

Second Draft Charlotte Future 2040 Policy Map Comments & Staff Responses

Date	Comment Source	Comment Summarized	Response/Resolution
1/10/2022	Email	<p>1. Old large healthy trees - thank you for the TCAP. I'd like to see in the TCAP a significant effort toward saving and maintaining Old Trees. It is very important that we all are aligned with the idea that replacing an old tree with a sapling is NOT an equal exchange for the health, beauty and welfare of our community. EVERY effort will need to be taken to build around Old Large healthy trees. Beyond probable death or destruction to an existing structure, there aren't that many reasons (beyond money) to cut down a 100+ year old tree. We all know planning and design can find effective ways to maintain the healthy existence of old large healthy trees in all the neighborhoods and commercial zones. We just have to be willing to do it. 2. Urban greenery - we know from seeing other cities that without a way to bring nature into our city effectively, the city life fails. People get sick from pollution, the area heats up more, the roads melt, flooding and other impacts occur because no-one planned green zones. We have a chance to do that and NOT repeat the mistakes of the other cities: Create porous roadways and walkways, :Promote and fund vertical gardens, :Promote vertical farming: like Ensure multi-floor outdoor garage units are designed to support vertical farming. (Those big cement garages that have multi levels for parking outside could be designed and insured for planting boxes on the outside of their building and people/organizations could plant food in them. All the condos have permits to allow for vertical gardens on their buildings and roof tops. Commercial roofs built to support gardens - allowing them to rent the roof to other businesses, like restaurants, or farmers markets to grow food, flowers or just a really good park. 3. Build downtown out to have a walkabout nightlife. Let's not be downtown Atlanta. Encourage and promote housing in the downtown area, ensure the first floor of office buildings have a business that can thrive after the office workers go home to the suburbs. 4. Connect all the greenways without requiring people to walk/ride along busy road or bridges to get to the next leg of the greenway. 5. Allow businesses to open along a greenway if there is space for it. 6. Prohibit businesses in our city from using plastic that CANNOT be recycled by our PRESENT recycling capabilities. If the plastic package cannot be recycled in Charlotte, then the businesses need to use something that can or is bio degradable. 7. Promote a bottle return policy for our city. It not only promotes recycling but it also provides money options for people.</p>	Comments shared with UDO Team and Streets Map Team.
1/21/2022	Email	<p>After reviewing the Charlotte Future 2040 Policy Map Second Draft showing the properties located at 5200 and 5240 Park Road designated as "Campus", I want to say that I think this is wrong and should be designated as "Community Activity Center".</p> <p>My thoughts are: One, the Park Road corridor next to 5200 and 5240 is designated as "Community Activity Center". Some of these neighboring properties are offices, some are retail stores, and others are multifamily/retail/offices. 5200 Park Road is an office building that has a mix of professional users. 5240 is a veterinary clinic.</p> <p>Two, when I looked at other "Campus" designations in the area, I found that most were schools, hospital complexes and places such as Queen's University and the YWCA.</p> <p>I hope that you will change the properties at 5200 and 5240 Park Road to Community Activity Center in keeping with its neighbors. Your hard work in developing a plan for our city is certainly very appreciated.</p>	This has been reviewed and addressed on the Policy Map.
1/25/2022	Listening Session	Question of whether his place type can legally be made N1 instead of N2, he wants his property to be in lower zone of N2 rather than higher zoning in N1. He wants to know whether it's legal. Zoning will be based on place type map, he respects that it's a separate process, but he sees them as connected, and he wants to make sure as a landowner that it doesn't take away his rights. IS there a process down the line for landowners to adjust mapping if needed?	There will be a process in place for any amendments needed to the Policy Map. In addition, the area planning process will further refine the Policy Map.
1/25/2022	Listening Session	1425 Academy Street - he believes this parcel needs to be N2, it's within a 10 min walk to Noda/Blue Line Station. Also 4251 The Plaza, he thinks it should be N2.	No change - current Place Type is appropriate for the area.
1/25/2022	Listening Session	Streets Map related - Circumferential Rd - question of whether it's needed. He says there's already many roads there and not sure if necessary to add this.	This comment has been shared with the Streets Map Team.
