

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Zoning Meeting on Monday, April 20, 2026, at 5:05 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, J.D. Mazuera Arias, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, Joi Mayo, James Mitchell, and Kimberly Owens.

ABSENT: Mayor Lyles, Councilmember Victoria Watlington

* * * * *

Councilmember Driggs said I'd like to call to order this April 20, 2026, Zoning Meeting of the Charlotte City Council. My name is Ed Driggs. I am the District Seven Council member, and I Chair the Transportation, Planning and Development Committee, and in that capacity, I am sitting in this chair tonight. We will begin with introductions.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Mayfield gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

* * * * *

EXPLANATION OF THE ZONING MEETING PROCESS

Councilmember Driggs explained the Zoning Meeting rules and procedures.

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION OF THE ZONING COMMITTEE

Douglas Welton, Chairman of the Zoning Committee said thank you very much, Councilmember Driggs. My name is Douglas A. Welton. I am the Chairman of the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission. Allow me to introduce my fellow committee members. They include Melissa Gaston, Erin Shaw, Theresa McDonald, Robin Stuart, Carolyn Millen, and Michael Caprioli. The Zoning Committee will meet on Tuesday, May 5, 2026, at 5:30 p.m. At that meeting, the Zoning Committee will discuss and make recommendations on the petitions that have a public hearing here tonight. The public is welcome to that meeting, but please note it is not a continuation of the public hearing that is being held here tonight. Prior to that meeting, you're welcome to contact us and provide input. You can find contact information and information about each one of the petitions at the City's website at charlotteplanning.org. Thank you very much, Mr. Driggs.

* * * * *

DEFERRALS / WITHDRAWALS

Councilmember Driggs said thank you, Mr. Welton. So, before we get into the items in our agenda tonight, we're going to consider deferrals and withdrawals that have been requested.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera and carried unanimously to defer: a withdraw on Item No. 8, Petition No. 2025-094 by Atapco Properties, Inc., a decision on Item No. 9, Petition No. 2025-135 by The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hospital Authority to May 18, 2026, a decision on Item No. 12, Petition No. 2025-086 by Pence Road Development LLC to May 18, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 14, Petition No. 2025-027 by Mission City Church and Freedom

Communities to May 18, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 15, Petition No. 2025-120 by American Tower Asset Sub LLC to May 18, 2026, and a hearing on Item No. 16, Petition No. 2024-143 by Panorama Development, LLC to May 18, 2026.

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 3 THROUGH 7 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS PULLED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE PULLED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

Councilmember Driggs said so we now move on to the decisions in our agenda, and I will mention here we have consent agenda items and then we have individual items. Please note that these petitions meet the following criteria. They had no public opposition to the petition at hearing, staff recommends approval, Zoning Committee recommends approval, and there were no changes after the Zoning Committee’s recommendation. So, colleagues, you can see the consent items on your agenda. Are there any Consent agenda items Council would like to pull for question or comment or a separate vote?

Councilmember Johnson said Item No. 3, please.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Owens, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent agenda as presented with the exception of Item No. 3 which was pulled for a separate vote.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 4: Ordinance No. 1116-Z, Petition No. 2025-132 by Hopper Communities, Inc. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.44 acres located west of Providence Road, north of Edgemont Road, and south of Cavendish Court from R-8MF(CD) (Multi-Family Residential, Conditional) to N1-A (Neighborhood 1-A).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Shaw) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the South Middle Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing. The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the area plan: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion may be facilitated by removing narrow entitlements on the site as part of a previously approved conditional plan. The proposed rezoning opens the property up to all permitted uses within the N1-A district, which may include diverse residential options. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The surrounding area along Providence Road is characterized by a mix of residential forms, including established single-family neighborhoods, institutional uses, and pockets of transition where lot sizes and development patterns vary. This portion of Providence Road acts as a connective corridor between lower-density established neighborhoods and emerging areas experiencing reinvestment and redevelopment. The subject property is larger and more flexible than typical surrounding lots, with a significantly greater lot width and total lot area compared to most nearby single-family parcels. These characteristics make the site suitable for a wider range of neighborhood-compatible housing types envisioned within the N1-A district. The petition supports the area plan’s goals by encouraging a less intense residential district along a major corridor, rather than maintaining older, narrowly defined conditional entitlements that limit housing variety and reinvestment opportunities. Allowing all N1-A permitted

uses provides a more predictable and context-appropriate zoning framework than the existing conditional plan, ensuring that future development remains compatible with surrounding residential character while accommodating evolving housing needs. The site's location along Providence Road provides direct access to an established transportation corridor, enabling efficient vehicular connectivity and supporting land uses that fit well within a corridor-oriented development pattern.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 026-027.

