

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/24/2022	Article 33	<p>Sidewalks - The current prioritization of sidewalks along major roads should be reconsidered. Sidewalks in neighborhoods should be given first priority especially those with good sidewalk coverage, in general, but that have missing connector sidewalks. Connecting neighbors and neighborhoods make people healthier mentally and physically, make neighborhoods safer, create connectiveness and community, provide a higher happiness score, and increase the value of property in the area. Walkable streets attract businesses which offer employment. Walking means less cars and school buses which means less climate change and lowers the need for new roads and repairs. Sidewalks are also the most equitable mode of transportation - everyone can use a sidewalk; you don't have to purchase anything to use it. (1 of 4)</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/24/2022	Article 33 (ight not be exactly right)	<p>The following excerpt is from a listed source below. It emphasizes connecting neighborhoods from within; not major streets -</p> <p>At the outset of a sidewalk construction program, prioritize where to build first by focusing on a quarter mile circle around schools, parks, transit stops and key commercial destinations. Everything within that circle should be a priority for sidewalk construction. Be sure to map sidewalks so they're connected between the primary areas where people work, shop and play.</p> <p>At the recent UDO informational opportunity at the Government Center, I was given the argument that people in neighborhoods with lower traffic volume can walk on the road instead of having sidewalks. Reality - People do not want to walk on the road or in what is perceived to be a neighbor's private property, especially with children and dogs. (2 of 4)</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/24/2022	Article 33	<p>This is an unacceptable answer. I was also told there is limited money for sidewalks. Given the myriad of benefits of walkability, sidewalks should have government allocations from the budgets of transportation, health and safety, education, climate change, police, etc. and from the private sector. Builders of single and multi-family homes should be required to install sidewalks. This needs to be included in the UDO.</p> <p>Bottom line - The current sidewalk placement prioritization requirements and how they are funded need to be seriously reviewed and changed. The mindset of the importance of sidewalks and what gets prioritized needs to be rethought. The arguments are outdated and unfounded. This would be a win, win, win. (3 of 4)</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/24/2022	Article 33	<p>Several Sources: https://www.keflatwork.com/blog/sidewalks-add-value-community/ https://legistarweb-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/attachment/pdf/334359/Attachment__3_-_One_excerpt_from_an_attached_source_says:lk_in_the_street_on_low_traffic_neighborhood_strrets_is_not_true_and_not_safe.Sidewalk_Factsheets.pdf (4 of 4)</p>
6/27/2022	Article 32	<p>page 32-1 removed TDM but left it in the CTR. why? If it's in the CTR it should be acknowledged in the UDO</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/27/2022	Article 32	<p>page 32-6 section 32.5 A. required new streets Not all subdivisions in 30.3.A require a new street (a Minor Subdivision for example) and clearly the construction of a principal structure is not likely to demonstrate a need for a new road to be constructed. This #A needs to be changed</p>
6/27/2022	Article 32	<p>page 32-7 required off-street public paths where does the required path go? not defined in Streets Map Manual. Article 33 only refers to a Transit Trail. Definition says: greenways, transit trails, off-street trail connections, and bicycle and pedestrian connections. But requirement is not obvious when or where one would be required.</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/27/2022	Section 1	Section 1 Charlotte Street map page 4 to 10 page 4 should include acknowledgement that certain facilities listed are prohibited in NCDOT roads (especially in the ETJ). The UDO acknowledgements do not carry over the separate document. Note should be on page 4 or on every line item for pedestrian facilities, planting strip/amenity zone, and bike facilities. These should not require a variance since we know today that NCDOT controls new and existing roads in ETJ and will not allow most pedestrian facilities, planting strip/amenity zone, and bike facilities.
6/27/2022	Section 1	Section 1 Charlotte Street map Table 1.3 table does not include Uptown street type
6/27/2022	Section 1	Section 1 Charlotte Street map page 4 #1 and # 6 we don't have street trees in the UDO, they are now called Frontage trees

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/27/2022	Section 2	Section 2 Access Management & Driveway design Schools fix the typo. The correct statute is 160A-307.1 not 60A-307.1
6/27/2022	Section 2	Section 2 Access Management & Driveway design item B page 15 infers SF driveway review (in conflict with UDO section 31.3) correct the intro paragraph to say: "To ensure safe and efficient operation, CDOT will review non-single family driveway/access points based upon their location relative to other features (such as intersections, other driveways and property lines). In addition to UDO section 31.3 the following section outlines requirements for driveway locations."