1/25/2022	Listening Session	UDO related - questions about the building materials restrictions in UDO, 4.3	This comment has been shared with the UDO Team.
1/25/2022	Email	<p>I have a question regarding how the current given place designation, reflected in the second draft map, of a property was determined. The properties in question are 5200, 5208, and 5240 Park Rd.</p> <p>According to the 3-step process in the comprehensive plan for the policy map there are several inputs taken into consideration for the place designation of a property. The current place type, Campus, does not match the existing place type. Nor does the Campus place type reflect any of the city's existing adopted policies and/or entitlements. Then when the comprehensive plan policies like equitable growth framework, implementation strategy, udo, goals and objectives metrics, and place type manual are taken into account it becomes very clear that Campus place designation is not inline with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. In fact there are areas in the policies that conflict with this designation. Also public comment and survey responses from the first draft map seem to have been ignored.</p> <p>So, the BIG question is, how did these properties get designated with the place type Campus?</p>	This has been reviewed and addressed on the Policy Map.
1/25/2022	Listening Session	<p>[Already put most of his comments on 2nd Draft Map.]</p> <p>Concerns about the handful of Campus place type designations Uptown. These do not seem to fit in urban/Uptown locations</p> <p>What Place Types are going to support TOD zoning in the future? Does the Policy Map support the department's recent realignment efforts?</p>	Comments entered into the Policy Map comment application.
1/26/2022	Listening Session	<p>How will this mapping even the playing field for the East Side which has traditionally held a lot of the N1 place type?</p> <p>As a resident of the East Side, how will I see my life improve as a result of this effort?</p> <p>As a resident of the East Side, what pain points can I expect?</p>	Staff provided information on population and jobs growth predictions related to this question.
1/26/2022	Listening Session	Worried that we are putting development pressures on historic districts which conflicts with purpose of the Historic Districts. Would like to have some transition changes considered around the East BLVD area which have been noted on the map.	The Policy Map does not absolve the Historic District designation.
1/26/2022	Listening Session	<p>In relation to both the UDO, Policy Map, and the Comp Plan Implementation elements: Struggled with what these changes look like in the sense of what it was versus what is being suggested. Being just a lay person and not being in this every day it is difficult to tell how the changes are really going to affect the area when you do not have the past context.</p> <p>Had a question about the Community Benefits committee and if that had been set or if there was the opportunity for Habitat to be involved.</p>	Staff provided information on Place Type descriptions and Community Benefits related to this question.

1/26/2022	Listening Session		Comments were entered onto the 2nd Draft Policy Map - Generally the same comments from the Dilworth Group	Comments entered into the Policy Map comment application.
1/26/2022	Listening Session		Comments were entered onto the 2nd Draft Policy Map. Landowners were concerned that their land off of Moores Chapel Rd / Performance Rd was shown as ML in 1st Draft but N1 in second draft. They think the industrial nature of the area is more suited to be coded as ML.	Comments entered into the Policy Map comment application.
1/26/2022	Listening Session		is concerned about developers going into neighborhoods, buying houses and renting them out. Concerned about neighborhood displacement. Interested in serving on anti-displacement committee	Follow up email with resources and how to get involved was sent.
1/27/2022	Listening Session		In the zoning, with the UDO, there are some contentious issues, first of all being boarding houses with student occupation. Question: Who is objecting to the boarding house issue and how does that affect my neighborhood? Concerns about superstreet developments, NC49. There is a missing street to the UNCC campus from 29. Not terribly excited about how Commercial is being used, and am not seeing much difference in the strip developments that we have now and what we are proposing on the map and in the language. Ex. commercial area in university city area.	Follow up email with resources was sent.
1/27/2022	Listening Session		How is the Policy Map different from the UDO? In terms of neighborhoods, how is this going to impact density and development in existing areas? What is an example of an incentive that would be offered to a developer? See 2 things happening: Developers coming in and buying a SF home and putting 2 homes on the parcel...second is people using larger parcels to put townhomes and sometimes these are put in areas that it seems like a much higher density than the SF homes around it? How is the plan helping to address this? How does open space play into this and the environmental considerations? Also how is mobility considered? General questions about Community Benefits. For waste management and recycling: how is that being addressed or is it addressed at all? Land Use: for existing industrial, is there a way to transition those spaces to working spaces?	All questions addressed at the Listening Session.
