

**Transportation & Planning Committee**  
**Thursday, April 23, 2015**  
**12:00 – 1:30 p.m.**  
**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center**  
**Room 280**

**Committee Members:** Vi Lyles, Chair  
David Howard, Vice Chair  
Patsy Kinsey  
Greg Phipps  
Kenny Smith

**Staff Resource:** Debra Campbell, City Manager's Office

---

**AGENDA**

**I. University City Area Plan– 60 minutes**

*Resources:* Mandy Vari and Kathy Cornett, Planning

This is a continuation of the University City Area Plan discussion. Staff will present responses to comments received at the April 13 City Council Meeting, discuss implementation strategies, and review next steps. Staff's proposed revisions and responses to public comments are included with this agenda.

*Action:* Request recommendation of the University City Area Plan with proposed revisions

Link to plan: <http://UCAP.charlotteplanning.org>

Attachments: 1. Proposed Revisions.pdf  
2. Public Comments Tracking.pdf

**II. Zoning Ordinance Update– 25 minutes**

*Resource:* Ed McKinney, Planning

Staff will share the status of the Zoning Ordinance Update effort, and how the concurrent and related efforts of Parking near Colleges and Universities, Auto Oriented Uses, and the TOD District review will be incorporated.

*Action:* For information only

**III. Future Meeting Topics and Schedule – 5 minutes**

*Resource:* Debra Campbell, City Manager's Office

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Lead Dept.</b>
1. University City Area Plan	April 23 & May 11 (if needed)	Planning
2. Prosperity Hucks Area Plan	May 11 & May 28 June 8	Planning
3. Charlotte Walks	June 8	CDOT
4. Bike Plan Update	June 8	CDOT
5. Transportation Action Plan	June 8 or July 13	CDOT
6. Zoning Ordinance Update	On-going as needed	Planning
7. Permitting and Inspection Process Reviewing	On-going as needed	Manager Office

