

# Steele Creek Draft Area Plan

## Public Comments

May 5, 2011 (updated for June 30, 2011 meeting)

Below is a draft summary of public comments and staff's preliminary response to comments.

Text in yellow indicates that a change made consistent with public comment received.

Text in black indicates outstanding issues.

Text in blue indicates comments added after the May 5<sup>th</sup> CAG meeting (see pages 16 – 18).

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
<b>Executive Summary</b>				
1.	Page ii: Vision Statement	Based on discussion at November CAG meeting, the first bullet should read "Protecting the Catawba River <u>access</u> , McDowell Nature Center and Preserve, natural features and historic places."	<p>The meeting agendas and meeting highlights do not indicate that the vision was discussed at the November 19, 2009 CAG Meeting. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools and the market analysis were discussed at this meeting. Staff presented two draft vision statements to the CAG for their consideration at the September 3, 2009 meeting and gave participants the option to review and edit the vision statements as they choose or develop a completely vision statement. Those present selected the vision statement below and requested that it be revised to include a statement about quality schools. Staff presented the revised visioning confirming this change at the following CAG meeting on September 17.</p> <p>Staff thinks that "protecting the Catawba River" includes <u>access</u> to the river.</p> <p><b>Draft Vision Statement presented at September 3, 2009 CAG Meeting</b></p> <p>The vision for the Steele Creek area is to create a unique and sustainable community that is a great place to live, work, and recreate, while preserving the community's character by incorporating natural and historic features into new development. The community will implement this vision through the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protecting the Catawba River <u>and its access</u>, McDowell Nature Preserve, natural features, and historic places;</li> <li>• Providing a balanced mixture of land uses with enhanced public facilities;</li> <li>• Developing a safe, accessible and efficient transportation system for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists;</li> <li>• Encouraging community design that recognizes the natural environment; and</li> <li>• Creating an interconnected network of parks, greenways and open space amenities.</li> </ul>	Change
2.	Page iii Activity Centers.	Add: as well as employment serving retail uses in <u>strategic locations</u> after "While this area is developed with over 20 million square feet of industrial development, additional industrial development is appropriate for the area," it is correct on page 19 of the Concept Plan.	The Executive Summary provides a summary of some of the key points in the Concept Plan. The Concept Plan should be referenced for more detail information. However, staff will revise text to reflect this comment.	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
<b>Part 1: Concept Plan</b>				
3.	Page iii Community Design and Concept Plan Page 23	Reword to read "Encourage sustainable development that promotes accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists while integrating green amenities and protecting environmentally sensitive features."	Modify plan to reflect this change.	Change
4.		<p>Misused references to South Tryon and York Road throughout the document. This road name has historical significance and is important to the Area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page iii. The last bullet refers to both roads so it should be S. Tryon/York Rd</li> <li>Page 12 bottom of 2<sup>nd</sup> column should read S. Tryon St /York Rd</li> <li>Page 15 at 4b and 6g: these are both York Rd (not S. Tryon) since its at the river and Youngblood</li> <li>Page 24 – It’s York at Shopton &amp; York at Palisades</li> <li>Page 26 and 36: Do you mean no curb cuts on York Rd also?</li> <li>Page 41 the water line is in York Rd</li> <li>Page 44 fire station is on York Rd</li> </ol>	<p>All references to York Road as South Tryon St. throughout the plan will be reviewed and corrected. CDOT staff has reviewed the policy of changing the street name upon annexation. This will not change. Staff recommends installing signs along S. Tryon St. recognizing the significance of the York Road name and General Cornwallis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 24 – It’s York at Shopton (this reference to S.Tryon is correct)&amp; York at Palisades</li> <li>Page 26 and 36: Do you mean no curb cuts on York Rd also? Is this in reference to policy 26? References in this paragraph to S. Tryon St. will also reference York Road.</li> <li>Page 41 the water line is in York Rd (this reference to S.Tryon is correct)</li> <li>Page 44 fire station is on York Rd (this reference to S.Tryon is correct)</li> </ol>	Change
5.	Page 16	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph of Activity Center Steelecroft Shopping is on the northwest (not northeast) corner of Steele Creek Rd and York Rd	Text will be modified.	Change
6.	Page 15 Wedge Area	The map and text do not call out the 19 acre Kennel Club on Choate Circle. This conditional use is likely to be redeveloped and if not developed as R-3 (adjacent to an apartment complex) what is the appropriate use?	The property is zoned R-3 with a Special Use Permit. The draft plan recommends residential up to four dwelling units per acre for the property. The adjacent multi-family is not oriented toward Choate Circle but South Tryon Street. Also, the site is located within the Wedge area. Changing this land use recommendation was not discussed during the planning process. Staff does not support or recommend this change.	May 5 <sup>th</sup> Meeting - No change -.