1/27/2022	Listening Session		How did we get to Campus Place Type at the Selwyn/Park Rd intersection? It is currently an office park. Vet and medical uses on the site, as well. General curiosity about the campus place type methodology. Would like to be consistent with adjacent CAC designation. (Looks like they've already provided comments on the draft map) After reading through the UDO, Manuals and Metrics, Place Type palette, etc., doesn't think these uses don't seem to qualify as campus Some of their tenants are concerned that they will end up getting redeveloped. What does our team suggest as a response for those concerns?	Changed to CAC.
1/27/2022	Listening Session		Does not see the fit at the at the Selwyn/Park Rd intersection when comparing their site to surrounding campus designations When will our team revise the map again before going to Council?	Provided schedule information.
1/27/2022	Listening Session		Owens an apartment complex that is improperly labeled as N1 (4125 Napa Oak Drive). It has gone through the rezoning process and already built. Should be N2 (comment added to map). Why are we not looking and making logical assumptions in areas where trends are clearly trending (rezonings)? Rea Rd, North of Old Course drive – this should be absorbed or more consistent with the center to the North. It is the last piece of Piper Glenn (He already made a comment on the map)	Comment captured on the Policy Map.
1/27/2022	Listening Session		Intersection of Sunnyside Ave and Hawthorne Lane - Elizabeth would like to see this area remain consistent with the N1 (going back west of Hawthorne) and N2 (along Hawthorne) designations from the adopted pedscape plan Independence Park area at Clement/Lamar - Neighborhood was envisioning N2 in this area, not NAC. Concerns about the campus place type designation in the single family near Greenway Ave. Seemed to have lost some of the transition areas between other place types and N1 in this draft of the map - Along independence park, Along Elizabeth... 7th street toward 5th street down loral - N1 now and they "asked" for N2 Memorial Stadium - Should e parks and preserves because it was traditionally part of independence park Elizabeth Ave - Needs to be NAC instead of Campus When are we going to talk about the potential impact of TOD on Elizabeth? They don't want to waste their time if TOD redistricting is going to come in one day and change everything.	This has been reviewed and addressed as appropriate on the Policy Map.

2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		In response to transitioning some N1 to N2 near TOD, Dan said it was a good move, but the % of N1 dropped, and wants to know how to get more N2. He said it won't be east but we need less SF in favor of higher density.	Thank you for your comment.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		Need to look at rezoning at Alexander and Rea Rd, 44 townhouses currently shown as N1.	Spatial comment made on online map
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		Charles Lee asked about difference between Campus and CAC.	Staff responded that it's typical but not always one owner, or like uses. Could be medical type uses, etc. Ideally we'd have more mixed use places than just single use.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		Glad that airport noise is considered with N1 revisions.	Thank you for your comment.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		Is it true that CAC includes 5-7 story mixed use buildings? Bc it's denser than commercial center now – eg. Arboretum.	Yes CAC type envisioned as 5-7 stories
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		How do we pull off 5 min neighborhoods access to goods and services in neighborhoods that like isolation from commercial uses. a lot of people in our feedback said they wanted neighborhood centers v commercial. 2 nd was that there may be something nearby but not accessible, so looking to improve access as well.	Thank you for your comment.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		PT is very aspirational. Will this development occur in near future or when UDO process?	Depends on private development, market, etc. but it's expected growth.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		When changes are made to map, are these decisions and supporting info being documented.	Yes this will be included with final map. Also discussions in recent council that there will be opps in future to update map moving forward, through community area planning or rezonings, etc.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		Is there an opportunity to have more grocery stores?	Staff looked at that in access to goods and services, so where possible, we mapped it to allow policy that would support that.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		How can we add more space for parks and greenways?	Parks and Preserve aligns with existing and future parks and greenways. The county was looking at opps through Playbook, but as Elly mentioned the city is built out, so green spaces should be considered as part of place types in the future to get more.