**Next Scheduled Meeting:** Monday, May 11 at 3:00 p.m.

**University City Area Plan – Issue Matrix**  
**Staff Proposed Revisions to Draft Plan**  
**As of April 14, 2015**

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
1	Entire Document	Minor edits to correct text, graphics, or tables that don't affect the content or intent of the document. Staff will make these changes as needed.	Entire Document	Not identified.
2	A-3: North Bridge cross section (Pg. 97) – Requested by CDOT.	To be consistent with Policy Area 8 #14. Since the cycle-track and/or multi-use path are being investigated.	Pg. 97, Cross Section dimensions	<p>Sidewalk: TBD (footnote 1)            Planting Strip: 8' (footnote 2)            Bike Lane: TBD (footnote 1)            Travel Lanes 11'-NA-NA-NA-11' (footnote 3)            Bike Lane: TBD (footnote 1)            Planting Strip: 8' (footnote 2)            Sidewalk: TBD (footnote 1)</p> <p><i>Footnotes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Determinations of the appropriate pedestrian and bicycle treatments to be deferred to project planning process for the I-85 North Bridge project.</li> <li>2. Across the bridge, the planting strip can be deleted. Add additional width to pedestrian and/or bicycle treatment as appropriate.</li> <li>3. 11-foot left-turn lanes permitted where needed</li> </ol>
3	<i>Character Area 2: Regional Services South</i> description (Pg. 30)	Sentence in summary needs to be revised to be consistent with the actual policy area language which does allow these uses in some areas, but focuses on how they are designed.	Pg. 30, paragraph 3	<p>Existing sentence: "Pedestrian unfriendly uses are discouraged, such as drive-throughs, strip shopping centers, heavy industrial uses, and parking or ancillary structures between buildings and key streets.</p> <p>Revision: "Pedestrian unfriendly design is discouraged in this area. Uses with drive through facilities, gasoline pumps, or large surface parking lots should be designed to comfortably accommodate</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				pedestrians.
4	<i>Character Area 10: Primarily Residential</i> (Pg. 72) Opportunities bullet	UCP and the University believe we have adequate supply [of housing] for the University's projected growth for the next 3-5 years. Restate Character Area description for Character Area 10 - Opportunities	Pg. 72, Opportunities and Challenges	Existing sentence: "Strong demand for student housing, but need to provide housing for other residents as well"  Change to: Need to provide adequate supply and mix of housing options to meet demand
5	Implementation Guide	Library is not sure when funding will be available.	Pg. 112, Action Items for Policy P-6	Change from: Long (>10 years)  Change to: As funding becomes available
6	Street Activation  Transit Station Areas and Policy Areas 5 and 8	Street activation policies (E.g. Pg. 23 Policy 1a #8) are too limiting.	Pg. 23 Policy Area 1a #8; Pg. 26 Policy Area 1b #7; Pg. 29 Policy Area 1c #5; Pg. 42 Policy Area 3 #8; Pg. 51 Policy Area 5 #10; Pg. 57 Policy Area 7a #11; Pg. 60 Policy Area 7b #6; Pg. 63 Policy Area 8 #11	The intent is to provide a menu of options to achieve street activation. Staff proposes the following change for this policy in every applicable Policy Area.  Existing Policy: The ground floor of buildings should be designed to activate streets and open space through a variety of design techniques that may include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Non-residential ground floor uses should have clear glass windows and prominent entrances with operable doors allowing access from the sidewalk.</li> <li>b. Non-residential and multi-family building facades should have architectural elements that will help distinguish the ground floor from upper stories. Building corners at street intersections should be designed to feature prominent entrances and distinctive architectural features.</li> <li>c. Multi-family residential development should include direct connections to the sidewalk. Where feasible, ground floor units should also have direct connections to the sidewalk. For the privacy of residents, ground floor units should include vertical separation and/or increased setbacks from the sidewalk.</li> </ul>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>Proposed Revision: Both residential and non-residential buildings should be designed to activate the public realm (i.e. sidewalks, streets, parks, plazas, greenways, trails, and open space). Street level building activation will promote walking and cycling, thus enhancing the area’s safety and security and contributing to better public health. The following are but a few of the ways to achieve ground floor activation of the public realm. Other methods may be equally or more appropriate based on unique site criteria, as long as they contribute toward this goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Non-residential ground floor uses with clear glass windows and prominent entrances with operable doors allowing access from the sidewalk.</li> <li>b. Non-residential and multi-family building facades with architectural elements that will help distinguish the ground floor from upper stories.</li> <li>c. Building corners that feature prominent entrances and/or distinctive architectural design.</li> <li>d. Multi-family residential development with direct connections to the sidewalk, preferably for ground floor units, where feasible. Ground floor residential units may have vertical and/or horizontal separation from the sidewalk for privacy or to address site issues.</li> </ul>
7	<p>Diversity of housing/building types</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 1c, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3, 4a, 5, 8, 9a, 9c, 10a, 10b, 10c</p>	<p>Policy language to require at least two building types for residential development is not clear. Seems to indicate that every development must include at least two types of housing. May not be feasible on smaller sites.</p>	<p>Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a #3 and add new design policy; Pg. 26 Policy Area 1b add new design policy, Pg. 28 Policy Area 1c #1 and add new design policy; Pg. 33 Policy Area 2b #1 and add new design policy; Pg. 35 Policy Area 2c #1 and #5; Pg. 37 Policy Area 2d #2 and add new</p>	<p>The intent is to minimize the potential for several large multi-family buildings and to achieve a diversity of building types of different height, sizes, and scales – regardless of the type of housing.</p> <p>Existing Policy: E.g. Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a #3: Development outside of the core and beyond approximately 500 ft. of N. Tryon St. should include more than one building type, such as single family, duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and multi-family buildings. Retail services...area.</p> <p>Proposed Revision: Land Use Policy revision</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
			<p>design policy; Pg. 41 Policy Area 3 #3 and add new design policy; Pg. 45 Policy Area 4a #1 and #6; Pg. 50 Policy Area 5 #4 and #9; Pg. 57 Policy Area 7a add new design policy, Pg. 60 Policy Area 7b add new design policy, Pg. 62 Policy Area 8 #1 and #10; Pg. 66 Policy Area 9a #4 and add new design policy; Pg. 70 Policy Area 9c #2 and add new design policy; Pg. 73 Policy Area 10a #1 and #6; Pg. 75 Policy Area 10b #2 and #6; Pg. 77 Policy Area 10c #1 and #3</p>	<p>E.G. Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a #3: Development outside of the core and beyond approximately 500 ft. of N. Tryon St. is appropriate for moderate to high density residential development (8 to above 22 DUA). <b>Development in this area is encouraged to include a variety of housing options (e.g. single family, duplex, triplex, quadraplex, multi-family, etc.).</b> Retail services...area. <i>(Highlighted sentence is recommended revision – rest of the policy language should remain as is for each Policy Area).</i></p> <p><b>Add Community Design Policy:</b> Buildings should be designed to avoid the appearance of having a long, continuous building wall and to break up visual mass and bulk. Consider a combination of design techniques to achieve this including, but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Façade modulation that provides variation in the building wall.</li> <li>b. Building mass separation between all, or part, of a single building to create the appearance of multiple buildings.</li> <li>c. Use of varying architectural styles, building heights, and/or roof pitches to reduce the apparent size of a building.</li> <li>d. Multi-family residential development with a variety of building mass, scale, and type (e.g. townhomes, carriage houses, apartments, etc.).</li> </ol>