6/27/2022	Section 2	Section 2 Access Management & Driveway design 2.3 Driveway Design Table 2.2 type II driveway LDSM # 10.26 does not exist, What reference is correct?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/27/2022	Section 3	<p>Section 3 CTR 3.2 C Mitigations / Fee-in-lieu new section C does not indicate that fee in lieu can only be accessed (at that undetermined rate-- which needs to be known before this document is approved) for improvements the City can legally require. we don't want this section to be a way to hide that you are illegally requiring offsite improvements Case law is TAC Stafford, LLC v Mooresville and Buckland v. Haws River</p>
6/27/2022	Section 3	<p>Section 3 CTR 3.3 C page 23 Item C and Table 3.3 do not specifically say (but it should) that the Mitigation options are only determined by the proposed INCREASE in pedestrian impacts and the improvements/ mitigations can only be installed on the property (not offsite-see TAC Stafford LLC v. Town of Mooresville)</p>
6/27/2022	Section 3	<p>Section 3 CTR Table 3.4 how in this document do you ascertain what the potential points will be for TDM mitigation?</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/27/2022	Section 3	<p>Section 3 CTRTable 3.4 Points attributed to different TDM Options are not equal and should better align with the benefit and cost. For example, an onsite shower facility is very expensive and a bike repair station is not the same cost.</p>
6/27/2022	Article 31	<p>Need special provisions for seniors who are aging in place for additional driveways around back for easy access in their two story homes. I need a second driveway around back because my kitchen and bedrooms are upstairs. I have 10 steps from the front of the home to upstairs.</p>
6/27/2022	Article 31	<p>Are there any special provisions for second driveways for those elderly Residents who may need a driveway around back to stay in place and may also need a handicap ramp? I will need a second driveway around back because my kitchen and bedrooms are upstairs.</p>
6/29/2022	31.2	<p>cross access needs and administrative path for staff approval if it doesn't make sense in the context of surrounding properties or street network, or other physical or environmental limitations exist (similar to subdivision ordinance exception to block length 31.D)</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/29/2022	32.7.B.3	relocation of existing curb and gutter. item (i) is confusing, is this stating anytime a CTR is required the curb must be relocated? which part of the CTR as there are 3 sections with triggers? does this give CDOT the ability to request relocation in every CTR negotiation? also confused on what approval of a subdivision indicates to trigger relocation of a curb
6/29/2022	Section 33.3	Section 33.3 - need ability for CDOT Director to modify street section with a rezoning. i would suggest items such as on-street parking, lane widths, and streetscape can be staff level approvals based on specific site constraints (such as preserving existing building, or old non maintained r/w with no existing or future connectivity benefit).
6/30/2022	30.8.E.1	30.8.E.1 - Remove "Highway" from title. It should be NCDOT District Engineer.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/30/2022	32.1	<p>32.1 Comprehensive transportation Review - this section is light and I understand that the Charlotte Streets Manual is also under comment period so the comments for 32.1 are for both the UDO and the CTR. Page numbers refer to CTR in the Charlotte Streets Manual: P. 20 Multimodal Analysis and TDM are not something that RLAs learn in school nor is it listed in NCGS 89A, the only engineering an RLA is allowed to do is "arrangement of land"; remove reference to landscape designers being eligible to perform this work. P 22 talks about assessing deficiencies in the multimodal but where is the requirement to provide offsite mitigation, add language that specifies some mitigation may be offsite. P 23 Unclear what solid waste collection has to do with multimodal and it is allowed the most mitigation points, understand that trash cans get in the way of sidewalks but this seems random and out of place. P 23 & 26 Transit is not listed as a mitigation, add a transit section to include waiting pads, seats, benches and shelters. P 25 Active Transportation strategies - a bike repair station is much cheaper than showers, consider giving showers more mitigation points. P 27 mentions alternative mitigation but does not clearly state how to design for impacts of roadway widenings or what alt mitigation is. Overall the CTR does not adequately address impacts to environmental justice communities. For example, widening out intersections and increased traffic makes crossing the street more difficult and waiting at bus stops uncomfortable. The TIS portion should include a connectivity analysis (are new streets needed) and conformance with local area plans or community area plans (requirement to analyze streets that the City plans to add)</p>
6/30/2022	32.4.C.	<p>32.4.C. new bus stop - reference trips in CTR but CTR does not address new bus stops. Consider closing this loop by specifying the trips as was in the prior draft or including new bus stops requirement in the CTR.</p>
6/30/2022	32.4.C.2.c.	<p>32.4.C.2.c. Consider adding schools, daycares, colleges, etc. to list of non-exempt uses. For many, transportation is a barrier to getting their kid into a great school or daycare.</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
6/30/2022	32.5.E	32.5.E Collectors: commercial collectors are also important but not addressed in this section; commercial collectors serve an important multimodal need and many require bike lanes or side paths where a local street might not. Add thresholds for commercial collector status.
6/30/2022	32.6.C&D	32.6.C&D - 18-month is not enough time for staff and the developer to come to an agreement; it is easy for the developer to stall so that the requirement is lifted. The UDO should make it a requirement for developer to build/dedicate the trail/greenway to reduce the infrastructure burden on taxpayers
6/30/2022	32.6.E	32.6.E Thank you for this section!! I had to read it a few times to get it, but I'm glad it's in there and appreciate the graphics.
6/30/2022	32.7.D.4	32.7.D.4 Constrained space in streetscape: "less than 4' available" then "sidewalk/SUP is not required." This exemption must be removed!! We are in an era where eliminating sidewalk is not equitable to all users of the transportation system. Rather, reduce vehicle lane widths, median widths, or turn lanes to acquire the needed minimum width for at least sidewalk to be installed.