2/1/2022	12pm Community Conversations		Questions about the fiscal impact analysis.	Please visit cltfuture2040.com for all resources.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		The increased housing density near light rail stations was only changed for built stations and not planned, correct? Were there any thoughts about doing this around other areas to help create the 10 min. neighborhoods that were not currently near transit?	Correct.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		There are many areas that have been surrounded with planned M&L in Draft 2 despite the outcries from our community. This is the opposite direction of prior Community Feedback that we gave. Wanting more TOD and Activity Centers around Wilkinson and in the Far NW region. In particular, along Wilkinson, Moores Chapel Rd, and Sam Wilson Rd - there is a ton of N1, great. But you added M&L right next to all of that with virtually nothing else. Already, we are a food desert. We MUST have some more activity centers, or at a minimum, innovation, to bring the type of development that will serve the community.	Thank you for your comments. The Place Types are consistent with the airport master plans.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		I noticed that areas that were Commercial in the first draft of the policy map have changed, which is excellent, but some of those segments when to N1 or ML. Those didn't fit, and neighborhood centers make more sense. Also, I noticed areas that were N2 in the first draft have now moved to N1 and are located on major corridors.	Preserving existing N1 due to comments from community.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		Why isn't there anything around the airport? Can we have a vision of maybe something like the 7th street station in uptown. Folks flying in Charlotte are definitely not impressed with the area near the airport. NO restaurants gas hotels.	We can't have full mixed use due to noise overlay. The airport masterplan envisions a mixture of uses. Unfortunately, the noise contours limit uses.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		Would there be consideration of adding live/work space IMU to certain areas. For example artist studios that also have space for residential quarters? Or first floor retail with upper floor residential?	Yes, IMU does envision that.

2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		Dilworth concern w Historic District and PT map.	Thank you for your comments. The Policy Map does not absolve the Historic District.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		Summit & Mint makes no sense for M&L as well. This flies in the face of the 'gold district'.	Changed to NAC.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		Whitewater is amazing in the shadows of industrial.	Thank you for your comment.
2/1/2022	6p Community Conversation		I will say thank you for removing one M&L from north of Heavy Equipment Rd on Draft 1 and reverting back to a much more appropriate R1. That was a HUGE improvement. Thank you!!	Thank you for your comment.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area A - Sunnyside Ave - CAC to N1 and N2	Changed from CAC to N1 and N2
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area B - St Johns, Kings College, Park Drive change to N2	No change - current Place Type does not preclude N2 development from occurring.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area C - Charlottetowne/Elizabeth Ave change from Campus to N2	No change - current Place Type is appropriate for the area.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area D + F - 7th Street and Ridgeway Ave change from NAC to N2	No change - current Place Type does not preclude N2 development from occurring.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area E - Durham Rd and Randolph area. Change from Campus to N2	No change - current zoning and form is appropriate for the area and in this Place Type.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area G - 7th Street and Living Way area change from NAC to N2, and N2 to N1	No change - current PT does not preclude N2 development from occurring. Also, current development and form is appropriate for the area.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area H - Memorial Stadium Complex change from Campus to Parks & Preserve	Changed from Campus to Place Type - use is appropriate in this Place Type.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area I - Medical development including nursing home south of Emerson Ave change N2 to Campus	Changed with methodology adjustment.
1.27.22	Listening Session	Elizabeth (20)	Area J - 7th Street and Weddington area change from IMU to N2, and Campus to N2	Changed to IMU - use and current form in relation to surrounding area is appropriate in this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	300 block E. Park Ave. odd number addresses should be N1 vs N2	Changed to N1 - use and character is appropriate in this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	300 block Rensselaer should be N1 vs N2	Changed to N1 - use and character is appropriate in this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	300 block E. Worthington odd number addresses should be N1 vs NC	Changed to N1 - use and character is appropriate in this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	1606 – 1618 and 1611 Fountain View should be N1 vs Campus (Loop Rd. must be the border for Campus)	Changed to N1 - use is appropriate in this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	Kenilworth and Buchanan area change to N2	Changed to N2 - use and location is appropriate for this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	2200 block of Park Rd change from N2 to N1	Changed to NAC - use and location is appropriate for this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	2000-2099 Euclid should all be N2 vs NC	Changed to N2 - use and character is appropriate in this Place Type.