8	<p>Land Use Recommendations related to areas currently developed as primarily retail</p> <p>Policy Areas 3, 7a, and 7b</p>	<p>These areas are developed as primarily retail uses. While these areas are in transit station areas, they are outside the “core” area where TOD is more likely to occur in the short term. The proposed revision is intended to allow flexibility for future redevelopment, and transition to a mixed use, walkable, urban form.</p>	<p>Policy Area 3 #2 and #5; Policy Area 7a #2 and #7; Policy Area 7b #1 and #3</p>	<p>The proposed revision is intended to allow flexibility for future redevelopment, and transition to a mixed use, walkable, urban form.</p> <p>Existing Policy: (e.g. Pg. 56, Policy Area 7a, #2)</p> <p>2. In areas outside of the core, existing businesses and residences are anticipated to remain in the near term. Over time, properties should be redeveloped for residential, office, and civic/institutional uses. Retail uses are also appropriate if located within multi-storied</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>buildings. Ground floor retail uses may include drive through facilities only if they meet the Community Design criteria below (#7). Structured parking should be lined with active uses along the street or screened from view from streets and sidewalks. Commercial uses with gasoline pumps are not appropriate in the transit station area.</p> <p>7. In areas outside of the core, buildings should be multi-storied (typically 3-5) and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk. Surface parking lots should be located to the rear or side of buildings. No more than 35% of a site's street frontage should be devoted to surface parking or driveway access. Drive-through facilities may be appropriate in areas indicated above (#2) if located on the interior of a parking deck and are designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrians.</p> <p>Proposed Revision:</p> <p>Land Use Policy In areas outside of the core, existing businesses and residences are anticipated to remain in the near term. Over time, properties should be redeveloped with a mix of residential, office, retail, and civic/institutional uses. Ground floor retail uses may include drive through facilities only if they meet the Community Design criteria below (#7). Structured parking should be lined with active uses along the street or screened from view from streets and sidewalks. Commercial uses with gasoline pumps are not appropriate in the transit station area.</p> <p>Design policy: In areas outside of the core, buildings should be multi-storied and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk. Surface parking should be located to the rear or side of buildings, and not between the building and the street. Not more than 35% of a site's street frontage should be devoted to surface parking or driveway access.</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>Uses should activate the street with appropriate building orientation, accessible entrances, and space for outdoor seating and display near the sidewalk. Structured parking is strongly encouraged to reduce the need for surface parking. Drive-through facilities may be appropriate in areas indicated above (#2) if located on the interior of a parking deck and are designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrians.</p>
9	<p>Community Design recommendations for Transit Station Area Core</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 1b, 3, and 7a</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance and indicate there is not a height limitation in the policy guidance and that multistoried buildings are encouraged.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1a #4; Policy Area 1b #3; Policy Area 3 #4; Policy Area 7a #5</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:  <b>Within the core</b> (shown in blue on Transportation Network Map above, as defined in the glossary on page 12) of the transit station area, buildings should be a minimum of 2 storied (typically 5-10 stories) and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk, with a greater setback when needed to accommodate outdoor seating and display.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:  <b>Within the core</b> (shown in blue on Transportation Network Map above, as defined in the glossary on page 12) of the transit station area, buildings should be a multistoried and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk, with a greater setback when needed to accommodate outdoor seating and display.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
10	<p>Community Design recommendations for Transit Station Area, outside the Core</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 1b,</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance and indicate there is not a height limitation in the policy guidance and that multistoried buildings are encouraged.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1a #5; Policy Area 1b #4; Policy Area 1c #3; Policy Area 3 #5; Policy Area 7a #6; Policy Area 7b #3</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:  <b>In areas outside of the core</b>, buildings should be multi-storied (typically 3-5 stories) and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk.</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
	1c, 3, 7a, and 7b			<p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:  <b>In areas outside of the core,</b> buildings should be multi-storied and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
11	<p>Community Design recommendations for areas adjacent to established neighborhoods</p> <p>Policy Areas 1a, 3, 10a, 10b, 10c</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance and provide language for protection of visual and physical impacts to adjacent established neighborhoods with the provision to increase height as you move away from those neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Policy Area 1a #6; Policy Area 3 #7; Policy Area 10a #4; Policy Area 10b #5; Policy Area 10c #4</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:  Development [in areas outside of the core and beyond 500 ft. of N. Tryon St.] can be up to 4 stories.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:  Development [in areas outside of the core and beyond 500 ft.] should be sensitive to the character, views, and privacy of existing neighborhoods. Base height adjacent to existing neighborhoods should be no greater than 4 stories and incrementally increase in height away from the neighborhood.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
12	<p>Community Design recommendations near the future Auto Mall</p> <p>Policy Areas 2a and 2b</p>	<p>To clarify height guidance.</p>	<p>Policy Area 2a #7; Policy Area 2b #4</p>	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:  If <b>automobile services and sales uses</b> are introduced in this area, the following design guidelines apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings should be a minimum of 2 stories and/or designed to have the appearance of a 2 story building.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only</i></p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p><i>this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:            If <b>automobile services and sales uses</b> are introduced in this area, the following design guidelines apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings should be multistoried and/or designed to have the appearance of a multistoried building.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
13	Community Design recommendation for Policy Area 4a  Policy Area 4a	To remove height limitation.	Policy Area 4a #5	<p>The original intent was to encourage taller buildings to be located closer to the transit station; however after further review there is no reason that taller buildings are not appropriate in this area as it is adjacent to the transit station area and I-85.</p> <p>Existing Policy:            Buildings should be no greater than 5 stories.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:            Delete policy.</p>
14	Community Design recommendation for Policy Area 9b  Policy Area 9b	To clarify height guidance and establish a strong building presence at this intersection that the community identifies as a gateway.	Policy Area 9b #4	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:            As a gateway to University City, buildings should be oriented to the corner at the intersection of Mallard Creek Church Rd. and N. Tryon St., at least 2 stories in height and designed to feature prominent entrances and distinctive architectural features.  <i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:            As a gateway to University City, buildings should be oriented to the</p>