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
7.	Page 15 Wedge Area 6a and 8	The additional square footage retail added is only 150,000 sq ft. This is not enough to meet the demands called out in the market study. Logical places to add it (not in activity centers) would be in 6a Palisades Center, and a corner of the Bartlett Tree property (#8) if redeveloped.	In response to an inquiry about a plan amendment during the planning process, staff reviewed this site and recommended the additional 100,000 square feet of retail. Further intensifying the square footage at this location was not discussed during the planning process. Also, changing the land use recommendation for the Bartlett Tree Farm was not discussed. The plan recognizes this institutional use which also provides the opportunity for preserving a significant environmental feature. <b>Staff does not support or recommend this change.</b>	No change
8.	Pages 16 and 17 RiverGate Mixed Use Activity Center	<p>Odd that you would assume a redevelopment here – at this mixed use center - but not elsewhere.</p> <p>Top of page 17: As the center is currently very biker, walker, and car friendly this sentence makes no sense: “Street connections within the center should reduce block sizes and provide interconnectivity for not only automobile drivers but transit riders, cyclists and pedestrians.” Was it copied from another document?</p> <p>At the top of the 2<sup>nd</sup> column you say ‘developed’ not ‘redeveloped’ so there is a disconnect. Please revisit the whole intro to better align with the future intensification you are suggesting. I also note that the description in 10(g) does a better job and this whole intro could be eliminated.</p>	<p>The Plan recognizes that all of the Activity Centers could Intensify over time with infill development. As new streets are built to accommodate the increase in land use intensity, streets will be with shorter block lengths to improve walkability, connectivity, and to accommodate all users – pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and motorists.</p>	No change.
9.	Page 17 Graphic 1	Do not delete parcels that front Steele Creek Rd on the north end of the Activity Center boundary up to Sledge Rd. These parcels are appropriate for non-residential and higher density residential because of their depth, traffic counts and proximity to the school and library. Also, the two parcels on the south end of the boundary fronting Steele Creek, at their widest point are 500 feet deep and should be office or non-residential.	The land use recommendation for these parcels was always shown as residential up to four dwelling units per acre, throughout the planning process. The parcels are oriented toward the existing residential development and better relate to the Wedge.	No change
10.	10c	Why limit building height here? The area is surrounded by non-residential uses, taller offices are appropriate near hospital.	In general, this area is recommended for office development and located on the edge of the Activity Center. In addition, consideration was given to the amount and intensity of office development throughout the plan area.	No change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
11.	10d	Parking is not appropriate in Steele Creek. That sentence should be removed.	The reference in the plan is to “on-street parking” which is considered appropriate if the area develops with a mixture of uses and buildings that front the street as recommended in the plan. This reference will be clarified in the document to add “along internal streets”.	Change
12.	10e	Without extending the RiverGate Activity Center boundaries, the suggestion for structured parking wrapped with active uses is too dense for the edge of an activity center. The site is zoned for multi-family. If not multi-family, then office or retail is appropriate.	The land use recommendation is for residential, office and retail land uses, if this area does not develop with residential and office land uses as zoned. within the existing zoning. As the development in the Activity Center intensifies over time, structured parking may be needed, especially to free up space for infill development.	No change
13.	10f	Adding the parcel located on the southerly side of Walker Branch Greenway into RiverGate by parcel lines is gerrymandered. The Activity Center Boundary should match the proposed future road network.	The land use recommendation for residential up to eight dua matches the parcel lines. This property was included in the Center because of its orientation toward the greenway and the mixed use development. Typically, property that is not recommended for single family is included within Centers.	No change
14.	10f	With a corrected boundary line, the portion of the parcel fronting the creek is appropriate for continued non-residential uses. This would tie the two sides of the Activity Center together.	Residential land uses are appropriate along the greenway with higher density oriented toward the RiverGate Shopping Center transitioning to lower density near the Wedge area.	No change
15.	10h	Extending the mixed use to the ‘finger’ of this parcel (only 90 ft wide) is odd. That ‘finger’ should stay MF as is the adjacent tract.	The land use recommendation is for the entire parcel, the “finger” is a part of the larger parcel that is recommended for mixed use.	No change
16.	10i	Because of parcel depth, proximity to retail, school and library everything south of Huntington Meadow Ln is appropriate for the Activity Center.	The land use recommendation for this area was residential up to four dwelling units per acre throughout the planning process. Therefore, the plan recommends that these parcels be included in the Wedge area.	No change
17.	10j	The Steele Creek Athletic Association fields could redevelop. Alternative Activity Center uses should be listed.	The conditional rezoning approved for this site recognizes the ball fields. Therefore, the draft plan recommends park/open space land uses for the site.	No change
18.	Page 21 Whitehall / Ayrley Mixed Use Center	Between 12 (d) and (f), a parcel zoned MUDD is colored for residential. If not developed for residential, this is a good location for employment or retail.	The subject property is zoned R-17MF(CD) and considerate appropriate for multi-family development. A portion of the property on the east side of W. Arrowood Road is developed with multi-family residential land uses.	No change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