2.1.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	600, 700 and 800 blocks of E Morehead should be NC vs RAC for transition to N1	No change - current zoning and form is appropriate for the area and Place Type.
2.7.22	Email		Parcel ID 115-102-01 & 115-102-03 Both properties are currently zoned I-2 however the Draft CLT 2040 Policy Map notes these "Commercial". What is the process to make sure the final 2040 Policy Map better reflects the current zoning which I believe would correspond with the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type.	Resolved - Both parcels are designated M&L on the Policy Map.
2.3.22	Email	Elizabeth	This area has many residences that want to continue as residences so leaving it N1 or N2 rather than changing it to a purple designation!	Thank you for your comments.
2.3.23	Email		The Second Draft of the Charlotte Future 2040 Policy Map identifies parcels 02965107, 02911106, 02911103, 0921104, 02903113 and 02965109 as Place Type 'Neighborhood 1'. For the reasons outlined below, we urge the Charlotte Future Team to reevaluate these parcels and classify them as Place Type 'Neighborhood 2'. A Tribute Companies affiliate owns parcels 02965107, 02911106, 02911103, and 0921104. Carey and Curtis Elam own parcels 02903113 and 02965109 and have authorized us to write on their behalf. Parcels 02965107, 02911106, 02911103, 0921104, and 02965109 are currently vacant land. Due to the parcels highly close proximity to major highways I-85, I-485 and Hwy 29, this land is more suitable for a higher-density residential use classification. In addition, a Neighborhood 2 Place Type classification is supported by the City's approval of much of the adjacent land for higher density (R-12MF, R-17MF, MUDD-0). Neighborhood 2 place types also include civic uses such as schools, and this land is being discussed as a potential site for an elementary school. Finally, having this land classified as Place Type Neighborhood 2 should not cause an issue to some of the adjacent land that is a single-family neighborhood, because Place Type Neighborhood 2 is intended to serve as a transition between lower-density development and high-intensity uses. Also please note that the parcel 02911104 is R-12MF (CD) and should be classified as Neighborhood 2. The map shows it as Neighborhood 1.	Thank you for your comments.
2.5.22	Email		Please be sure all areas of Sunnyside are residential, the lots of Park Dr. facing Independence Park are residential, and Memorial Stadium is kept at the lowest possible designation. These areas are all part of the National Historic Register and need to be honored and preserved!	Changed from CAC to N1 and N2
2.1.22	Email		*Speed and haste of process: Mapping conversion appears still imperfect. Public does not seem to understand the elimination of density and impact to their surroundings based on public comments. *Development "by right" in Neighborhood 1, described in Zoning Districts N1-A through N1-F, and specifically density in a particular Zoning District and the parcels included in that Zoning District. No guardrails on density according to unique parameters of lots. Not one size fits all. *Misleading nomenclature between "structures" and "units" and the corresponding density. Don't believe the public understands this. *Density governance by lot size alone is not adequate to allow for infrastructure considerations.	Comments shared with UDO Team.