#	Recommendation and Location	Purpose of Change	Current Text, Map or Graphic	Proposed Revision
				<p>corner at the intersection of Mallard Creek Church Rd. and N. Tryon St., multistoried and designed to feature prominent entrances and distinctive architectural features</p> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
15	<p>Community Design Policy for Policy Area 5</p> <p>Policy Area 5</p>	To clarify height guidance.	Policy Area 5 #5	<p>The proposed revision intends to provide clarity for a policy related to building height.</p> <p>Existing Policy:            Along Hampton Church Rd. properties with frontage on or within approximately 400' of N. Tryon St., should be developed with multi-storied buildings (typically 3 stories) that are oriented to both streets.</p> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p> <p>Proposed Revision:            Along Hampton Church Rd. properties with frontage on or within approximately 400' of N. Tryon St., should be developed with multi-storied buildings that are oriented to both streets.</p> <p><i>Any remaining language in this policy will remain the same, only this sentence changes.</i></p>
16	Implementation Guide	To address Zoning Implementation strategies.	Pg. 107, Implementation Strategies	<p>Add Action Item:            Further evaluation should be conducted to include identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning.</p> <p>Project Type:            Land Development</p> <p>Lead Agency:            Planning</p> <p>Time Frame:            Immediate to Short (0&gt;5 years)</p>