19.	Page 22 Graphic 4	Shopton Rd Graphic #4 shows the parcels on Steele Creek south of I-485 as mixed use. The parcel shapes are incorrect from the stakeholder meetings. The neighborhood at the freeway is deed restricted for residential and was not included in the Activity Center. The mixed use designation should follow the proposed road plan not the parcel lines.	Although property owners are legally required to adhere to deed restrictions, when developing this land use recommendation, consideration was given to the Berewick Center which is proposed to be located across the street from this property.	Discuss with CAG
20.	Page 24	Residential Design Guidelines - The bullets on single family for 14A and B are not in the Council approved General Development Policies (GDP's). These GDP's apply to multi-family only. I do not support the application of these standards in excess of what Council previously approved.	Very similar policies were adopted by City Council in 2003 as part of the GDP, however, 14B (blank walls) only applied to multi-family development. Design policies in area plans build on what is included in the GDP to best address the issues and concerns for the specific area that the plan covers. Staff believes that both policies are appropriate for the Steele Creek area to help ensure quality design. However, this will apply to multi-family only.	Change
21.	14e	14e is poorly worded staff goal – never articulated by stakeholders – we said a variety of types of houses. Floor plans, exterior materials, massing and roof forms are not variety in TYPES. Residential design standards are not approved by Council and are not appropriate for this document. If approved and upheld by the courts, then all will be subject to them regardless of the insertion buried in this document and never discussed with stakeholders. To require porches, garages placement and massing changes would make new development stand out inappropriately from existing development. Our goal is for harmony not contrast.	The community design policies provide guidance for future development. Design policies are a standard part of all our area plans and are intended to help address the issues and concerns that were discussed during the planning process. However, staff will delete text in parentheses.	Change
22.	14F, 14G, 14H	Remove – Residential design standards are not approved by Council and are not appropriate for this document. If approved and upheld by the courts, then all will be subject to them regardless of the insertion buried in this document and never discussed with stakeholders.	The community design policies provide guidance for future development. Design policies are a standard part of all our area plans and are intended to help address the issues and concerns discussed during the planning process. However, staff will delete 14F, 14G, and 14H.	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
23.	Page 25 15A	Residential Natural Environment: The Council approved GDP's does not require single family open space to be common. Remove the last sentence of 15A.	The community design policies provide guidance for future development. Design policies are a standard part of all our area plans and are intended to help address the issues and concerns that were brought up during the planning process. However, staff will reconsider and modify text	No change
24.	15D	15D would be better worded to say 'comply with Tree Ordinance' – as it is subject to change.	Staff agrees with this change.	Change
25.	15I	Policy 15I is nonsensical. The open space is the transition. You can't transition from open space to built environment. What would that be – pervious houses?	Staff agrees with removing text.	Change
26.	15K	Policy 15K was never discussed and is currently not defined – thus the policy can never be met. Items A through H define the goal making K unnecessary	Staff agrees with removing text.	Change
27.	Page 26 16G, 16J	Residential Pedestrian and Vehicular network: 16(g) and (j) do not match verbiage in USDG's. USDG will rule so these two need correction or elimination.	Planning and CDOT staff will review and update this policy.	Change
28.	16M	16M is covered in Tree Ordinance in better detail and wording appears to be tree related not pedestrian related. This should be removed.	Staff will remove this text from document.	Change
29.	Page 26	The pictures from Baxter in Fort Mill are not representative of our built-environment. Please use appropriate pictures.	These pictures are not from Baxter and are intended to illustrate certain design features. However, staff is willing to consider any pictures that you would like to suggest.	Change
30.	Page 28 17K	What is the purpose of 17k – the requirement to distinguish the first floor from the upper floor? What people don't know which is the first floor? 17k needs to be eliminated.	Staff thinks this architectural design feature is worth noting in the plan	No change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
31.	Page 29 18C , 18G	How does the Policy document “Encourage” green roofs/ the group never discussed this and there are more global issues that affect the implementation of those roof structures. You should eliminate this very specific item and reword 18C ) to say to minimize impervious area.	The design policies provide options that may be considered when developing in the plan area. Green roofs are not a requirement.	Discuss with CAG
32.	Page 30 19A-E	Non residential Pedestrian and Vehicular network: Items 19A-E are the generic way of saying use the USDG’s – except that now that the USDG’s are Council approved this wording is not entirely correct. One sentence about conformity would be sufficient.	Planning and CDOT staff will review and update this policy.	No change
33.	19F	19F should include the phrase ‘where appropriate’ as outdoor dining (for example) is not appropriate in industrial.	Staff supports this change.	Change
34.	19K	19K should also say ‘where appropriate.’ Seating on the rear of building is a safety issue.	Staff supports this change.	Change
35.	19H	How do you make a ‘secure’ transit stop. Safe yes, but secure?	Staff supports this change.	Change
36.	19Q and 19R	19Q and R are the same thing.	Staff will combine 19Q and R.	Change
37.		There are only 2 small non-residential areas on the river (both existing) so 19N should be removed.	Discuss with CAG.	Discuss with CAG