2.7.22	Email	Dilworth (30)	<p>I wish to stand with my neighborhood organization, the Dilworth Community Association, concerning the map. in the early 1980's Dilworth led Charlotte with a Small Area Plan to preserve residential housing stock, historic structures, and integrity of the neighborhood by correcting the zoning. The DCA Land Use Committee correctly identifies seven areas which have survived for four decades but are threatened by the 2040 process. Please heed the specific guidance from the DCA Land Use Committee. Their work has been careful, measured, thoughtful; their recommendations are precise and correct.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
2.7.22	Email		<p>As a 40-year residential and commercial property owner in Dilworth, I'm writing to include my opinion for the Charlotte Future 2040 Policy draft. My influential neighborhood association (DCA) issued several email campaigns to solicit challenges to what they deem as errors in seven perimeter areas. Most are logical and cite valid issues with the current policy draft. However, there is one one DCA-cited error that addresses ten office-zoned parcels at 2201-2237 Park Rd. In preface, this hectic, high-traffic truck/commuter corridor was rezoned from R6 to office in the 1980s and bound within the Dilworth historic district at the same time. The large Food Lion neighborhood center across the curb has dictated nearby land use and aesthetic ever since. Indeed, recent commercial build-out within that center has been robust and positive. On our side of the curb, many properties have languished for years, with all but two converting to small office. Most owners are absentee and several highly visible, blighted properties have stained the block for decades, diminishing our historic district gateway. Although many are historic (1920-1935), most structures have been badly scarred by pre-HDC remodels, including paved front yard parking, front porch mutilations, railroad tie retaining walls, casement windows, improper additions, etc.. DCA cites the city's draft designation of N2 here as an error, urging residents to rally and comment for N1. As a multi-unit office property owner, the notion of designating this NC-adjacent block for future 1-2 story single family residential is nonsensical. Highest and best use is clearly commercial, and handcuffing owners with illogical down-zoning guarantees that our curb will remain stagnant (there's no reasonable ROI for new investment as small-parcel residential). DCA conceded to me recently that N2 is reasonable and that they struggled with citing the planned N2 designation as an error. They agree that the historic district overlay assures scrutiny of mass/scale concerns that nearby residents may have with future development. I can tell you first hand that HDC is routinely rigid here in their approval prescriptions. In summary, my neighbors and I assert that the Planning Commission has this area designated correctly at N2. Because my neighborhood association has been working with city leaders closely on the policy, I'm copying relevant City Council members on this comment. I've always been grateful to have DCA protecting improper encroachment, but their opinion is clearly flawed on the Park Rd subject area. They indicated that it was too late to retract Park Rd from their analysis and encouraged me as a property owner to contact you. I rushed to contact a few neighbors to do the same late last week. However, we remain concerned that the DCA campaign's error has distorted the aggregate feedback for this map area. Please keep property owners in mind as you finalize the policy and visit the block to understand the unique burden on these parcels. The city decided this was a commercial corridor 40 years ago and undoing that now would be an illogical, inequitable result for every stakeholder.</p>	Changed to NAC - use and location is appropriate for this Place Type.
2.8.22	Email		<p>We are the owners of 1913 Cleveland Avenue in Dilworth. We are concerned that a small group of Dilworth neighbors associated with the DCA (not an elected Board) is putting inappropriate pressure on the County to change the zoning of our property, others surrounding it, and others on the edge of Dilworth. I've attached a recent bulletin the DCA sent out to neighbors instructing them exactly what to say when reporting "issues" with the maps. Our property was rezoned to TOD-NC and in the second draft of your map has now been changed from Regional Activity Center to Neighborhood 2. This seems to be downzoning compared to TOD-NC in terms of setbacks, property uses, and several other development criteria. We spent over a year going through the HDC process last year for an apartment building and were approved in December 2021. It appears what you are now labeling us would not allow that building to be built if we aren't able to get it permitted prior to this going in place. In addition to our property, we are concerned about the downgrading of adjacent properties to Neighborhood 1 from Neighborhood 2. The first three parcels in the 300 block of E Worthington (300, 304, 308) are either vacant land (300) or commercial properties (304, 308) that are not on the historic register for Dilworth. Comments made in your last round were inaccurate about these parcels being historic properties. Charlotte is a growing City, and all neighborhoods should grow with it. Dilworth should not be exempt. We would appreciate you taking another look at our property and its surroundings and consider going back to the designations from Round 1 Maps.</p>	Use and location is appropriate for this Place Type.
2.8.22	Library Comment Form		<p>My name is Teawan Gausi and I am a resident in the northeast Charlotte area near the University of North Carolina at Charlotte campus. My comment is to express concern for the recent congestion that has split our community area as a result of previously drawn maps. The congestion of Uptown Charlotte due to recent construction has seen an influx of residents to move to outer surrounding areas. Furthermore, the recent influx of residents from outside states has resulted in the recent outpricing of houses that is unaffordable for many looking for new homes. The current drawing of maps has split areas that have similar interests apart. For this commenting period I would like to see northeast inner middle and outer, northeast inner, north middle and outer, and north inner drawn together. Thanks for taking the time to review my comment.</p>	Thank you for your comment.