**University City Area Plan – Issue Matrix**  
**Public Comments and Staff Responses**  
**As of April 13, 2015**

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
1	Plan says there are 4-1/2 million light rail transit riders in Charlotte. How is this calculated?	Pg. 154, Table: Annual Ridership Routes Serving the Northeast Corridor	<p>Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) generates ridership through the Automatic Passenger Counters (APC) on the Light Rail vehicles as well as an accounting of ticket sales. The 4.7 million is consistent with what we reported to the National Transit Database (NTD) in 2011, viewable through the below link. Ridership is called on the NTD report annual unlinked trips.</p> <p><a href="http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/pubs/profiles/2011/agency_profiles/4008.pdf">http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/pubs/profiles/2011/agency_profiles/4008.pdf</a></p> <p>The chart on pg. 154 of the Appendix will be revised for clarity.</p>
2	Concern with policy area 7A – on the map, this area is recommended for a mix of office and residential uses and doesn't recognize the existing retail use. It will likely redevelop with retail uses. Having to read through the plan policies to find the full use of permitted uses and community design criteria is cumbersome.	Pg. 17, Map 4: Recommended Future Land Use Map; Pg. 56, Land Use Policy 7a #2	<p>The intent is for this area to transition from the suburban, single-use building and form of development that currently exists to a more urban form of development near a future transit station.</p> <p><b>Staff proposes the following changes to address the public comment and is continuing to work with the property owner and his agent:</b></p> <p>Proposed Revision:  Policy Area 3 #2 and #5; Policy Area 7a #2 and #7; Policy Area 7b #1 and #3  Map: Update Map 4: Recommended future land use map to include residential, office, and retail stripe.</p> <p>Land Use Policy  In areas outside of the core, existing businesses and residences are anticipated to remain in the near term. Over time, properties should be redeveloped with a mix of residential, office, retail, and civic/institutional uses. Ground floor retail uses may include drive</p>

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
			<p>through facilities only if they meet the Community Design criteria below (#7). Structured parking should be lined with active uses along the street or screened from view from streets and sidewalks. Commercial uses with gasoline pumps are not appropriate in the transit station area.</p> <p>Design policy:  In areas outside of the core, buildings should be multi-storied and be placed at or near the back of the sidewalk. Surface parking should be located to the rear or side of buildings, and not between the building and the street. Not more than 35% of a site's street frontage should be devoted to surface parking or driveway access. Uses should activate the street with appropriate building orientation, accessible entrances, and space for outdoor seating and display near the sidewalk. -Structured parking is strongly encouraged to reduce the need for surface parking. Drive-through facilities may be appropriate in areas indicated above (#2) if located on the interior of a parking deck and are designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrians.</p>
3	Mallard Pointe shopping center is a 15 acre center – would like it to be shown as recommended for office, retail and residential uses on the map.	Pg. 17, Map 4: Recommended Future Land Use Map; Pg. 56, Land Use Policy 7a #2	Please refer to response above.
4	Closing of Eastway bridge is causing hardship to his business and he's not sure that the business can survive more than a month with the continued closure.	n/a	We have let CATS business liaison Jennifer Duru know about your concerns.
5	Wants to stress the importance of open space from Sugar Creek Road to the community garden at	n/a – outside of plan area	This area and intersection are outside of the University City Area Plan Update geography. CDOT will respond to the question regarding Eastway Dr. directly.

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	Hidden Valley. Are there plans to redo the intersection of Eastway and North Tryon Street?		
6	Are there plans for a senior center (similar to Marion Diehl)?	Land Use and Open Space policies for All Policy Areas (Concept Plan Pg. 13-104)	Parks and Recreation has not identified a location for a senior center in this area. Area plans don't typically identify specific locations for new park/recreation, civic or institutional uses. These are appropriate in most areas as indicated in the policies. University City Partners intends to undertake a Park and Open Space analysis with Mecklenburg County Parks and Recreation.
7	Discrepancy between TOD zoning being applicable within the ½ mile walk distance, but the station area plans referring to the ¼ mile walk distance. Needs more language that addresses suburban sprawl.	Pg. 17, Map 4: Recommended Future Land Use Map; Pg. 22 Policy Area 1a, Land Use Policies; Pg. 25 Policy Area 1B Land Use Policies; Pg. 28 Policy Area 1C Land Use Policies; Pg. 41 Policy Area 3 Land Use Policies; Pg. 56 Policy Area 7a Land Use Policies; Pg. 59 Policy Area 7B Land Use Policies	<p>The Area Plan defines Transit Station Areas as within generally 1/2 mile walk distance from each transit station. The land use policies indicate TOD land use for most of this area, however in some areas a mix of uses is shown, rather than TOD. This does not preclude property owners from seeking TOD zoning. It is meant to recognize that some areas farther from the station may redevelop to the intensity of TOD at much later intervals and the policies provide for a more realistic transition by not requiring the use of TOD zoning.</p> <p>To address suburban sprawl even outside the transit station areas, land use policies generally encourage a mix of uses, designed to create more walkable environments and to allow intensification over time. The land use policies encourage a transition away from the primarily retail pattern of development we see today.</p>
8	When will the Implementation Plan be made available? Would like to review it.	Pg. 105	<p>The Implementation has been available on the project website: <a href="http://UCAP.charlotteplanning.org">http://UCAP.charlotteplanning.org</a> since February 5, 2015.</p> <p>Implementation Guide is not adopted by City Council and is updated periodically, as needed.</p>
9	Need provisions for affordable housing at stations.	n/a	City Council has adopted policies that address the provision of affordable housing in transit station areas.
10	Need green architecture/LEED policies in station areas.	n/a	Environmental sustainability is an inherent characteristic of the policies for the transit station areas. These policies provide for compact, walkable development and efficient use of land and

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
			infrastructure. Further, the policies in the Natural Environment chapter encourage environmentally sensitive site design and minimizing runoff from development. Additional green architecture/LEED elements such as building architecture, internal layout and materials are not specifically addressed in area plans.
11	Supports the plan and has participated as a stakeholder with UNC Charlotte. Working on a park master plan with Land Design.	Open Space Policies for all Policy Areas (Concept Plan Pg. 13-104) and Implementation Guide (Pg. 105)	The Park Master Plan will be part of the Implementation of this area plan.
12	Language should require the redevelopment of shopping centers with an urban form.	Land Use and Design policies for All Policy Areas (Concept Plan Pg. 13-104)	The area plan recognizes that redevelopment to a more urban form may be more feasible adjacent to transit stations, especially in the short term future. Over time, other areas are expected to redevelop as well and this plan supports a transition to a more urban form in these areas as well. The policies for areas outside of transit stations emphasize designing for pedestrian mobility and transitioning to a more urban form of development by bringing buildings to the sidewalk and reducing parking lots along street frontages.
13	Consider adding language about pedestrian connectivity, pedestrian oriented uses and redevelopment without large parking lots.	Design and mobility policies for All Policy Areas (Concept Plan Pg. 13-104)	Within transit station areas (TSA), the policies emphasize pedestrian and bicycle connectivity as part of site and street design. In areas outside of TSA's, the policies are intended to address the pedestrian network and encourage providing clear, comfortable, direct connections between sidewalks along streets and building entrances. In addition, the policies will be implemented by the zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance, and urban street design guidelines that require certain block lengths and elements like sidewalks and bike lanes where appropriate.
14	The Implementation Plan needs to include development timelines.	Pg. 105	The Implementation has been available on the project website: <a href="http://UCAP.charlotteplanning.org">http://UCAP.charlotteplanning.org</a> since February 5, 2015. It includes time-frames for the various implementation actions.

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
			<p>Although we are not able to predict timelines for private development, we do track development in the station areas.</p> <p>Implementation Guide is not adopted by City Council and is updated periodically, as needed.</p>
15	<p>Can the plan strongly state five year increments that list specific development and redevelopment goals to accomplish each period? Can such stated development and redevelopment goals be measurable? Also can feasible 'carrots and sticks' incentives be on the plan to ensure it is realized through a strong likelihood of implementation?</p>	Pg. 105	<p>An implementation guide for the area plan was made available on February 5, 2015. It includes time-frames for the various implementation actions. Although we are not able to predict timelines for private development, we do track development in the station areas.</p> <p>In terms of incentives, in addition to the light rail line itself, the City has a number of capital projects planned or underway to facilitate future development. These projects are included in the plan with anticipated timelines.</p> <p>Implementation Guide is not adopted by City Council and is updated periodically, as needed.</p>
16	<p>3 observations: 1) transit overlays won't solve problem, we must go TODs; 2) the time is now for corrective rezonings; Council shouldn't just preach pedestrian friendly, but act on it; Council should avoid free market temptations; 3) corrective rezonings can occur in the implementation of the plan.</p>	Transit Station Areas	<p>The Plan does not currently recommend corrective rezonings. We have been discussing zoning implementation strategies within the station areas with TAP and stakeholders and will recommend in the Implementation Plan that further evaluation be conducted to include the identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning.</p> <p>As a reminder, the implementation guide is not adopted by City Council.</p>
17	<p>We are blessed to be a part of the Camino Community Center with 4300 square feet. We serve people out of every zip code of the city and many are volunteers, one who is a patient of our clinic. She gets up early to take the bus to the</p>	n/a	No response necessary.

