

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change to UDO?
6/3/2022	13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	On page 13-5, the current draft requires zero feet of side or rear setbacks as long as the TOD site is not abutting a Neighborhood 1 Place Type. I believe that if the TOD site is abutting any residential use (not just Neighborhood 1 Place Type) then a minimum side or rear setback should be required. I live in a townhouse community that abuts a TOD-UC parcel. So under these current requirements, a developer could build a 10+ story tower directly on their property line and just feet away from our community's townhomes' windows, balcony, doors, etc. There must be some protection of the existing residential use next door to the TOD property so that a developer cannot simply build up to the property line and destroy out homes' values and quality of life.	TOD-zoned properties are typically located in transit station areas, which are intended to have high-density development to take advantage of proximity to nearby rapid transit. In these areas, setbacks are limited and designed to maximize the use of land. The standards in the draft UDO are consistent with the TOD standards currently in place. In addition to the UDO, Building Code will limit the proximity of buildings to each other.	No
6/3/2022	13.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	On page 13-6, maximum heights are adjusted down when within 200' of a Neighborhood 1 place type. Why are they not adjusted for any residential uses (detached or attached, such as townhomes) regardless of Place Type? It doesn't make sense to allow a 10-15 story tower to be built on the parcel abutting our existing townhome community without some kind of height transition / adjustments	See above response.	No
6/4/2022	3.2 Zoning District Translation	I dont understand the hate for what is currently R-8 zoning. Every other current zoning is allowing increased desnity and yet R-8 (not R-8MF) is being downgraded in almost every way to the inferior N1-D. I made this clear during last draft and in several meetings and the UDO team assured me it was not the intent to downgrade R-8. Many existing R-8 properties will be NON CONFORMING. Minimum lot size is going from 3500sf currently up to 4000. Why? Rear yard setback is going from 20' up to 30'. Why? Current R-8 properties 10,500sf and up allow a 35' tall quadruplex but N1-D only allows up to a maximum of a 20' tall triplex. R-8 zoning is responsible for many great development oportunities for more density and affordability in this city. Many lower priced neighborhoods with R-8 are being redeveloped with duplexes that actually give new home buyers a shot at affording a home. At minimum R-8 should be changed to something that allows equal density instead of the downgrade with the new UDO. I do apreciate the new height increase for duplexes and triplexes but it is still a massive downgrade from where we currently are. This change would make many existing lots and structures non conforming and unable to do anything with. This change just doesnt make sense.	The minimum lot size for N1-D will be changed from 4,000 to 3,500. The minimum rear setback will be changed from 30' to 25'. The 20' maximum sidewall height would only limit the sidewall height of infill dwellings if the sidewall height of the adjacent buildings is less. Otherwise, the new infill dwelling's sidewall height can be the average sidewall height of the adjacent dwellings. The maximum height for residential structures is 40 feet.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/4/2022	3.2 Zoning District Translation	Currently R-8 being transitioned to N1-D will leave a massive amount of non conforming structures and properties. Min lot size is going from 3500sf now to 4000sf. Rear yard is going from 20' now to 30'. Height for duplexes and triplexes are going from 35' now to 20'. This will create so many existing non conforming lots that MANY citizens will not be able to touch or do anything with except repair. If an existing structure on an R-8 lot is within the 30' rear yard setback because you guys increased the setback will that home just not be allowed to be expanded or renovated at all? Do you see how this will create a massive issue and heartache for many people?	See above response.	Yes
6/13/2022	Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts	4.1. Quadraplexes on arterial streets make sense, but how will builders be incentivized to actually build these if one of the units is required to be affordable? Most will likely just build a market rate triplex. Small scale projects cannot afford to build a unit at full market cost and be restricted to affordability on the back end. 4 market rate units will be more attainable in price since you'd have smaller units compared to a market rate triplex that have larger units. Please reconsider this so we can ensure more housing inventory can be practically built with more diversity as intended.	The zoning requirement that quadraplexes only be permitted on arterial streets in Neighborhood 1 zoning districts N1-A through N1-E is based on Policy 2.1 in the adopted Comprehensive Plan.	No
6/13/2022	4.3 Dimensional and Design Standards	4.3.D.1.a. Applying a 20' max sidewall height meets the intent of protecting existing neighborhoods with more respective development. However, limiting a builder to max their side wall height to the average of the adjacent existing houses does not make sense. Incorporating duplexes or triplexes adjacent to other properties with one story houses will be very difficult to design for and constrains our city's ability to grow its neighborhoods incrementally.	The 20' maximum sidewall height would accommodate two-story infill dwellings (single, duplex, or triplex), even where the adjacent dwellings are one-story. If the adjacent dwellings are taller, the infill dwelling's sidewall height may be allowed to increase above 20' by averaging the sidewall height of the adjacent dwellings.	No
6/21/2022	Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts	<p>Hello again. I think I'm following somewhat. We currently are R-5 and now if, when this all passes will be a N1-C, 6000 sq ft to build upon. I'm assuming that although we are located in "Mecklenburg County" that these new rules will apply if and when approved.</p> <p>My thoughts are that your main thrust of building seems to be centered upon the understanding that everybody will have city water and sewer available to them.</p> <p>That is not our case, we are on an acre of land, with our own well and septic. What purpose does this change serve for us? It seems more confusing to me. But, as I read it our lot would become an N1-C zoned property which could never be possible because the lack of city water and sewer. Would I be assuming correct? Thanks for your thoughts</p>	<p>Your current zoning district of R-5 will translate to the new UDO zoning district of N1-C when the UDO is adopted and goes into effect. This change will have absolutely no effect on your property unless you wish to expand or redevelop in the future, in which case you would need to conform to the development standards of the N1-C district. They are very similar to your current R-5 standards.</p> <p>The presence or absence of municipals sewer and water service has no bearing on your zoning district but may inhibit your ability to redevelop the property in the future.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/21/2022	Page 5-5 Section 5.3D	Building Height Standards note 3: "a structure within the first 100 feet is limited to a maximum of 50 feet in height" I would recommend changing 50' to 55' to allow more room for a 4-story building. 50' is very tight for a 4 story residential building, especially with a ground floor height requirement of 14'.	Staff believes that 50' is the appropriate height for this transition requirement, as a provides a height that is more compatible with adjoining residential.	No
6/21/2022	Page 5-6 and 5-7	Building Articulation Standards: Maximum Building Length Note 3, A, 1: The building passage requirement for buildings over 400' will be very detrimental to projects where the building does not exceed max building length by a significant amount. A building that is 20' too long will be hurt by the loss of rentable area required. Also, the required location of the passage (in the middle third of the building) will chop out a section of the garage in most wrap-style buildings. Consider implementing the passage requirement only if a building exceeds max length by more than 10%.	The requirement to allow a building to exceed the 400 maximum length with additional design elements mandates that a pedestrian through-access be created. It should be in the middle third of the building to address the need to mid-block through access. This is only permitted in the N2-C district and is purely an option to give more flexibility for development on longer blocks. Also, an administrative adjustment, per Section 37.4, can be pursued.	No
6/21/2022	Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts	Is there a map that displays the sub-type of N1 Zoning District?	There is a map on the UDO Website that shows the sites that will be zoned one of the new N1 zoning districts after zoning translation on the UDO effective date.	No
6/22/2022	Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts	We need a map that will indicate the sub-type of N1. Will the HDO follow existing historic districts?	There is a map on the UDO Website that shows the sites that will be zoned one of the new N1 zoning districts after zoning translation on the UDO effective date. The HDO will follow existing historic districts.	No
6/22/2022	Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts	Since removing the single family zoning requirement will effectively destroy older neighborhoods without homeowner's associations, the UDO must increase the protections to the neighborhoods by ensuring the multi-family density fits the neighborhood - ie. increase the feet requirement for setbacks so these large dwellings don't overshadow the smaller homes on adjacent lots. Further, reduce the height of the buildings that will be allowed in these neighborhoods. The current UDO effectively sets in motion the destruction of these older neighborhoods - It has already begun with the buying up of these homes by investment companies just waiting to rip them down.	The draft UDO includes provisions in Article 3 designed to maintain the character of existing neighborhoods. These include height maximum for duplexes and triplexes and driveway limitations. The setbacks are the same for all residential buildings in the N1 districts.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/22/2022	Article 13: TOD Districts	<p>As someone who lives in a residential development that is technically zoned TOD-UC, it is concerning to know that there are basically no limitations to building height for properties in the area. Based on my read, it is only if the adjacent parcel is a Neighborhood 1 Place Type. There should be some consideration with respect to how close a new building can be built next to an existing residential structure. The issue is degradation of property values. I can't imagine having a 300 foot building right next to my living room window, bedroom window, etc. How is the city zoning ordinances addressing these specific issues? I appreciate living in TOD-UC means you are in a more urban area, where growth is encouraged. But there has to be some consideration given to residences that already exist, specifically that are adjacent to newly zoned TOD-UC parcels, including both building siting standards and height restrictions. I encourage the UDO code to address these specific issues, that may not be as prevalent but will be in the future given rapid growth and development.</p>	<p>TOD-zoned properties are typically located in transit station areas, which are intended to have high-density development to take advantage of proximity to nearby rapid transit. Within these areas, landscape yards are not required. The standards in the draft UDO are consistent with the TOD standards currently in place. In addition to the UDO, Building Code will limit the proximity of buildings to each other.</p>	No
6/22/2022	Article 20	<p>I will admit that I am not an expert with these specific tree zoning ordinances. But as a resident of Charlotte for over 30 years, I have seen the depletion of our tree canopy and I do not think the city is doing enough to protect, promote and maintain the urban tree canopy. Removing large mature trees should require a higher fee, a larger tree is "worth" more. Developers who remove large mature trees, replace them with small trees that die and are not maintained is not a long-term strategy. The city should also be actively planting trees in medians and along sidewalks. We have increased incidents of poor air quality, which is a health issue but also an economic issue. Trees filter the air, remove pollution, alleviate heat stress, reduce noise and water pollution, sustain wildlife, result in energy savings and provide higher property values for citizens. Please do not compare our tree ordinances to other cities, be a leader in this space, it will pay off for future generations.</p>	<p>The draft UDO proposes a regulation that would require a fee and/or replanting for the removal of a heritage tree which is defined as any healthy, native tree greater than 30 in. diameter at breast height (dbh). We believe this ordinance balances the need for greater tree preservation with the need for flexibility in development. To your second point, tree planting programs are important for growing our tree canopy but are not directly related to the UDO. However, some fees collected by the city as mitigation payments for tree removal in development go toward these tree planting programs.</p>	No
6/22/2022	20.14	<p>City Staff should restore the requirement "Preservation of Heritage Tree required unless there is no other reasonable location" (removed from the first draft) and remove the loophole "Specimen trees may be preserved in-lieu of submitting mitigation payment." (added to the second draft) as worded in the UDO 2nd Draft Key Changes Document. The \$1500 removal fee (per Heritage Tree) from the second draft should remain.</p> <p>Specifically, all changes on pages 20-18 and 20-19 should be reverted to First Draft version.</p>	<p>We believe that the proposal in the second draft balances the need for flexibility with the community desire to preserve and sustain our tree canopy. Taking this approach will allow us to track and better understand the location and impact heritage trees have for residents and Charlotte's tree canopy. We will study this further in the future to determine whether preservation standards should be increased.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/23/2022	Article 4: Neighborhood 1 Zoning Districts	We should not require minimum setbacks. Land is a scarce resource, but fundamental to community prosperity. As we grow and land gets more valuable, let's eliminate land waste. Setback requirements are a forced land waste. If a homeowner owns a large parcel of land and wants to build a house set back from the property boundary, that should be her call. But, we should not require every building to be set back some arbitrary distance from one another. Give property owners the freedom and optionality to build close to the lot line, reserving space for plentiful pedestrian accessibility and a robust street tree canopy, plus entryway prominence. Reduced or eliminated setbacks also allow for: low-maintenance living by reducing front lawn care requirements (good for seniors and those without the means to spend weekends gardening), greater pedestrian accessibility, traffic-calming, more dwelling units, a "living room" feel in our streetscape. If Baxter Village in Fort Mill can do it, why wouldn't this be allowed absolutely everywhere in a growing international city and urban center like within Charlotte city limits?	Building setbacks for N1-A through N1-D are designed to insure compatibility with existing neighborhoods. N1-E would permit the form of development you have referenced.	No
6/23/2022	4.3 (H)(2)b	Leave text for steep grade and associated flexibility required on sloping sites.	With the removal of language stating that all other ground floor entrances shall be between four feet above and four feet below the sidewalk grade, staff does not believe the text related to steep slope is needed.	No
6/23/2022	5.3 (C)	setbacks should range from 20-30 feet in all locations for N2, in addition open space should be allowed to count between building and back of sidewalk with correct design (or allow similar to TOD enhanced streetscape to count for a portion of public open space) reduce N2-A Primary/Secondary to 20' and 16'.	N2 setbacks do generally range from 20-30 feet in the second draft UDO with a few exceptions (e.g. Linear Park (Uptown) and Parkway). Parkway will be changed to 20'. Required public open space may be located adjacent to a sidewalk (Table 16-2). Staff will revise the setback for Other- Primary and Secondary for N2-A from 24' to 20' but does not recommend setbacks of 16' for N-2A because of the intent of the district.	Yes
6/23/2022	7.1	RC-1 only appears to accommodate development in a area of charlotte of such as URP; but with many other 'private' properties around charlotte (morehead, elizabeth, etc) that could see development of single use office, or multi-family as has occurred previously around the hospital. the flexibility for these uses don't appear to exist in the campus zoning districts as written or in the table of uses.	Campus uses are found in the Use Definitions in Article 15.3. They are not called out individually in the Use Matrix. RC-1 is designed to provide the flexibility referenced by the comment.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/23/2022	7.3(B)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Setbacks for IC-2 and RC-1 are between 20-30 feet for all frontages except Parkways and (Uptown) Linear Park. Parkway will be changed to 20'. For IC-1 and OFC, an option to reduce parking will be added when no parking or maneuvering is provided between a building and the street. See response above on open space.	Yes
6/23/2022	7.3(D)	main street ground floor residential height in suburban districts should be 12', not 16'. this is only applicable in urban districts. in addition, residential is not even a primary or allowed use in campus or OFC.	Minimum ground floor residential height in all Campus districts is 12' with the exception of development on a Main Street frontage, which would be a very infrequent occurrence. Residential uses are allowed in certain Campus types, particularly when the residential supports the campus use(s).	No
6/23/2022	8.3(B)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Staff believes that the proposed setbacks for ML-1 and ML-2 are appropriate in light of the character of the uses in these districts. They are generally consistent with the effective setbacks in the current zoning ordinance. See response above on open space.	No
6/23/2022	9.3(A)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Setbacks for IMU are between 20-30 feet for all frontages except Linear Park (Uptown) and Parkway. The Parkway setbackd will be reduced to 20'. For IC-1 and OFC, an option to reduce parking will be added when no parking or maneuvering is provided between a building and the street. See response above on open space.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/23/2022	9.3(C)	main street ground floor residential height in suburban districts should be 12', not 16'. this is only applicable in urban districts. in addition, residential is not even a primary or allowed use in campus or OFC.	Minimum ground floor residential height in the IMU district is 12' with the exception of development on a Main Street frontage, which would be a very infrequent occurrence. The IMU district is not intended as a "suburban" district.	No
6/23/2022	10.3(A)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Setbacks for NC are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'. See above for open space response.	Yes
6/23/2022	11.3(A)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Setbacks for CAC-1 and CAC-2 are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'. See above for open space response.	Yes
6/23/2022	12.3(A)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Setbacks for Regional Activity Center districts are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'. See above for open space response.	Yes

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/23/2022	13.3(A)	setbacks should range from 20' - 30' in all districts. typical streetscape is 16', and allows are smaller 2 lane roads (primary or 2 avenue) small separation from sidewalk to building. 30' allows on larger 6+ a separation zone from sidewalk to building. note that all setbacks are based on FUTURE back of curb, so the building will many times be separated even farther from traffic, and in a majority of cases the streets map recommends bike lanes between traffic and sidewalk further buffering buildings and traffic. in all cases, open space should count between building and back of sidewalk as stated above.	Setbacks for TOD districts are typically between 20' and 30'. The setback on 6+ Avenue/Boulevard will be reduced to 24' and Parkway will be reduced to 20'. See above for open space response.	Yes
6/27/2022	Page 4-13	page 4-13 Voluntary Mixed-Income Development #4.d needs exception for dispersion of units if less than 5 units total provided. Suggest it reads: "d. Affordable housing units provided as a component of the voluntary mixed-income residential development shall be distributed throughout the development, not concentrated in any one structure or area of the site, unless the total Affordable Housing Units in the development is 5 or less. " [explanation is one building of 5 townhomes can not be dispersed; but the 5 units is still important]"	Change will be made.	Yes
6/27/2022	Page 5-6 and 5-7	p5-6 sec E and 5-7 chart note 3. passage way requirements through the building are not legal for TH in N2-C. Note 3 on page 5-7 needs to exclude townhomes on sublots. Section G. Min Ground floor can not be required on TH (duplex, tri, quad, SF). As there is no definition of passage or passageway they meet the definition of Breezeway which causes conflicts with Articulation standards in section 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12,13	Footnote 3 regarding passageways only applies if development in the N2-C district wishes to exceed the 400' maximum building length with additional design elements. The criteria for the passageway provide the clarity needed. A passageway is a common term that is different from a breezeway.	No
6/27/2022	Page 14-15	pg 14-15+ Cottage Court Overlay: it's a good concept but the diagrams on page 14-16 and the addition of the sentence in #3 about emergency access don't sync. The drawing needs to show parking and access. It would also be more helpful to write a more complete sentence which tells us specifically how many feet to a fire hydrant each building need be.	Thank you for these comments. We will revise the diagrams in the next draft.	Yes
6/27/2022	Page 14-7	14.2 page 14-7 addition of Streetside Historic District must include the requirements of General Statute 160D including 160D-944 which has requirements for investigations & analysis, and public hearings.	The requirements of 160D are already included in Section 14.2.B.2 which states that the designation procedures of 14.1.C through 14.1.L govern the administration of the HDO-S.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/28/2022	Articles 3-5	Hi- In regards to Articles 3, 4 & 5. I'm very confused as to how we, the general public, are to know which new zoning district we are in (neighborhood 1 or 2). Without that knowledge, how are we to know what comments we may want to make. There's no maps attached anywhere and the so called zoning maps on the City of Charlotte website show nothing. I think it's ridiculous to call this "community input" if we don't have all the information to give input on. This is very frustrating.	The translation table on page 3-1 indicates the current zoning district and the new UDO district. The zoning for a conventionally zoned property will translate to the applicable new UDO zoning district on the effective date of the UDO. The current zoning of a property can be found on Charlotte Explorer and the translation map is located on the UDO website.	No
6/27/2022	3.2	Translation of existing zoning districts to new UDO districts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It is unclear from the information provided how the following districts and/or existing entitlements in the URP and UCP translate to new districts: •There is no guidance provided in the UDO to understand how and where the CAC-1 and CAC-2 districts will be appropriately used. oThere does not appear to be a translation or rationale on how and where MUDD would translate to CAC-1. The intent statement of CAC-1 would suggest that its use in the UCP area would be appropriate. 	Zoning translation to new UDO districts will occur for conventionally zoned properties on the effective date of the UDO per Section 3.2. Criteria for application of CAC-1 and CAC-2 districts will be determined during the alignment zoning process. Per Section 3.2, properties with conventional MUDD zoning will translate to CAC-2.	No
6/27/2022	3.2	Current zoning district translation and direction on appropriate locations where IMU is to be used appears to be absent.	None of the current zoning districts will translate to IMU. This district will be appropriate for properties with an IMU Place Type designation on the Policy Map.	No
6/27/2022	Multiple Articles (Building Design & Material Standards)	Building Design & Material Standards: Façade Modulation For non-residential and mixed use buildings should be re-introduced as a standard with the following revisions. For buildings 150' in length or longer, facades located along a frontage shall be divided into shorter segments by means of modulation. Such modulation shall occur at intervals of no more than 100' and shall be no less than 1' in depth and 20' in length. Modulation is not required for those portions of the façade located higher than the first story. Special consideration shall be given to Architectural Styles that use alternate design details to achieve the same goal.	Staff believes that facade modulation is more appropriate for residential development and has retained modulation standards for residential but believes that modulation is not appropriate for non-residential and mixed-use in all circumstances and does not recommend adding this standard.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/27/2022	Multiple Articles (Building Design & Material Standards)	<p>Base and Entrance Design Standards should be re-introduced as a standard with the following revisions:</p> <p>For buildings four stories or more, the first floor above street grade shall be significantly distinguished from the remainder of the building with an emphasis on providing design elements that will enhance the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>Buildings shall be designed with at least three elements to add special interest to the base, including but not limited to cornices, corbeling, molding, stringcourses, ornamentation, changes in material or color, recessing, architectural lighting, and other sculpturing. Special consideration shall be given to Architectural Styles that use alternate design details to achieve the same goal.</p>	Base of building standards will be added to the next draft of the UDO. The updated standard is similar to what is recommended.	Yes
6/27/2022	Multiple Articles (Base and Entrance Design Standards)	<p>Base and Entrance Design Standards should be re-introduced as a standard with the following revisions:</p> <p>The use of EIFS should be restricted to building stories above ground level.</p>	Staff will make this change for multi-family development.	Yes
6/29/2022	4.3.B.	<p>Minimum lot standards in N1 zoning districts are too high to allow for the quantity of attainable housing that is needed in Charlotte. In modifying existing zoning districts in the UDO, the City should allow for smaller lot sizes and significantly greater flexibility in site design. Greenfield developments should be permitted a by-right 50% reduction in lot sizes (effectively instituting the Conservation option by-right) and widths to maximize the residential utility of what little undeveloped land remains in the City of Charlotte.</p>	Charlotte has many established neighborhoods, and the minimum lot standards recognize that the UDO zoning districts will be applied to these neighborhoods. The lower intensity residential districts are designed to support retention of the character of these neighborhoods. There are some districts with small lots that provide residential zoning options. Also, the Conservation option is allowed by-right.	No
6/29/2022	4.5.A.	<p>The Conservation Development Option should be rewritten as a performance-based tool with unlimited flexibility in lot size, lot dimension and site design, based on a sliding scale of open space preservation. This will allow for maximum product innovation and residential clustering on topographically challenging sites, while substantively moving the needle on housing attainability.</p>	Staff believes the current approach provides significant site design flexibility while meeting environmental objectives and does not recommend changing at this point.	No
6/29/2022	Multiple Articles (Building Height)	<p>Building Height - (2): most screening elements around roof top equipment is higher than 5'. for example high rise projects with cooling towers and HVAC equipment can require up to 20' parapet for screening. recommend removing the 5' cap and each project needs to prove the parapet is used for screening of equipment</p>	Staff believes that screening beyond 5' should be considered in determining the height of the building because of the visual impact.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/29/2022	Article 14.3.D.1	Article 14.3.D.1 -Please add restrictions on street-facing garages and minimum front porch/entry requirements to the allowable standards as it pertains to the Streetside Historic District Neighborhood Character Overlay Standards	These types of restrictions would be handled through the design guidelines for streetside historic districts. State law does not allow these restrictions for single-family homes and duplexes in the Neighborhood Character Overlay per 160D-702 which states the circumstances when these standards can be used and includes historic districts.	No
6/29/2022	Article 4	Article 4 - The height transition was reduced from 65' to 50' for new builds adjacent to residences, but this should be reduced to a maximum of 3 stories (or 40'). Historical neighborhoods have many single-family homes that are only one story high and so a 40' maximum next to single family residences would be a more appropriate transition into a neighborhood setting.	The first draft UDO would have allowed 65' within the first 200 feet adjacent to a Neighborhood 1, which was reduced in the second draft to 50' within 100 feet of a Neighborhood 1 to address concerns expressed by some neighborhoods. We do not support further decreasing this to 40'.	No
6/29/2022	Article 4	Do not pass this. Keep R3 zoning. If you do pass this increase/create green space requirements that increase along with density of duplex / triplex / quadraplex.	The residential zoning districts in the UDO have been developed to be able to implement the adopted policies of the Charlotte Future 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Such adopted policies include the elimination of single-family only zoning and allowing a duplex or triplex on any lot that a single-family dwelling could be built on.	No
6/30/2022	Article 6	Article 6, "Commercial Zoning Districts" should be renamed to "Auto-Oriented Commercial Zoning Districts" Charlotte has a significant problem with cars that we need to overcome. Lets not hide from this.	Staff believes the name of the district is appropriate because it aligns with the Place Type name.	No
6/30/2022	3.3.J	3.3.J - What is the point of breaking these apart? You talk in this chapter as if these are different districts with different codes but then you get into the nuts and bolts of the document and leave so many opportunities to define these as different ideas only to white wash something across the board as the same. Prominent entrances, all at 250'. Why is that the same right off of a light rail stop where we are trying to promote walking environments as it is all the way out in suburban parkway? We want mixed use and smaller pedestrian oriented spaces in our Urban Cores. Let them have it all day in suburbia in the land of cars, but why make it more stricter where we want people feel safe to walk around?	The four distinct TOD districts have different development standards and different purposes and location applicability, as outlined in Article 13.1. The increase in spacing of prominent entrances to 250' does not intrinsically diminish the pedestrian environment. The UDO's development and design standards for streetscape elements, setbacks, built-to zones, building articulation, blank walls, minimum ground floor height, etc. all contribute to walkability in urban places.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/30/2022	Page 4-6	page 4-6 chart under E contains Articulation requirement of 150' max for Townhomes in violation of NC GS 160D-702. "Articulation" in Websters dictionary is the act of giving expression and is used 41 times in UDO (though not defined) to mean aesthetic appearance. "Bulk" can be regulated in 160D-702. Websters dictionary says Bulk is "not divided into parts or packaged in separate units", but there is no authority for municipalities to regulate the size of a single-family dwellings even with the reference to "bulk." City cannot dictate the maximum length of a building if the lot size (setbacks, buffers, and such) is large enough. Same aesthetic articulation standards on chart page 5-6 (line B) see also page 15-34 for a correction necessary there	Per 160D-702(a), zoning regulations "...may regulate and restrict the height, number of stories, and size of buildings and other structures..." There are exceptions in subsections (b) and (c) but none apply to townhouses. Staff believes 160D does not preclude the regulation of the length of a townhome building, as it would fall into the category of "size".	No
6/30/2022	14.3	14.3. The Neighborhood Character Overlay has the potential to significantly undermine the City's goal of expanding housing access by giving neighborhood groups the tools to create restrictive designations in the name of preserving neighborhood 'character'. This overlay should be struck from the UDO.	Staff believes it is important to expand housing options with increased dwelling units while maintaining current neighborhood character in existing neighborhoods. Staff believes the NCO supports these goals.	No
6/30/2022	14.1	14.4. The Residential Infill Overlay has the potential to significantly undermine the City's goal of expanding housing access by giving neighborhood groups the tools to limit the size and height of new homes in the name of preserving neighborhood 'character'. This overlay should be struck from the UDO.	Staff believes it is important to expand housing options with increased dwelling units while maintaining current neighborhood character in existing neighborhoods. Staff believes the RIO supports these goals.	No
6/30/2022	14.5	14.5. The Cottage Court Overlay District is a worthwhile effort to allow for the construction of affordable cluster homes on smaller lots, but the ordinance as written is far too restrictive. The unit count should be much higher (100 - 120 lots) and the requirement that every home abut greenspace will undermine its value in expanding the city's supply of diverse housing at all price points.	The definition of a cottage court is a small scale residential development clustered around a common green or open space. Staff believes the proposed Cottage Court Overlay accomplishes this objective.	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/30/2022	Article 3	<p>I have concerns with the appropriateness/possible inconsistencies/errors in translation of existing zoning districts (& permitted uses) into new UDO districts and in the new UDO use matrix.</p> <p>-A major but under the radar feature of the UDO is the translation of current zoning ordinance districts into new UDO districts. There are several concerns (and could be more) that existing permitted uses under current conventional zoning districts may become non-conforming upon translation into a new UDO district (e.g. medical/hospital uses in existence now under O-1 appear to be non-conforming under OFC, possible B-2 uses non-conforming under new CG).</p> <p>-Similar questions arise regarding the Global Use Matrix of Article 15 and appropriateness of uses/consistency with other UDO provisions.</p> <p>- The UDO is complex so it is understandable that changes will be needed so items like these should reviewed further prior to adoption and between adoption and effective date.</p>	<p>Staff is developing a process to sponsor rezonings for properties that are not aligned with their Place Type and for which non-conformities have been created.</p>	No
6/30/2022	Article 7	<p>The draft UDO continues to limit the location of residential uses in some new districts (e.g. new Campus Districts, OFC districts, & possibly others..</p> <p>Housing affordability, creation of 10 minute neighborhoods and other 2040 goals are served by greater flexibility in location of housing near jobs and services, not less. (Part I)</p>	<p>Some campus districts allow particular residential uses, typically those that support or are in conjunction with the campus use. Staff does not believe that all zoning districts are appropriate for any type of residential use. Other examples would be Manufacturing and Logistics and Commercial place types. The uses allowed, including residential uses, are based on the use approach from the applicable Place Type.</p>	No
6/30/2022	Article 7	<p>Housing currently allowed in existing ordinance districts appears to be more limited in new UDO districts such as OFC, Campus, among others. Further review is needed to ensure greater housing availability not less. (Part II)</p>	<p>Some campus districts allow particular residential uses, typically those that support or are in conjunction with the campus use. Staff does not believe that all zoning districts are appropriate for any type of residential use. Other examples would be Manufacturing and Logistics and Commercial place types. The uses allowed, including residential uses, are based on the use approach from the applicable Place Type.</p>	No

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment	Staff Response	Recommend Change UDO?
6/30/2022	Article 7	Along these lines the New RC-1 zoning district appears tailored only for URP. Campus place types exist in a significant portion of the city. If a property has a place type for Campus along Randolph, Elizabeth, Morehead, Whitehall, URP.....and would like to build a stand-alone residential project for example; the definition does not appear to support those uses and is intended for support of a research campus. (Part III)	Stand-alone residential projects will be allowed in the RC-1 district and the next draft will be updated to clarify this.	Yes
6/30/2022	Multiple Articles (Setbacks)	There should be no setbacks in any district that are greater than 30'; remember this is from future back of curb so many times this is 40'-45' from existing back of curb on our major thoroughfares, and in the future these thoroughfares will have bike lanes separating traffic from the streetscape further buffering the pedestrians and adjacent development. (Part I)	Changes to setbacks will be made so that 1) setbacks are no greater than 30, or 2) in some cases where setbacks are greater than 30', the setback can be reduced if there is no parking or maneuvering between a building and the street. The only districts with setbacks greater than 30' with no reduction option will be ML-1 and ML-2.	Yes
6/30/2022	Multiple Articles (Setbacks)	Urban / Hybrid districts, max setback for 6+ lane Blvd should be 24' which provides min. 16' streetscape and 8' transition amenity zone. (Part II)	Setback will be changed to 24'	Yes
6/30/2022	Multiple Articles (Setbacks)	Parkway setback should be reduced to 30', again what is the goal of a setback this large? (Part III)	The parkway setback will be reduced to 20' for all zoning districts.	Yes
6/30/2022	Multiple Articles (Setbacks)	Suburban district setbacks should be reduced to between 20' – 30' depending on road type (Part III)	Staff will make adjustments to some of the setbacks in the second draft.	Yes
6/30/2022	Multiple Articles (Setbacks)	Changing setbacks is the easiest way for staff to allow more density and offset other impacts of the UDO, without compromising ANY of the goals of the UDO or 2040 plan (Part V)	Staff will make adjustments to some of the setbacks in the second draft.	Yes
6/30/2022	14.2	We are excited to see the new Streetside Historic District (Article 14) as we agree that the "restoration, preservation, rehabilitation, and conversation of historically, architecturally, and archaeologically signification areas" are a part of the City's heritage, and therefore should be protected.	Thank you for your comments.	No
6/30/2022	14.3.D.1	We encourage the City to please add restrictions on street-facing garages and minimum front porch/entry requirements to the allowable standards as it pertains to the Streetside Historic District Neighborhood Character Overlay Standards (Article 14.3.D.1). This will allow neighborhoods, such as NoDa, to retain their historic architectural features as our district grows.	These types of restrictions would be handled through the design guidelines for streetside historic districts. State law does not allow these restrictions for single-family homes and duplexes in the Neighborhood Character Overlay per 160D-702 which states the circumstances when these standards can be used and includes historic districts.	No