38.	Page 36 27	The ‘old’ proposed alignment of Youngblood at Hamilton doesn’t show on map 4 so this paragraph is unnecessary.	This policy was included in the plan because the Thoroughfare Plan still has an adopted re-alignment. Including this in the plan, provides staff some framework to work with MUMPO in amending the Thoroughfare Plan. Policy guidance from the <i>Steele Creek Area Plan</i> will assist staff with pursuing an amendment to the LRTP. For Policy 27 (page 36), add “of the Mecklenburg-Union Thoroughfare Plan” after “currently adopted centerline.”	No change
39.	28	Do not reference sidewalk width – refer to USDG’s - as that document allows for flexibility relative to land use and road type.	Staff supports this change.	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
40.	29	This is misleading. Not all roads will end up with sidewalks.	Replace "eliminate" with "reduce" on Policy 29.	Change
41.	30	Policy should read " as Infrastructure development occurs....." to be clear when residents can expect bike lanes.	Staff supports this change.	Change
42.	31	This is a greenway improvement and should not be located in this sections titled "Transportation / street design policies" (on page 32).	Greenways provide transportation options for pedestrians and cyclists.	No change
43.	Page 37 33	The shared-use path on Shopton is inappropriate because there is not now nor planned access to the Nature preserve (which is required to not be developed based on the funding source).	Existing trails in Nature Preserve come very close to Shopton Road West. Developer-built Palisades Parkway was the model for an innovative cross-section for Shopton Road West. The shared-use path along Shopton Road West will not provide direct access to The Preserve. However, it will connect to the overland connector along S. Tryon St. / York Road which will provide access to the Preserve.	Change
44.		Street cross sections are informative but misleading. As these cross sections have flexibility, the public would be better served by just referencing the other document and eliminating the details.	The cross-sections included in this plan are used to illustrate typical street elements for each street type. Many of the policies and content of area plans reference other documents, but the overall intent is to create a plan that is comprehensive in understanding the vision for the area. Note at bottom of cross-sections explains that dimensions may be flexible in terms of topography, operations or other conditions discovered during subsequent phases.	No change
45.	Page 41	Water and Sewer and Storm Water: The paragraph ignores the pump station on Palisades Parkway.	Staff will modify text.	Change
46.	36	Policy needs to be deleted: City has no legislative authority for an Adequate Public Facilities ordinance; and rezonings are based on land use, not water line / sewer line size. Those issues are addressed at building construction.	An area plan is a policy document that provides guidance for future growth and development. The future land uses adopted as part of this area plan are policy, not regulations or legal requirements for development.  Public facilities and infrastructure improvement policies are identified in the plan to support the overall plan vision. The Implementation Guide provides specific strategies for public and private investments in the area and will require future action by elected officials and will be presented to them for approval as needed on a case-by-case basis.	No Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
47.	37	I support #37 but note that every time you call for alleys you are increasing the runoff and increasing the speed of the runoff. All references to alleys should be deleted to achieve this Policy. As it continues on page 42 the 5 <sup>th</sup> full sentence should read: "Therefore, preservation of the tree canopy, open space, limited impervious area, grading and compact development contribute to the protection of the area's natural resources and reduce storm water runoff."	Staff will modify text.	Change
48.	Page 42 40	The Red Fez club if redeveloped is an appropriate location and topography. This should be noted in the Wedge section.	Allow redevelopment for institutional or retail land uses.	Change
49.	Page 43	Rumors of the 2-story Urban design Police station are circulating. The York Rd Fire Station is out of character architecturally. We residents hope more appropriate architecture is used for the Police station.	The design of this facility is not addressed in the plan document.	N/A
50.	Page 44	The detail on Natural Heritage is interesting but never mentioned again – indicating that we have no natural Heritage sites in the Area plan (except the road name York Rd.). This paragraph should be removed.	See Map 17 in the Appendix.	No change
51.	Page 45	The discussion on the Nature Preserve should mention the funding that does not allow development, as it is an important characteristic in the area.	Staff will modify text.	Change
52.	49	Sentence should be changed: "Development practices that utilize minimal clearing, grading, paving, impervious areas and soil compaction have less impact on the water quality."	Staff will modify text.	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
53.	49	References the area's water supply. We fixed that at the November meeting. We do not get our water from Lake Wylie. That last sentence should be removed.	Throughout the planning process, residents expressed the importance of protecting the Catawba River.	Discuss with CAG
<b>Part II: Implementation Guide</b>				
54.	Page 50 21	Upgrade to what standard?	Typical improvements are described on Page 33; however, cross-sections will be selected per the Urban Street Design Guidelines.	Change
55.	Pages 50 – 51 22, 28, & 30	These are thoroughfares and not usually privately funded.	In some instances, thoroughfares may be privately funded as development occurs. The timeframe will be changed to long term / ongoing.	Change
56.		What does 'as development occurs' mean?	Roads may be constructed as part of a development project	No change
57.	24	What does enhance mean?	These Intersection improvements will require NCDOT involvement, such that some features, like turn lanes, may be added, while others, like a signal, may not.	No change
58.	24	Choate at Carowinds is in South Carolina.	Staff has confirmed that Choate Circle at Carowinds Boulevard is in North Carolina.	No change
59.	33	No access to this private park, so shared-use paths not needed.	Existing trails in Nature Preserve come very close to Shopton Road West. Developer-built Palisades Parkway was the model for an innovative cross-section for Shopton Road West.	Ongoing
60.	46-50	Subdivision process is by Ordinance not area plan. This cut and paste insertion is not correct and should be removed.	Discuss with CAG.	Discuss with CAG.
61.	48	How does Planning Dept 'limit development' around contaminated sites? This is county process.	Implementation of the plan is the responsibility of multiple public agencies as well as the private sector. However, if a development proposal is submitted near a contaminated site, the site plan will be reviewed and recommendations on site design should consider this information.	No change
62.	Page 54 18	The connection to Moss Road is specifically prohibited in a Conditional rezoning plan. The connection was discussed and sentiment made clear that the City can no more violate a Conditional Plan than the property owners can. To take the connection out of Part 1 but bury it with a note in part 3 is disingenuous.	A street would not violate the rezoning conditional plan, as streets may bisect buffers. However, in response to the community's concerns heard during planning process, the Steele Creek Area Plan no longer includes the connection.	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
63.		<p>What is the reason or the "short time frame?" There seems to be a rush to get this approved very quickly. Are you under some deadline? Growth has slowed to a trickle in Steele Creek, and there are no outstanding rezoning applications in the plan area, so it's unclear why there's an urgency to get the area plan approved in the next couple of months.</p>	<p>In response to public comments shared at the April 19<sup>th</sup> Planning Committee Meeting, Planning staff requested that the Transportation and Planning Committee receive an overview of the draft <i>Steele Creek Area Plan</i> at their April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. (Previously, staff planned to request that the Committee recommend City Council schedule a meeting to receive public comment on the draft plan.) As a result, The Transportation and Planning Committee (TAP) delayed recommending City Council receive public comment on the draft plan. The TAP Committee meets on May 9<sup>th</sup> and will consider recommending City Council receive public comment on the draft plan. Staff scheduled a Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meeting to discuss comments on the draft plan for Thursday, May 5<sup>th</sup>. The results of the CAG meeting will be shared at the May 9<sup>th</sup> TAP Committee meeting.</p> <p>The plan adoption process generally takes at least a few months and there are a number of Council and Committee meeting dates that have to be considered. However, staff is continuing to meet with the CAG to address outstanding issues. The earliest that this plan will likely be adopted is July.</p>	Change
64.		<p>Is it correct that the CAG will not be able to see, review, and comment on a revised draft of the plan before it is presented to the Planning Committee for approval? That all we'll see are the staff responses to the comments?</p>	<p>Staff understands the desire of the CAG to have input on the wording of text in the document. However, it is the Planning Department's practice to release one draft document and track all comments received throughout the plan review and adoption process. As the plan moves through the adoption process, staff will provide a detailed list of comments received and proposed changes to the document to the CAG, Planning Committee, Transportation and Planning Committee, and City Council.</p>	Ongoing
65.		<p>The Land Use Committee of the Steele Creek Residents Association will be meeting on Tuesday May 3 and would like to discuss the staff responses to the comments. The Citizen Comments posted on the Steele Creek Area Plan web page appear to include only the written comments provided at the March 31 meeting. Do you plan to post additional comments before May 5 so that we will have an opportunity to review them before the CAG meeting?</p>	<p>A list of all comments on the draft plan received to date along with staff's response will be provided to the CAG before the May 5<sup>th</sup> CAG meeting.</p>	Ongoing
66.	Page iii Executive Summary	<p>The second paragraph under Activity Centers says that "additional industrial development is appropriate for the area." This suggests more industry is appropriate for Steele Creek in general. This should say "additional industrial development is appropriate within this center."</p>	<p>Staff supports this change.</p>	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
67.	Page 10 Concept Map	<p>The Concept Map (Map 2) shows two greenways labeled "Future Greenway" north and west of the RiverGate corner, one continuing north towards the intersection of Steele Creek Road and the other crossing Steele Creek Road north of Southwest Middle School and continuing west to Shopton Road West and McDowell Nature Preserve. I don't see these on any other maps, and they should be, especially Map 4, Map 16, and Map 17.</p> <p>These do not appear to be on the Master Greenway Plan, but they will eventually be greenways. The county already owns most of the route leading up to Sledge Road and the owner of the property along the creek towards Shopton Road West has committed to donate land.</p>	Maps will be changed to reflect this change.	Change
68.	Page 42 39	This policy refers to overland connection to Winget Park, but this is not on the maps. Maps 4 and 16 should show an overland route from the Steele Creek Road/Sledge Road intersection up Sledge Road and Winget Road to Winget Park.	Maps will be changed to reflect this change.	Change
69.	Page 35 Map 4	There should be a circle on Map 4 at the intersection of Steele Creek Road and Erwin Road. Even though the state doesn't want a traffic signal there, there should be one eventually, even if it's in 30 years.	Recommend adding to enhanced intersections in Transportation Policies. However, actual enhancements will require NCDOT involvement, such that some features, like turn lanes, may be added, while others, like a signal, may not.	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
70.	Page 20 11a	Par. 11a on Page 20 says that the Siemens property west of Armour Creek "is more appropriate for industrial development." Although it is owned by Siemens and is zoned industrial, it is not "more appropriate" for industrial development. It's on the lake adjacent to Winget Park and residential area. A road would have to be built from the main Siemens plant across Armour Creek. It's likely that Siemens will never develop it. It's more appropriate for residential or open space. I think this area should not be added to the Westinghouse Blvd Industrial Center, but if it is because it's already Siemens owned and industrial zoned, the statement that industrial is "more appropriate" should be removed.	The property is zoned I-2, located adjacent to the Industrial center, and part of a larger industrial parcel. However, staff has been informed that there is interest in having this property used for park land. The site could be linked to Wingate Park and provide water frontage for park users.	Change