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	<p>center. We are excited about the plans. We believe this transportation will have us more connected. We want to give hope, not just help people. This is a positive benefit for University city. Pat Martinez has been talking about sidewalks. Thanks for your vision and leadership.</p>		
18	<p>UNCC is a major source of talent for this town. Those creative talents will shape our city. We support this plan and further improvements. TOD encourages urban style development, this is critical with linking businesses to the university. An urban approach is needed for development. There is a diversity of visitors, students, and staff at UNCC with unique demands for services, needs, and retail. Support the updates for the plan and the policy changes.</p>	Transit station areas	No response necessary.
19	<p>There are countless environmental and planning benefits with this plan. UCAP is one component of the transit and land use plan. Completion of each component is vital to achieving these goals. Charlotte will mitigate issues surrounding growth. Upward economic ability would be improved; Charlotte is currently last in this area. This will be an effective approach for jobs, housing, access to healthcare and</p>	n/a	No response necessary.

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	<p>educational facilities. This makes economic opportunity accessible to all. Outside uptown sits several impoverished communities. Support UCAP and the completion of the blue and gold lines. This city will be judged by how it treats its poorest citizens and how they live.</p>		
20	<p>We ask for adoption of the plan as it includes TOD that provides more opportunity to live and work along transit. This won't be easy. We need to fight for this area and TODs. Reject that gas stations and storage are appropriate for our area. Be willing to accept that this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest employment area in the city. Don't be willing to postpone this plan for out of town interests and legal threats. Adopt and embrace this plan not because it is easy, but because it is hard.</p>	Transit Station Areas	<p>The Plan does not currently recommend corrective rezonings. We have been discussing zoning implementation strategies within the station areas with TAP and stakeholders and will recommend in the Implementation Plan that further evaluation be conducted to include the identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning. As a reminder, the implementation guide is not adopted by City Council.</p>
21	<p>I am here to support this plan. I have lived here a little over 2 years. I am ashamed to admit that I only went to the university area for the first time this past weekend. We need easier ability to get here. This plan seems to match with the plans and vision of CRVA's. I suggest that with the \$21.4 million shortfall, we need to look at ways to attract more visitors. Business considers a lot more than just the non-discrimination ordinance.</p>	n/a	No response necessary.

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
22	<p>Speaking on behalf of Darlene Heater with University City Partners. We recommend adoption of the plan. It will serve as the urban core within University city and adjacent areas. It is important that the city execute strategies to allow the corridor to be a major corridor in the city. The development process for this plan has been extensive to bring the best plan forward. Development is increasing along the corridor. UCP suggests that you adopt the plan to guide development uses to support the vision. We are interested in supporting a transit center overlay. We request this work be done justly, transparently, and swiftly. Thank you for all you do to make Charlotte a memorable city.</p>	n/a	<p>The Plan does not currently recommend corrective rezonings. We have been discussing zoning implementation strategies within the station areas with TAP and stakeholders and will recommend in the Implementation Plan that further evaluation be conducted to include the identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning.</p> <p>As a reminder, the implementation guide is not adopted by City Council.</p>
23	<p>There is an amazing transformation taking place in the University area. There is not a safe pedestrian option to my classes. This is the best opportunity for reinvention and improvement in University city area. I support the plan's vision for the development of light rail. Ensure properties are zoned for TOD. This will leverage the city's investment. I would like to see a design for people with bike and walking connections. Connect the university. I want an</p>	Transit Station Areas	<p>The Plan does not currently recommend corrective rezonings. We have been discussing zoning implementation strategies within the station areas with TAP and stakeholders and will recommend in the Implementation Plan that further evaluation be conducted to include the identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning.</p> <p>As a reminder, the implementation guide is not adopted by City Council.</p>

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	alternative to driving to class.		
24	I was shocked to move to the University area. Living in a place physically disconnected was hard. I am studying urban design to build people-oriented places. I am now living in South End in Charlotte and working for Sustain Charlotte. They support TOD. We have a petition with 200 signatures supporting this plan. Align zoning with this plan. Rezone using corrective rezoning. TOD near transit stations ensures environmental sustainability. Support the plan and implementation of TOD [provided copy of petition].	Transit Station Areas	The Plan does not currently recommend corrective rezonings. We have been discussing zoning implementation strategies within the station areas with TAP and stakeholders and will recommend in the Implementation Plan that further evaluation be conducted to include the identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning. As a reminder, the implementation guide is not adopted by City Council.
25	I wanted to tell the story of a friend who moved from New York City. She just moved here in January. She doesn't know how to drive in this [University] area. When she moved, she wanted to move close to where she worked but she couldn't walk to work. She did not have access to sidewalks or shopping. She moved to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ward but catches an express bus. I want us to recruit more bright young people from big cities. I am proud to call this area home.	n/a	No response necessary.
26	I have read the plan and when I had questions, staff got back with me. The Mallard Pointe shopping	Pg. 56-58	We intend to provide proposed revisions to Transportation and Planning Committee at an upcoming meeting. These changes will likely address the concerns raised in relation to retail as an

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	<p>center is adjacent to UNCC. Part of our concern is the plan needs more clarity and flushing out to understand what the terms mean. We have seen new language inserted. What is the expectation for retail? A market study calls for a lot of retail space at the stations. The plan has a curious limitation on heights. We are concerned with utility of the Mallard Pointe site. In the implementation section, it is not clear. I am looking forward to TOD.</p>		<p>appropriate use and height guidance.</p> <p>Also see response for comment #2 above.</p>
27	<p>I am grateful to share our concerns with the area plan, although I am supportive of it and excited about the future. One concern: taking of the right of way. We have a 22-foot wall against the right of way now. We have to develop around it. There have been lots of chaos and construction pains but we and our tenants are excited. I have attended the planning meetings. We were surprised that a pause took place. The rollout was different. We are pleased with the recent changes that have been agreed to by staff. The definition of "primary" is of concern. The main concern is that our property will be bisected by roads: who will build and maintain them?</p>	Pg. 56-58	<p>We intend to provide proposed revisions to Transportation and Planning Committee at an upcoming meeting. These changes will likely address the concerns raised in relation to retail as an appropriate use.</p> <p>Also see response for comment #2 above.</p> <p>The identified street connections provide for vehicular and pedestrian movements (i.e. not just a drive aisle). It would be determined through the redevelopment process whether these would be public or private streets based on ordinances and land development regulations.</p>
28	<p>How do we transition from an old yet vibrant shopping center? This</p>	Pg. 56-58 and general Transit Station Areas	<p>The Plan does not currently recommend corrective rezonings. We have been discussing zoning implementation strategies within</p>

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	<p>needs to be carefully protected. If you don't do that, older uses will deteriorate. No one wants to see that in these areas. I have spent years with University City Partners. We have the most transformative event under way in the area right now. It is important that the transit station area core is protected. If not protected but we have new developments (have a useful life of 20+ years), the plan will be emasculated. This plan has come a long way with a high degree of specificity. Thanks for your time and the City's patience on all this.</p>		<p>the station areas with TAP and stakeholders and will recommend in the Implementation Plan that further evaluation be conducted to include the identification of candidate parcels and the implications of potential rezoning and requirements of current ordinances and regulations.</p> <p>As a reminder, the implementation guide is not adopted by City Council.</p>
29	<p>Speaking on behalf of the owners at the University Shoppes. The property was purchased with the intent to develop. Over the past years, we have worked with the City on a retail plan. We have concerns about the redevelopment vision. Bring it to fruition with practicality so we can meet our obligations as owners. Thanks for your time and hard work</p>	Pg. 56-58	No response necessary.
30	<p>Speaking as a South End resident and neighborhood leader. I am the ghost of TODs past! I have two homework assignments: Provide an idea of what you want to create is a walkable neighborhood. We are not there yet. Second</p>	Transit Station Areas	<p>The Planning Department has initiated the Zoning Ordinance Update and is currently reviewing the Transit Oriented Development zoning district.</p>

#	Public Comment	Location of Current Text, Map or Graphic	Staff Response
	<p>assignment is to dig up plans for the south end and read up on them and visit the neighborhood physically. Not much teeth to that previous plan. There is a still lot of work that needs to be done on that. I support this, but going forward, look at TOD. Make sure you get a chance to get things right the first time, it is difficult to get it right afterward.</p>		