking is not required. | Updated 06/01/2022: Parking minimums have been retained for certain uses in Tier 3 and the 200' separation distance has been increased to 400'. | Yes |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I'd like to see bike parking count towards any parking minimum or maximums. If a business wants to dedicate more of their required parking towards bikes and EV's they should be allowed to instead of being required to build more car parking | No change recommended. | No |

| Date | UDO Section | Public Comment | Staff Response | Recommend Change to Draft UDO? |
|-----------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I'm an HOA board member with mixed housing types including detached and attached homes similar to duplex, triplex and quadplex. My understanding is city ordinance long ago defined "single family" as being related persons OR up to 6 unrelated persons to live in a "single family zoning". As housing costs increase we are seeing an increase in rentals and sublets with unrelated parties. This is starting to create problems with private parking as most units were originally built with 2 spaces originally. We are also seeing an increase in parking on public street as a result of rental patterns. A concern is for pedestrian and biking safety as well as trash/recycle bin services. Does the UDO consider the impact on parking for sublets or the current definition "single family" occupancy? | The UDO bases residential parking requirements on the housing type which is determined at the time of permitting. Managing sublets and associated parking is not within the scope of the UDO. | No |
| 3/10/2022 | 19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements | I'd like to propose that parking minimums should be converted to parking maximums for the same amount in all tiers. I'd also suggest that bicycle parking counts toward that parking maximum. | No change recommended. | No |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |