

Comments Submitted by Letter and E-mail							
Reference	Comment	Support	Object	Observation	Recommendation or Other	Resolution	
					Comment Type		
1	Opposed to stipulating the height on interior building space		x			Building Types	This regulation allows the conversion of certain types of building code spaces to other types of spaces. Example is the allowance of residential space to commercial space, especially at street elevation.
2	What about townhouses facing parking lots? There is no illustration to allow how this would be designed. This applies to all building types where frontages do not apply		x			Building types	Additional design options for townhouse and apartment building types have been incorporated.
5	Incorporate Transition demand management standards in TOD				x	Concepts	This is a concept which requires separate policy decisions related to the comprehensive plan and not exclusive to zoning and subdivision regulations
Table of Contents	Reorganize to name Chapter 2 ZONING and include all zoning district sin this chapter, Res, Mixed-Use, Special. Development Standards need to be a subchapter of Chapter 2 ZONING				x	Concepts	The UDO does not have exclusive zoning and subdivision sections, as is a UDO as defined; however, the authority table in chpater 10 describes which body oversees jurisdiction
1	A preamble should be included with Sec. 1.3.3 General Use Zoning Districts to explain why there are 4 categories of zoning districts and to how/why itworks with the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan.				x	Concepts	See section 1.1.4 and 5 of the revised UDO.
12	terminology and definitions need clarification			x		Definitions	These will be included in chapter 12. Additional terms have been added; however, this will be the last item that will be built on as the draft is reviewed in the public process.

12	The definitions should be carefully reviewed for applicability and consistency. For example, the definition of "Bar/Nightclub/Tavern/Lounge" is "A facility licensed by the state." This definition is not precise.			x		Definitions	Agreed, this will be included.
2	Setbacks for accessory buildings should be the same as principal building		x			Development Standards	Accessory building setbacks in the rear and side have been changed from 3' to 5'.
7	Require Bus Shelters at least on main thoroughfares				x	Development Standards	The location of bus shelters is not based on zoning and subdivision regulations, but rather a city adopted transportation plan, related to policy issues, population projects and classification of streets.
2	Require residential developments to dedicate an area for dog peeing and pooping				x	Development Standards	This provision is not being incorporated into the UDO and
2 and 3	Regulate Solar Gain (lower building heights to the south), apply green sustainable building techniques, more creative pedestrian spaces, restrict heat island and wind tunnel effects				x	Development Standards	The UDO will allow sustainable provisions in the zoning districts as allowed; however, sustainable policies and low impact development standards are outside the workscope and will possibly be evaluated through the Stormwater Management Commission and Environmental Advisory Board through a post UDO adoption effort.
3	50' foot setback and additional stepback in Transition Zone "C" is too restrictive		x			Development Standards	Transitions only apply when mixed use district developments are adjacent to residential uses; therefore, protection is needed. The widths of transitions are not proposed to be changed and will remain as written.
3	Wall articulation requirement in Transition Zone "C" is incompatible with parking decks		x			Development Standards	

	2	Do not impose the 40-foot height limit on churches. May prohibit auditoriums.					Development Standards	Height exception not incorporated outside of what is in the draft at this time for steeples, bell towers. If additional height is needed, a rezoning will be the only option.
	3.5	Transitions should be based on use. An old family cemetery or commercial day care in the Res. Zone should not get the same transition as a s/f home	x				Development Standards	The transitions are based on a residential use and not zoning.
	2	The required minimum 50-foot width for open space in R-districts is too high. Recommends 30 feet.	x				Development Standards	The dimension has not been changed.
	7	Opposed to the multifamily parking requirement for visitors (1 space per 5 units)	x				Development Standards	Proposed parking standards will maintain a visitor parking component. The experience over the years for the city is that apartment and townhouse and condominiums for residential uses are historically underparked, especially when there are driveways involved
	3	Proposes UDO be clarified to state "no mandatory requirement for mixed use"				x	Development Standards	Mandatory mixed use is not proposed and not stated as such. The combination of building type definitions, frontages and height together provide an environment to allow the marketplace to grow
	7	6-foot wide planting islands are too narrow for shade tree plantings	x				Development Standards	
	7	Allow leeway on location of interior planting islands rather than a strict 1 for each 10 parking spaces				x	Development Standards	Landscape alternatives may be proposed and considered
	7	Require bike parking for public parks and open space				x	Development Standards	
	7	Require vehicle parking for parks				x	Development Standards	Parking for parks has been added to the UDO

7	Clarify requirement for pedestrian access physically separated from vehicular surface area. Is 6-inch curb adequate?				x	Development Standards	
	Required tree and shrub plantings in Protective Yards are too great. Reduce for health of plantings.		x			Development Standards	Protective yards and transitions target specific situations and proposed to remain; however, additional options to use these areas to meet tree preservation requirements has been provided
2	Do not support height limitation for churches		x			Development Standards	Churches have specified height exceptions; however, they are not given blanket exceptions from height
2	Do not support inability to increase height with increased setback		x			Development Standards	The method by which height is calculated will remain as proposed in the UDO
7	Disagree with parking for senior and affordable housing projects		x			Development Standards	Each unit requires .5 spaces
7	Agree with car sharing	x				Development Standards	It is remaining in the UDO
7	Parking for apartments should be increased				x	Development Standards	These have been increased
7	Support parking fee in lieu	x				Development Standards	This is maintained in 7.1.3
2	Minimum heights should be evaluated in TOD			x		Development Standards	Minimum heights apply to buildings taller than 5 stories as well as in the TOD
2	Heights for churches should not be limited		x			Development Standards	Churches have specified height exceptions; however, they are not given blanket exceptions from height
1	Lot dimensions hard to understand and apply to all lot shapes			x		Development Standards	Lot dimensions and setbacks have been revised
1	Density confusing about how it is calculated			x		Development Standards	This has been clarified for all residential districts.
1	Setbacks should only apply to primary street front				x	Development Standards	Setbacks apply to all lot dimensions
1	Corner lot setbacks conflict			x		Development Standards	This has been clarified

1	Setback encroachments are misleading; 4 feet may be too narrow for fire escape			x		Development Standards	Encroachments have been clarified
1	Height should be calculated from finished grade		x			Development Standards	Height determination has been clarified in the draft
1	Natural grade is not relevant when developing a site to determine height			x		Development Standards	Natural is relevant as it provides a context for determining compatibility
1	Residential uses should not be required to meet transparency requirements		x			Development Standards	Residential uses in residential districts are not required a transparency; however, if in a mixed use district, they are and that is the case to allow conversions of those residential building types to non-residential uses. This is a relationship between the building code and the UDO.
1	60% transparency is too high for residential uses			x		Development Standards	60% transparency in chapter 3 applies to the ground floor for mixed use buildings where it would be non-residential uses. Residential may be located on upper floors where transparency is 20%
1	Decrease residential transparency to 20% for residential				x	Development Standards	This has been amended in chapter 3
1	Building Porches and stoops should be allowed to encroach in the r/w.				x	Development Standards	Revisions have been made in chapter 1. see 1.5.4
1	Do not support regulating garage style and placement		x			Development Standards	Additional options have been provided in the draft
1	A great number of non-conformities will result from garage placement regulations			x		Development Standards	Upon effective date of the UDO, garage placement will not cause non-conformities, as the UDO will state this for number of "new" regulations
1	Do not support eliminating front loaded garages		x			Development Standards	Additional options for front loaded garages have been added in chapter 1
1	Alleys add expense, impervious and reduce developable density			x		Development Standards	Additional options for front loaded garages have been added in chapter 1

1	Remove regulation of ceiling heights, allow building code to regulate		x			Development Standards	Regulating ceiling heights allows the conversion of buildings to other uses, one of the objectives of the UDO. Ceiling heights will remain
3	Transitions - A.2, replace "is zoned to accommodate" with "contains". Purpose is to protect established neighborhoods				x	Development Standards	Yes, it is for protection
3	How will varying widths for zone A be applied, does the developer pick one?				x	Development Standards	Yes, there are options
3	No provisions for use, just districts			x		Development Standards	Uses are regulated in chapter 6
3	No standards for plant sizes			x		Development Standards	This has been incorporated
3	No spacing standards			x		Development Standards	This has been incorporated
3	Integrate TCA and protective measures			x		Development Standards	
3	With the fence requirement, zoned A type 1 and 2 automatically exclude this from being TCA as well. Allow alternate to move fence and provide TCA				x	Development Standards	The use of these areas as TCA has been incorporated into transitions and protective yards
3	Allow alternates in transitions to allow substitutions for understory and shrubs				x	Development Standards	Noted
3	clarify the developer may choose type 1,2 or 3.				x	Development Standards	Noted
3	Why is a civic building allowed in zone B where office is not			x		Development Standards	Civic uses have been removed from zone B
3	Wall articulation 50' from a property line does not needed		x			Development Standards	Noted
3	Neighborhood connections, why is this regulated?			x		Development Standards	This is no longer required
7	Define "improved site"				x	Definitions	Yes, will be defined
7	Clarify parking for visitor parking is 1 per dwelling, not one per bedroom. Recommend sliding scale here				x	Development Standards	Visitor parking is 1 space per 5 units
7	Parking reductions - A1.e. penalized multi-story buildings			x		Development Standards	Noted
7	What constitutes a parking area? How does it differ from a vehicular surface area already defined in the code			x	x	Development Standards	They can be the same, but not always. Parking contains parked cars. Vehicular ways allow cars to drive through or park
7	Walls and fences - prohibition to locate fences or walls in drainage easements - object		x			Development Standards	They impede water flow if not high enough
7	multi-use easements should be encouraged				x	Development Standards	They are when they are compatible

7	Prohibition of chain link fences is unreasonable		x			Development Standards	noted
7	100' maximum length for a continuous fence should be removed from the code		x			Development Standards	Noted
7	What is a transparent section of a fence?			x		Development Standards	Portions you can see through
7	Allow reduced quantities/wider spacing for large growing shrubs or trees used for screening (magnolias, hollies)				x	Development Standards	Alternates are permitted
7	Require sustainalbe mechanical systems to also be screened				x	Development Standards	Screening is required
7	Dam structures should not be required to be screened. A few trees and shrubs at the base would allow them to blend in with the natural landscape.				x	Development Standards	Noted
7	What is the plant establishment period to be able to survive on natural rainfall?			x		Development Standards	Noted
7	12'-15' 3-gallon material will leads to a much more diverse plant palate				x	Development Standards	Noted
7	C.5.b. - 5-gallon, 3-foot height at planting is a very limited group of plants that will a healthy 3-foot height in a 5-gallon container				x	Development Standards	Noted
1	Section 1.5.2. Lot/A potentially conflicts with Sec. 8.2.8a in that the minimum clear width is stated to be "...at least 18 feet" where as sec. 8.2.8a allows for widths as low as 14 feet. Suggest that 18 feet be replaced with 14 feet.				x	Development Standards	These sections have been modified and updated
1	Suggest that building height be measured from the top of the finished first floor to the top of the pitched roof instead of average grade. Doing so would encourage raised finished floors which assist in making residential streetscapes more pedestrian friendly while providing important privacy on front porches, stoops, etc.				x	Development Standards	The average considers sloped sites and takes into consideration context. Height does go to the top of the pitched roof.
1	Sec. 1.5.11 Building Elements presents a standard that may make it difficult and cost prohibitive for implementation by users. For smaller structures, achieving the 50% standard for a gallery will not be a problem but for larger buildings having a continuous gallery for the entire span of a building may be too cost prohibitive. Suggest that this standard be eliminated from this ordinance and tie any requirement to building articulation requirements. Also, suggest that multi-story galleries are permitted by right.				x	Development Standards	These optional regulations have been modified.

1	Suggest that in Sec. 1.5.12 that garages and parking areas be explicitly referenced as accessory structures/uses so as to make it clear that they are not the primary feature on a residential lot.				x	Development Standards	They are by definition accessory
2	The setback for accessory structures from alleys should be a range of 4-20 feet not an either or condition as proposed.				x	Development Standards	the setback is for garages so vehicles are completely out of the garage or in the garage...keeping cars from hanging out into the alley or street
2	Suggest allowing height to be measured from the elevation of the finished floor to encourage parking underneath an apartment building where topography and grade allow for it to be cost effective.				x	Development Standards	Average grade is maintained in the document
2	Front setbacks for civic buildings should be reduced by 50% in R-4 to R-10 districts and side setbacks should be based on building code requirements so as to promote inclusion of neighborhood scale civic uses.				x	Development Standards	Building codes regulate separation and that is not necessarily the same as a setback. No reductions for civic buildings are provided for in the UDO
2	Perimeter protective yards from major streets should be reduced and made consistent with those of other structures within the underlying zoning district to ensure consistency along a street edge.				x	Development Standards	No change has been made to the UDO
2	The minimum lot size identified in Sec. 2.3.4 Townhouse option should be eliminated and minimum lot width and area should be the governing development standard. This will encourage maximum flexibility in site design while ensuring minimal site disturbance in conservation developments.				x	Development Standards	Minimum standards for townhouses have been modified in chapters 2 and 3 of the UDO
2	Height should be measured from finished floor elevation instead of average grade to encourage park under conditions and "English basements" where topography allows for it.				x	Development Standards	Minimum heights apply to buildings taller than 5 stories as well as in the TOD

2	The wording in Sec. 2.3.8A should be changed to state, "...standards must set aside NO LESS THAN 40%..." to encourage more conservation where appropriate. Site standards should support doing more than the minimum by allowing designers to use density/building footprints wherever practical.				x	Development Standards	The standard as stated remains at 40%. It is a minimum
2	Sec. 2.3.8 B2f has a typo. It appears it should be "PERIMETER" protective yard			x		Development Standards	Corrections provided to this section
2	It is not clear in Sec. 2.3.8C1 who evaluates this standard. Who will be granting the exception. The Planning Director?			x		Development Standards	These exception exist today and fall under the purvue of the Parks Director. Development of a manual is underway and will include this information
2	Rights of way that are part of a streetscape plan or include pedestrian areas should be counted as part of minimum open space requirements. A good streetscape with pedestrian features is a linear park and should be counted as such.				x	Development Standards	The sharing of wider sidewalks is maintained in the UDO as currently in the existing code
2	Again, in Sec. 2.3.8C4 it is not clear who will be determining what a "logical location" is or what criteria will be used to make this determination. This should be clarified or called out with additional standards.			x		Development Standards	Open space exceptions approved by Planning Director
2	Sec. 2.3.8D should include verges and sidewalk areas in the list of uses for open space areas.				x	Development Standards	Not included in UDO
2	Streets should be included in the list of uses for open space areas, and in particular "plazas" should be identified as an appropriate use/treatment.				x	Development Standards	Open space may be used for several residential developments, as noted in the selections
2	The City of Raleigh should be identified as a potential owner of Required Open space in addition to the Land Trust, POA and Private Land Owner.				x	Development Standards	This is not incorporated into the UDO

2	Parking should only be allowed in the rear behind cottage structures and the section G (Parking) should include a provision for vehicular access like the other options. Access to parking may be allowed from the front, provided all parking is to be located behind any dwelling.				x	Development Standards	This is an option but not the only option
2	It is not clear why cottages in a cottage court should be raised a minimum of 2 feet, but other structures do not have this same requirement. Slab on grade cottages should be allowed to meet ADA/livability goals.				x	Development Standards	Setbacks relate to this requirement at 20'
2	Balconies, awnings, and galleries should all be allowed in cottage courts in addition to the proposed porches and stoops.				x	Development Standards	They are permitted.
2	Sec. 2.4.2 Backyard Cottages should include a provision for existing long and shallow lots in zoning districts where backyard cottages exist. As it is written, certain lots are excluded, but design solutions can exist.				x	Development Standards	There are requirements that need to be met to take advantage of a backyard cottage. Some lots may or may not be able to have them due to these requirements
2	Line 2.4.2.D3 should be listed as "Structures" per lot instead of Dwellings per lot to avoid confusion with density.				x	Development Standards	Agreed, this will be included.
2	The overall height limit may be too low for units that sit over a garage. Suggest increasing height limit to 32 feet.				x	Development Standards	Backyard cottages remain at 25'
3	It is not clear how additional height can be achieved from the Office Mixed Use Category or what criteria will be used to determine this additional height or who determines it. The criteria should be expressly identified here or the specific section should be referenced.				x	Development Standards	Additional height in mixed use districts is not allowed. Each zoning district has a maximum height and no more. There is no additional height provision

3	<p>The lot dimensions should be modified to include either width or area, but not both. This will encourage flexibility and variability in platting and make for a more visually interesting streetscape in mixed use districts. There is no need to have different standards for each district as well. This will simplify this option and make it more usable. This same sentiment carries through for the attached house, townhouse, apartment, general building, and mixed use building. Additionally, the new minimum lot sizes are substantially larger than those minimum lot sizes for previous zoning districts such as Residential Business (RB) and Shopping Center (SC). In fact, the new minimum lot size is 200% larger than what was previously allowed. This will impact the ability to develop smaller scale, neighborhood appropriate pedestrian oriented mixed use buildings in several new districts.</p>				x	Development Standards	Revisions have been made to lot dimensions
3	<p>The additional setbacks proposed for the buildings are not necessary when streetscape frontages are employed. Requiring additional building setbacks in addition to the streetscape elements will result in excessively wide and underused sidewalks and may in fact provide a disincentive for development in certain areas. Strongly suggest eliminating the additional building setback from primary streets when streetscape frontages are employed for Townhouses, Apartment Buildings, General Buildings and Mixed Use Buildings.</p>				x	Development Standards	Revisions have been added
3	<p>Minimum lot sizes are not needed for "open space" lots. Suggest eliminating them entirely along with all internal setbacks. Parking should only be allowed along the rear lot line when accessed from the rear.</p>				x	Development Standards	Some changes have been incorporated
3	<p>The maximum height limits identified in Sec.3.2.4-7 conflicts with Art. 3.3.2b. All heights within the designated districts should max out at 5 stories.</p>			x		Development Standards	Height as written remains with options. Height is achieved through rezoning process.

3	Sec. 3.3.2C1 states that the "7-story height designation is intended for KEY portions..." It is not clear how KEY portions are identified, what criteria is used to define these areas, and who is in charge of identifying these KEY areas. The criteria should be clearly identified and written/referenced. Use of words such as "may" as in Sec.3.3.2.C2 is in adequate for providing clarity and certainty. Specific criteria is needed.				x	Development Standards	Mapping the districts will address this.
3	Art. 3.5.3 is not clear on how the transition zone is chosen. Clarity on which option for use of Zone A is needed.				x	Development Standards	Transitions only apply when mixed use district developments are adjacent to residential uses; therefore, protection is needed. The widths of transitions are not proposed to be changed and will remain as written.
3	Streets, alleys and lanes should be included in the permissible items for transition areas				x	Development Standards	There are certain uses allowed in each of the 3 zones
7	Availability of On-street parking should be counted toward required parking spaces when included as part of a parking analysis within mixed use districts including residential, neighborhood, and office mixed use districts.				x	Development Standards	The City is not able to use public street parking to meet the mininums according to the city legal reviewers
10	In addition to the Payment in Lieu option provided in Sec. 10.1.5E, applicants should be able to provide a 1:1 trade for trees on adjacent sites owned by the same or mutually agreeable party where conservation interests are represented.				x	Development Standards	The City could not enforce this on other people's property
7	Contradiction to say no more than 2 per unit with urban frontage contradicts the parking table to require more			x		Development Standards / Frontages	Parking sections address frontages, and other exceptions or alternates and how they are handled
5	Reinstate certain approvals by PC or CC in MPOD		x		x	Districts	Subdivisions other than for single family require CC approval
4	Campus - include parking minimums in addition to the parking study option				x	Districts	No minimums are required
4	Campus - revise lighting regs				x	Districts	They have been revised
4	Cmpus - Revise heights in transition area				x	Districts	Campus has been substantially amended

5	Concerns on effectiveness of HOD-2			x		Districts	SSHOD will be tested through application, and will remain in the UDO as an option to GHOD
3	Mixed uses should be mandated					Districts	The draft is not mandating mixed uses
3	Transitions should be tested			x		Districts	The staff has tested them on various site plans
5	Parking in TOD should be lower			x		Districts	TOD parking is lower
5	TOD should mandate mixed use				x	Districts	TOD has more restrictions regarding prohibited uses and such
3	clarify not mandating mixtures of uses vague language in "successfully integrated", provide standards	x				Districts	The City is not stating that mixed use is not mandated. The draft does not say that it is mandated and thus it is not
				x		Districts	Revisions to vague language have been added
3	RX minimum lot size, how do you do this with 4,000 square feet			x		Districts	There are existing lots zoned residential that are 4,000 square feet. It is a minimum only
3	Townhouse type is too urban			x		Districts	revisions have been added
3	Townhouse minimum width be 13'				x	Districts	16 is proposed
3	Townhouse minimum depth be 35'				x	Districts	Revisions have been made to dimensions
3	Minimum lot depth not necessary		x			Districts	Lot dimensions have been modified
3	Do not regulate floor heights townhouse		x			Districts	The floor heights in the mixed use districts are regulated to allow for use conversions
	Minimum ground floor elevation should not be regulated		x			Districts	some revisions have been made in the document regarding floor height and elevation
3	why 35' blank wall requirement? What about french doors?		x			Districts	Blank walls have been revised
3.2.5	Where is parking in street option for apt.			x		Districts	Parking in street is allowed but not to meet required parking

3	An intro is needed tying the purpose and intent of mixed use districts to the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map as well as the Growth Framework Map.				x	Districts	This has been incorporated
3	Residential Mixed Use should also be allowed to implement the Low-density residential future land use category of the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan				x	Districts	Low density is permitted in RX
7	All mixed use areas should have the ability to benefit from "off-site" parking like the DX district.				x	Districts	All districts may provide off site parking
10	Remove reference to trout waters as there will never be a trout water classification in Wake County				x	Environmental	No change has been made to the UDO
2	Reorganize open space areas from protected resource areas such as TCA before discretionary areas are looked to				x	Environmental / Residential Development	Some changes have been incorporated
3	Add an 8th frontage to accommodate the traditional suburban retail shopping centers				x	Frontages	An 8th frontage has not been added
3	Add a frontage for retail shopping centers				x	Frontages	All shopping centers are considered retail or commercial and may fall under existing frontages or none. Frontages are not mandatory for shopping centers
3	illustration labels for parkway do not coincide with chart			x		Frontages	Agreed, changes have been made
2	why are attached units added to qualify as infill?		x			Infill	They are considered to be closeley related to single family and contribute to the context of the neighborhodd
2	side setback plane needs definition			x		Infill	Yes, tended to
2	increase the wall length subject to projection from 50' to 60'. Reduce projection / recess from 4' to 8'.				x	Infill	This change has not been incorporated
6	Community Gardens in Residential Districts should not require Special Use Permit approval				x	Land Use	The use table has been amended; however this remains as a special use permit

6	Medical Office should be allowed in RX as a Limited Use				x	Land Use	The use table remains the same on this. Some limited uses are allowed in RX that are not residential
6	Personal Service should be allowed in RX as a Limited Use				x	Land Use	See revised use table in chapter 6
6	Prohibit churches and day cares from locating within established neighborhoods.				x	Land Use	This has not been incorporated into the UDO
2	Sec. 2.4.1. Cottage Courts should be allowed in R-4 and R-6 districts as well as the others mentioned. These residential courts made up of small homes provide an excellent way of encouraging affordable housing through market means when enabled in land development codes. Cottage Courts should also be allowed in Campus, Conservation Management and Agricultural Production Districts in order to promote smaller scale developments that conserve land while providing affordability in housing choices.				x	Land Use	They are allowed in R-6
11	Staff will have too much power and less control by the elected officials		x			Process	Noted
11	Supports proposal for administrative approval process	x				Process	Noted, the UDO proposed this
11	Opposed to notification and appeal process for all subdivisions		x			Process	This is State law driven
11	support admin process, discretionary processes are inefficient and drawn out	x				Process	Noted
2	Cottage Court good idea	x				Residential Development	Noted, kept in the draft
6	Allow Home Occupations to store goods intended for resale				x	Residential Development	Home occupations remain the same
2	Prohibit backyard theaters/movie viewing in residential districts		x			Residential Development	This is not incorporated into the UDO
2	Permit backyard cottages in Sp R-30 district	x				Residential Development	They are permitted in all districts
2	Prohibit multiple dwellings on small lots from occurring in Historic Overlay Districts				x	Residential Development	Noted

2	Require accessory dwellings and backyard cottages to be on owner-occupied parcels only, that accessory apartments not exceed 25% of the dwelling and no more than 2 persons to reside in an accessory dwelling or backyard cottage. on small lots from occurring in Historic Overlay Districts				x	Residential Development	Cannot require owner occupancy based on NC court cases
2	Require backyard cottages to be on owner-occupied parcels only, limit # of unrelated persons to a maximum of 4 persons for the entire lot (both units), do not permit on lots less than 9,000 square feet				x	Residential Development	Cannot require owner occupancy based on NC court cases
2	Height limits to infill will negatively impact the regentrification of neighborhoods with existing small, ranch-style homes, precluding new modern marketable homes. Proposed revisions offered in the letter		x			Residential Development	Infill addresses context of neighborhoods
2	Front-loaded garage townhomes meet a current demand and the proposed changes will result in parking lot townhomes or more expensive products to accommodate the alley.		x			Residential Development	These have been incorporated
2	Opposed to eliminating the Cluster option. Proposes to retain with 20% open space		x			Residential Development	New minimum lot sized have been reduced to close what cluster options allowed. In addition, a clearer distinction was needed to separate conservation developments from smaller lot neighborhoods
2	Courtyard Cottage should not be limited to s/f and duplex. Should be available for townhomes.				x	Residential Development	Townhouses may be developed like this by attaching units, condo also
2	Corner Side Yard setbacks should be 10 feet - similar to fornt yard setback.				x	Residential Development	yes, added to draft
2	Proposes reducing the parking setback for townhomes from 30 feet to 15 feet.				x	Residential Development	Revisions to parking setbacks have been addressed
2	Disagree with density bonus in conservation subdivision		x			Residential Development	Noted
2	Disagree with allowance of accessory dwelling units in R-4		x			Residential Development	Noted
2	Concerns with accessory dwelling units			x		Residential Development	Noted
2	Support increase inhousing choices, but need more	x				Residential Development	Noted

1	Infill compatibility standards should reflect more than height and setback context			x		Residential Development	Height and setbacks are the primary contextual issues in neighborhoods. These drive scale and massing.
1	Infill should apply to R-10				x	Residential Development	It does now
2	Terminology confusing for housing types			x		Residential Development	Revisions have been made
1	Limitation on % of front yard for driveway and parking should be removed		x			Residential Development	This reflects a recent text change approved by City Council
2	Why limit % housing types in a development, oppose		x			Residential Development	Conservation development has a purpose and mixed housing is one of those purposes
2	Recommend side street setback be less than front				x	Residential Development	No change has been made to the UDO
2	Do not believe densities are achievable			x		Residential Development	Noted
2	Incorporate alley loaded setbacks for detached units				x	Residential Development	Rear yard setbacks include the alley
2	Townhouse - setbacks from primary and secondary streets should be the same				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	Need a parking setback from an alley for detached				x	Residential Development	No change has been made to the UDO
2	Townhouse, we don't need a setback from an alley					Residential Development	Noted
2	Remove maximum setbacks for townhouse in residential districts		x			Residential Development	This is a build to. Revisions have been made to townhouse design
2	Height standards should be uniform in code, townhouse and apt are different		x			Residential Development	This is related to building code and conversions of uses to other uses in the mixed use districts
2	Don't regulate ground floor elevation		x			Residential Development	Noted
2	Allow side entrance for end unit				x	Residential Development	They are permitted as secondary entrance
2	minimum entry spacing not needed				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	Reduce parking setback from 30-15' "encourage reinvestment" and reinforce traditional character are conflicting goals				x	Residential Development	Noted
2.3	Conservation sub 40% is too burdensome. Current code allows density bonus with 10%		x			Residential Development	Noted
2	Open space should be a sliding scale. As density goes up, so does open space required				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	How will public streets be addressed with regard to density			x		Residential Development	Public streets may be used to meet density if part of the gross site area

2	Minimum width of 50' open space is too high, reduce to 20'		x		x	Residential Development	No change has been made to the UDO
2	Should major and minor streets be primary and side?			x		Residential Development	Noted
2	Townhouse in conserv. Sub - do not need a setback from an alley, don't need a maximum setback, height should be uniform, allow a side entrance on end unit		x		x	Residential Development	Revisions have been made to these various sections in the udo
2	restrictions too difficult for open space in conservation subdivision		x			Residential Development	Noted
2	inclusion of flood prone areas as the first primary open space area is objectionable, should be listed as secondary		x		x	Residential Development	Noted
2	include buy down or fee for open space				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	Reduce open space less than 40%		x			Residential Development	405 is maintained
2	Define passive and active recreation				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	Object to city requiring open space management plan		x			Residential Development	This has been removed
2	Cottage plan shows alley load only, should also show alternate access					Residential Development	These are very small lots and arrangement does not allow front loaded access
	What is purpose of regulating wall plate?			x		Residential Development	Context and breaking up a long wall
2	Backyard cottage, don't allow everywhere		x			Residential Development	They are permitted but not necessarily allowed on all lots to due to requirements
5	NCOD, does the 15 acre cross over rights of ways or streets, and are they included?			x		Residential Development	NCOD has not changed in this draft
2	Suggest calling Sec. 2.1.3 Additional Housing Options instead of "...Patterns."				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	Suggest allowing cottage courts to be permitted by right in any transitional area between residential districts and mixed use districts or residential districts above R-10				x	Residential Development	They have been added to R-6
2	Suggest allowing cottage courts as a by-right use in R-4 and R-6 zoning districts.				x	Residential Development	Yes, R-6
2	Suggest eliminating minimum lot width dimensions in residential zoning districts to more proactively encourage a variety of residential building types within each district. The residential lot size will ensure the necessary consistency within each district to maintain character.				x	Residential Development	This has not been incorporated into the UDO

2	Townhouses should be allowed on individual lots and not be subject to minimum "Site" conditions in R-10 districts and the minimum lot dimension should be reduced to 16 feet per townhouse.				x	Residential Development	16' has been added in addition to other dimensional changes
2	The minimum width for apartment sites is too large to encourage neighborhood scale apartment structures. Suggest reducing minimum lot dimension to 72 feet. This will encourage deeper lots which will support rear yard parking more effectively.				x	Residential Development	Noted, lots may be arranged in many ways to create a lot
2	Minimum lot size should be eliminated from the Civic Building standards identified in Sec. 2.2.5. Civic buildings should be able to be placed wherever possible.				x	Residential Development	Noted
2	Minimum lot size should be eliminated from the Open Space standards identified in Sec. 2.2.6. Open space lots should not be subject to minimum dimensions.				x	Residential Development	Minimums relate to a proportion of the whole and this is the basis for the open space minimum
2	Minimum area requirements for a Conservation Development should be eliminated for all residential districts. If a user wants to provide 40% open space, then they should be allowed to do that regardless of the total assemblage of land.				x	Residential Development	No change to this in the UDO
2	Minimum lot size standards should be eliminated from the Conservation Development Option or provided as an average so as to promote maximum site/layout flexibility in all residential districts.				x	Residential Development	No change to this in the UDO

2	The minimum area for cottage courts should however be reduced to 12,000 square feet, and the minimum site dimensions should be eliminated altogether, as irregular lots make very good opportunities for cottage courts to "fit" into existing neighborhoods. The proposed minimum lot area makes a cottage court in an existing residential neighborhood infeasible because it will require the assemblage of multiple lots which and will result in multiple tear downs while driving the price up for new units. Additionally, the minimum lot area per dwelling is too large. This size should be reduced to 2,400 square feet and be used as an average lot size. Fire codes should regulate interior building setbacks.				x	Residential Development	Changes have been made to cottage court. With the minimum number of units and arrangements as well as allowed in R-6 now.
3	The Chart referenced in Article 3.2 should include cottage courts and backyard housing options and reference the appropriate standards.				x	Residential Development	Yes, changes have been made
8	Concerns with block grid dimensions and shortening cul-de-sac length		x			Streets/Public Improvements	Chapter 8 has been substantially changed
8	Need sensitive classifications for streets				x	Streets/Public Improvements	Yes, incorporated
6	TOD block dimensions should be decreased				x	Streets/Public Improvements	Yes, they have
8.1.1.b	Block standards are very TIGHT, this will increase more stub streets to areas where they may not be desired			x		Streets/Public Improvements	yes, street stubs and less culdesacs are a goal
8	Developer should not be required to provide a street stub every 600-800 feet		x			Streets/Public Improvements	Stubs are related to density and this is reflected in the chart. Revisions have been made
8	Sidewalks now required on both sides of streets. One side seems adequate			x		Streets/Public Improvements	No change
8	street trees moved to 6' planting streets causing more encroachments and wider rights of ways			x		Streets/Public Improvements	Yes, this is a result of this urban form
8	Clarification that setbacks are from the property line and not the street edge is needed			x		Streets/Public Improvements	Noted
8	new sidewalk width 6' with 6' planting will lead to sprawl		x	x		Streets/Public Improvements	The changes to these encourage pedestrian experiences on tree lined streets with protection between the walker and the car

9.1.2	Construction surety - requiring installation prior to recording is burdensome, today in Raleigh, the surety is required at permit issuance or CO, a big advantage		x			Streets/Public Improvements	Surety will be required prior to recording or permit issuance. The city has been left with situations where a developer has gone bankrupt and cannot finish improvements, streets or stormwater ponds, leaving the residences with the problem
8	6-foot verge is too narrow for growing large shade trees without damage to the pavement			x		Streets/Public Improvements	No change, working with Urban forester on other methods
8	Trees close to edge of road can be a hazard to drivers			x		Streets/Public Improvements	Not permitted in site distance triangles
8	Allow alternate design to permit trees to be planted behind sidewalk when better suited for trees, totp factors, NRBs, provide continuity with existing landscaping				x	Streets/Public Improvements	Yes, agreed in certain situations
8	Tree grates have negative effects on th elong term health of trees. Consider alternative.				x	Streets/Public Improvements	Other alternatives are being looked into
8	There are too many situations where planting trees 30- on center is too many trees. Recommend more discussion on this matter				x	Streets/Public Improvements	40' and 50' on center is recommended
8	Recommend no utilities other than irrigation be permitted within tree planting areas.				x	Streets/Public Improvements	Yes, that is proposed
6	retail sales in residential districts should be allowed, they are charlotte on major corners				x	Use	Noted
6	RX non residential uses are too restrictive			x		Use	Noted
6	Accessory - what happened to residential related services			x		Use	They are still allowed in chapter 6, but have been incorporated into different language
6	accessory apartment, how will these be regulated?			x		Use	zoning enforcement and a permit is required
6	see other comments on backyard cottage			x		Use	Noted
6	how will a dish antenna be screened		x			Use	Screening revisions have been made and they are not allowed everywhere visible
6	Home occupation - object to prohibition of employees, clients, patients and visitors		x			Use	Noted
6	limitations on what can be sold is unreasonable		x			Use	Noted
6	Pools, maximum size without a SUP is too small for a neighborhood		x			Use	Yes, this is revised

8	Streetscape dimension for mixed use streets conflicts with main street width. They should be the same				x	Streets/Public Improvements	These have been substantially revised