71.	Page 16	On Page 16 the description of CMC-Steele Creek says it "primarily provides outpatient and overnight emergency care." I believe that the majority of the building actually is used for doctors' offices, and it does not have overnight rooms.	Staff will modify text.	Change
72.	Page 13	Map 3 on Page 13 shows an area 6c, but there is no description of this on Page 15. It's actually pretty significant since this area is currently old residential and is being identified as mixed use.	Staff will add text to read: The plan recommends a mixture of residential, office and retail land uses located along Steele Creek Road south of Shopton Road. The property is opposite the Berewick mixed use center.	Change
73.	Page 22 12e	Map 21 has a label of "Whitehall Technology Center" in area 12e, but the text refers to "Whitehall Technology Park" in area 12f. I don't believe there is any industrial area in area 12f. Where is this, and what is the correct name?	Staff will modify text to read "Whitehall Technology Center".	Change
74.	Page 32	On Page 32 it talks about upgrades to farm-to-market roads. These appear to be the blue roads on Map 4. John Price Road, Nations Ford Road, and Downs Road are blue on the map but not mentioned in the text. The relationship between the text and map should be clearer.	For Policy 21 (page 32), add "Nations Ford Road," and delete "John Price Road" and "Downs Road" from Map 4 (page 35).	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
75.	Page 33	Map 4 shows Brown Grier Road as a 4-lane boulevard, but it's not mentioned in the text in Par. 22 on Page 33. This is on the chart on Page 56.	Add bullet "Widen Brown-Grier Road" under Policy 22.	Change
76.	Page 43	Par. 44 on Page 43, add Fire Station #26.	Staff will modify text.	Change
77.	Page 45	Par. 49 on Page 45 should mention drinking water. Even though CMUD doesn't use Lake Wylie for drinking water, Rock Hill does. We all live on the same little blue marble.	Discuss with CAG.	Discuss with CAG
78.	Page 49	The last box on Page 49 refers to "Heights in Residential Districts." I understand this should be "Heights," but it should be described in the text somewhere in Par 14 through 20	Will correct misspelling.	Change
79.	Page 36 31	Par. 31 on Page 36 should include the completion of Walker Branch Greenway Trail as a goal. (Also, is there a difference between "greenway" and "greenway trail?" Can greenways exist without trails?)	Staff will modify text to read "greenways in the Steele Creek area".	Change
80.	Page 59	In the chart on Page 59, is Continental Tire still out here?	No. Staff will modify text.	Change
81.	Page 65	On Page 65, the description of Steele Creek Commons includes Kerr Drugs. This is now Dollar Tree.	Staff will modify text.	Change
82.	Page 73	On Page 73 it describes Sam Neely Road and Winget Road as thoroughfares. It's in the plan to extend Carowinds Blvd through here, but it's not thoroughfare yet.	For Thoroughfare Plan sub-section of Appendix (page 73), add "*" to "Sam Neely Road*" and "Winget Road*" with footnote denoting "*Future Carowinds Blvd. Extension," and change "serving" to "within."	Change
83.	Page 78	I believe the Robinson House is gone. The William Grier and Hayes Byrum houses have been moved to Robbie Cir. However, these, plus John Douglas House, James Coffey House and Hayes-Byrum General Store are outside the boundary.	Staff will modify plan.	Change
84.	Page 20	I'm pleased that area 11b was added as retail on Page 20, but I also think this could be enlarged to the other side of S Tryon St.	Discussed at May 5 <sup>th</sup> CAG meeting.	No Change
85.		Is there any mention of encouraging park and ride lots?	Charlotte Area Transit will address park and ride lots as transit is extended into the area.	No change
86.		Carowinds is a prominent feature in Steele Creek (at least half of it), but it isn't mentioned too much.	The plan recognizes Carowinds as a retail use in the area.	No change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
87.		I was pleased to see that the presentation provided an updated population of 41,000 from the 2010 census. However, the area has had little growth since 2008. The 2008 estimate was probably too low. Other data also should be available from the American Community Survey.	The 2008 population estimate for the Steele Creek area plan was based on our Regional Transportation Model. However we did look at the 2008 Quality of Life Report estimates for the area and there number was even lower than the model number. So we decided to go with the higher number. There were a total of 2,277 residential permits issued within the plan area in 2007 and 2008 which is an indication of continuing growth in the region beyond 2008. Since the ACS data was not available in 2008 we had to rely on 2000 census, but we can certainly take a look at the ACS data now.	Ongoing
88.		York County is developing a plan for Carowinds Blvd. Has that been examined for compatibility with the Steele Creek Area Plan? Has other development and development plans across the SC border been examined? Would it be appropriate to mention this in the Steele Creek Area Plan?	Planning staff met with York County Planners and reviewed the York County Plan. York County Planners were also included on the interdepartmental team.	Ongoing
89.		When does this draft plan change to an implementation plan?	<p>The draft <i>Steele Creek Area Plan</i> document is organized into three parts: Part I: <i>The Concept Plan</i> includes the Purpose, Vision Statement, Plan Goals and Policies. Only Part I will become adopted City policy. Part II, <i>Implementation Guide</i>, contains action steps to carry out plan policies, and will be used primarily to guide staff work. Part III, <i>Appendix</i>, provides supporting information and data used to develop the plan.</p> <p>The <i>Implementation Guide</i> is primarily a staff document that outlines steps that can be taken by various public and private bodies so that the future envisioned in this plan may be realized. These strategies, the lead responsible agency, and tentative time frame are listed in the Implementation Guide.</p>	No change
90.		There are too many Mixed Use Activity Centers.	The update to the <i>Centers, Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework</i> (CCW) was adopted by Charlotte City Council in 2010. It defines Activity Centers as focal points of economic activity typically with concentrations of compact development. There are 22 designated Activity Centers in Charlotte's sphere of influence. Currently, there are 2 Mixed Use Activity Centers and 2 Industrial Centers within the Steele Creek Area Plan boundaries. See page 16 of the draft <i>Steele Creek Area Plan</i> document for more information.	No change
91.		Does mixed use activity mean apartments?	The draft Steele Creek Area Plan recommends higher density and more intense development that incorporate a mix of retail, office, civic, residential, and / or industrial land uses in the Mixed Use Activity Centers consistent with CCW. Residential development may include single family homes, townhomes, apartments, condominiums, or other types of residential development.	No Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
92.		The plan recommendations allow for too many people and the roads cannot handle the traffic and noise.	According to Noell Consulting Group, who conducted the Market Assessment of the Steele Creek Area. There will be demand for an additional 3,000 multi-family units and over 13,000 single family units in the plan area over the next 20 years. The plan recommendations take into consideration the Market Assessment and numerous other factors including the plan's vision and goals. The plan recognizes the need for transportation improvements within the area and recommends more intense development in the Activity Centers and along S. Tryon Street where the infrastructure can best support it.	No Change
93.	Clarification of # 70 above-	# 70 - My suggestion was to remove the words "is more appropriate for industrial development." Even though the land west of Armour Creek is owned by Siemens and zoned industrial, it is not "more appropriate for industrial development."	Staff will make this change	Change
94.	Clarification of # 73 above-	# 73 - Also, Whitehall Technology Center should be listed under area 12e rather than 12f in the text.	Staff will make this change	Change
95.	Clarification of # 74 above-	# 74 - While John Price Road, Nations Ford Road, and Downs Road may not qualify as Farm-to-Market roads, they currently do not meet the definition of an avenue, and upgrades would be required to make them avenues. These upgrades are mentioned on Page 38 but not on Page 32.	For Policy 21 (page 32), add "Nations Ford Road," and delete "John Price Road" and "Downs Road" from Map 4 (page 35).	Change
96.	Clarification of # 79 above-	# 79 - Additionally, the text on Item 31 on Page 51 should be revised so that it does not exclude the Walker Branch Greenway.	Staff will make this change	Change
97.	Clarification of # 82 above-	# 82 - The text says that Sam Neely Road and Winget Road "are major thoroughfares serving the Steele Creek Area." Although the Thoroughfare Plan shows these as major thoroughfares once Carowinds Blvd is extended, they "are" not major thoroughfares currently. While they provide access to Planters Walk and other subdivisions, they both are dead end roads, which should not qualify them as thoroughfares currently.	For Thoroughfare Plan sub-section of Appendix (page 73), add "*" to "Sam Neely Road*" and "Winget Road*" with footnote denoting "*Future Carowinds Blvd. Extension," and change "serving" to "within."	Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
98.	Clarification of # 9 & 16 above-	# 9 & 16 - I believe extending (or restoring) the RiverGate Activity Center would be an intrusion into adjacent residential areas and would not be appropriate.	Staff agrees.	Ongoing
99.	Clarification of # 38 above-	# 38 - Could state that the " currently adopted centerline" is in the Long Range Thoroughfare Plan. As written, it's unclear where the currently adopted centerlines could be found.	This policy was included in the plan because the Thoroughfare Plan still has an adopted re-alignment. Including this in the plan, provides staff some framework to work with MUMPO in amending the Thoroughfare Plan. Policy guidance from the <i>Steele Creek Area Plan</i> will assist staff with pursuing an amendment to the LRTP. For Policy 27 (page 36), add "of the Mecklenburg-Union Thoroughfare Plan" after "currently adopted centerline."	Change
100	Clarification of # 62 above-	# 62 - I understand that a restriction on a road connection onto Moss Road was a condition of the industrial rezoning. This should prevent a road connection. This needs to be stated clearly. If not, the suggested text in the Public Comments document should be added.	A street would not violate the rezoning conditional plan, as streets may bisect buffers. However, in response to the community's concerns heard during planning process, the <i>Steele Creek Area Plan</i> no longer includes the connection.	Change
101	General (landscaping / parking lots)	Something needs to be done about hedges, stone monuments, and signs that are placed close to the road and obstruct clear view of oncoming traffic at places where cars must pull out. Two places I frequent are at Wal-mart, where shrubs prevent a clear view of oncoming traffic at two places, and at Whitehall Corporate Center, where a cornerstone monument requires a driver to pull out in the cross street in order to be able to see if there is oncoming traffic. But by then, it may be too late. I brought pictures of some of these situations to the meeting on design last year. See the two aerials and photo attached.	Site distance issues are located on private property. CDOT's actions are limited, since these streets are not maintained by the City. Although some of the ordinances require tree plantings and screening, the maintenance of the vegetation is the property owner's responsibility. Please note persons may call 311 to report site distance issues.	N/A

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
102	Pages 26 and 30	Item 16M on Page 26 and Item 19R on Page 30 refer to using landscaping to break up large parking lots. One thing that annoys me is that landscaping areas typically are placed where pedestrians tend to or have to go, and they wind up cutting paths and destroying the landscaping. I would like to see landscaping islands designed so that pedestrian routes are provided through or around them or so that they have raised walls (such as 1 to 2 foot walls made with railroad ties) that would prevent pedestrians from traipsing through them.	Ordinances require sidewalk connections to provide pedestrian access to buildings, parking, etc.	N/A
103		The Concept Plan Map needs to corrected reflect The Palisades Town Center as a mixed use center as it is described in the text.	The Concept Plan identifies Palisades Town Center as a Community Center which is proposed to include a mixture of small-scale neighborhood serving retail and office uses. Mixed Use Activity Centers, as defined by the Centers, Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework (2010) allow development intensities that are not appropriate in this location. On page 11, staff will include language to clarify the differences between the land use vision for Community Center and Mixed Use Activity Centers.	Change
104		I suggested that the area including the Sanctuary and other undeveloped land should be shown as the overall base density of 4 du/ac.	The residential density proposed within the draft plan reflects the approved development proposals for this area and takes into consideration the areas environmental features, existing development pattern, street capacity, and other planning considerations.	No Change
105		I suggested that the market data assembled for the area should be reflected in the plan and that some assignment of future development expectations be included for the three retail mixed use areas.	The Market Analysis is one of more than 20 resources used to develop the draft plan policies and is not used solely to establish the appropriate mix, intensity and location of future land uses within the plan area. Nonetheless, the market analysis is used to provide information about existing land use conditions and the potential for changes in the future. The Market Analysis will not be used to assign the specific amount of development allowed on a parcel.	No Change

## Public Comments Received at March 30, 2011 Meeting

### Transportation

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
106		The turn lane at Rivergate is inadequate and requires traffic to stop in the thru lane. Two turn lanes or a longer lane is needed to accommodate turning traffic. The problem occurs with the timing of the Carowinds Boulevard traffic signal which holds up outbound traffic.	This is a short-term operational concern that does not have to be addressed by the area plan. The turn lane was recently extended and Charlotte Department of Transportation staff will re-evaluate timing of the traffic signal. Any intensification of the Rivergate Shopping Center site that requires rezoning may trigger a Traffic Impact Study that could result in dual left turns.	No change
107		A traffic signal is needed at Sam Neely Road and sidewalks are needed along Steele Creek Road.	The draft Steele Creek Area Plan shows Sam Neely Road and Steele Creek Road as having an enhanced intersection. Also, Steele Creek Road is shown as a Boulevard with sidewalks.	No change
108		It would have been helpful to have more information concerning plans for traffic lights and sidewalks down Steele Creek.	This is a short-term operational concern that does not have to be addressed in the area plan. Citizens can request traffic signals and sidewalks at any time by contacting the Charlotte Department of Transportation at 704.336.4119.	No Change
109		The concept map still shows a road through the Siemens building.	The Concept Map still shows a key connection going through the property, while the Future Transportation Network map does not. Recommend changing lines on Concept Map to better reflect Future Transportation.	Change
110		Is the Moss road connector still hidden under a letter? It needs to go away.	A street would not violate the rezoning conditional plan, as streets may bisect buffers. However, in response to the community's concerns heard during planning process, the Steele Creek Area Plan no longer includes the connection.	Change
111		Will roads be provided for Steele Creek residents before being annexed? Many near Lake Wylie currently do not have paved roads and have to cross Crescent's land to access their homes. When will these roads be provided?	Roads outside City limits are generally maintained by the State.	No Change
112		Erwin and Steele Creek roads should be evaluated. It is very bad when making a left off Erwin Road to Steele Creek Road, vision is blocked.	The draft plan can respond to this comment by recommending an enhanced intersection at Erwin and Steele Creek roads.	Change
113		There is only one traffic light at Brown-Grier / Arrowood Road and Sandy Porter. There are three schools back to back and increased traffic at certain times makes it difficult to safely turn left out of our neighborhood.	The existing signal at Gallant/Brown-Grier serves the schools.	No Change
114		There is a lot of traffic on Steele Creek Road. Will it be expanded? Traffic bottlenecks severely on Steele Creek Road between S. Tryon Street and Gold Hill.	Draft plan generally addresses comment. Steele Creek Road is shown as a 4-lane Boulevard. However, the timing for widening this road is beyond the scope of an Area Plan.	No Change

#	Document Reference	Public Comments	Staff Responses	Proposed Change to Draft Plan
115		Discussion of funding for road improvements would be helpful.	This is beyond the scope of the plan. However, the <i>Implementation Guide</i> , page 56, includes estimated costs of major roadway projects.	No Change
116		Bicycle lanes are desperately needed on Youngblood and Steele Creek roads.	In the draft plan, Youngblood Road is shown as an Avenue with bicycle lanes. Steele Creek Road is shown as a Boulevard with bicycle lanes.	No Change
117		Plan lacks official transportation design and bike lanes.	Numerous streets in the plan area are shown as Avenues and Boulevards, both street types include bicycle lanes.	No Change
118		Who is the NCDOT contact for the traffic lights on state roads?	Scott Cole. Scott can be reached at 704.982.0101.	N/A
<b>Transit</b>				
119		Are there future plans to extend bus services in the Steele Creek area?	There are no current plans to extend bus service in this area. However, as the area continues to develop and the bus service will be expanded. The last service change for the area was in February 2011, 41x Steele Creek Express, service was extended to the Steelecroft area. In addition, 56 Arrowwood, service was extended to Carolinas Medical Center – Steele Creek. However, as the area continues to develop CATS will look for ways to efficiently add service to the area.	No Change
<b>Greenways</b>				
120		Are bike paths and walking trails planned for the new greenway areas? Need more greenways as identified.	Greenway amenities will be determined by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation Department as a part of the planning process for developing the greenway.	No Change
<b>Schools</b>				
121		Should schools be more centrally located?	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools utilizes a site selection process to determine where future schools are needed. New schools are located as close as possible to the students that they are intended to serve, and must be sited within the boundaries of the school or schools that the new school is relieving. Additional criteria that are considered include parcel sizes and the cost of available land.	No Change
122		Why build more schools when schools are being closed?	Schools in certain areas of the county are more overcrowded than in others. The moves to close and consolidate schools were primarily focused in areas where additional capacity existed.	No Change
<b>Airport</b>				
123		The plan appears to ignore the change in airport operating procedure that is concentrating air traffic on the same flight path (previously disbursed).	Several residents voiced concerns about airplane noise and recent changes in flight patterns. Planning staff shared the names and numbers of persons who provided this information at the meeting and requested that Airport staff contact them.	No Change