Item No. 5: Ordinance No. 1117-Z, Petition No. 2025-138 by Coral Reef Investment Properties amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 8.62 acres located along the east side of West Tyvola Road, south of South Tryon Street, and west of Sleepy Hollow Road from R-17MF(CD) (Multi-Family, Conditional) to R-17MF(CD) SPA (Multi-Family, Conditional, Site Plan Amendment).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Gaston, seconded by Shaw) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: The petition is consistent with the goals and policies of the Southwest Middle Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing. The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the area plan: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion may be facilitated by adding additional multi-family stacked units in a mostly developed area where there is a gap in access to housing diversity. 3: Housing Access for All may be facilitated by increasing the number of workforce housing units from six to seven units. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition is a site plan amendment (SPA) to previously approved rezoning petition, 2021-235. It requests reducing the permitted number of principal structures, minorly increasing the number of multi-family dwelling units and workforce housing units, removing a pedestrian connection to Sleepy Hollow Road, and modifying a driveway location on West Tyvola Road. The site is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map's designation of Neighborhood 2 Place Type, which serves as a transition between lower-intensity development and higher-intensity commercial or mixed-use centers. The site abuts single-family development to the east, a commercial center with restaurant and retail uses to the north, multi-family apartment developments across West Tyvola Road to the west, and a public park to the southeast. The Neighborhood 2 Place Type supports low- to mid-rise multi-family residential development. The plan proposes a maximum building height of 65 feet. Overall, the site plan amendment introduces minor changes that do not significantly alter the previously approved rezoning plan. The site is served by the CATS number 60 local bus and a short walk from the number 16 local bus providing service to the Tyvola Road LYNX Blue Line Station, the airport, and the Charlotte Transportation Center.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 028-029.

Item No. 6: Ordinance No. 1118-Z, Petition No. 2025-139 by Averitt Express amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 53.24 acres located on the north side of Shopton Road, west of Beam Road from I-1(CD) ANDO (Light Industrial, Conditional, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay) to ML-2(CD) ANDO (Manufacturing and Logistics-2, Conditional, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Millen) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the Southwest Middle Community Area Plan and in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is entitled for light industrial uses. The petition would expand the permitted industrial uses while reducing the building footprint on the site. The petition prohibits many of the most noxious uses

that would otherwise be allowed in the ML-2 zoning district, while allowing for a vehicle operations facility. The site is located within the Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay and provides appropriate buffering to adjacent institutional and residential uses located across Shopton Road from the site. The petition maintains a commitment to dedicate the floodplain to Mecklenburg County for future Coffee Creek Greenway. The petition could facilitate the following additional 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity may be facilitated by supporting additional industrial uses on the site, which is located in the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type near Charlotte Douglas International Airport.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 030-031.

Item No. 7: Ordinance No. 1119-Z, Petition No. 2025-140 by Delores Howard Leith amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.43 acres located east of Sandy Porter Road, north of Camden Creek Lane, and south of Sandy River Lane from N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B) to CAC-1(CD) (Community Activity Center-1, Conditional).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Caprioli) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: The petition is consistent with the goals and policies of the Southwest Outer Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing. The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the area plan: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by developing nonresidential uses, potentially including personal services establishments, that could expand access to goods and services to the surrounding area, also its proximity to transit could also help facilitate this goal. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. However, the petition meets minor map amendment criteria described in the accompanying program guide document to the Southwest Outer Community Area Plan supporting a place type change to Community Activity Center. A rezoning to the CAC-1(CD) (Community Activity Center-1, conditional) zoning district could help to implement the goals of the Comprehensive Plan by promoting a variety of uses such as retail, office, medical, personal service establishments, and restaurants. The site is abutting the Community Activity Center Place Type on two sides containing multi-family apartment development and a variety of commercial uses. It is adjacent to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type across Sandy Porter Road. The rezoning site borders only one property designated as Neighborhood 1 Place Type, though it is zoned N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B). This petition is appropriate and compatible with surrounding development and the Community Activity Center Place Type as it proposes adaptive reuse of the existing structure and expands access to goods and services in the area. The site is within a quarter-mile walk of CATS bus routes 16 local and 41x express, providing transit access to the Charlotte Transportation Center. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Community Activity Center Place Type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 032-033.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: ORDINANCE NO. 1115-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-072 BY LINCOLN PROPERTY COMPANY AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 44.02 ACRES LOCATED WEST OF OLD STATESVILLE ROAD, SOUTH OF VANCE DAVIS DRIVE, AND NORTH OF REAMES ROAD FROM OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS) AND MUDD(CD) (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, CONDITIONAL) TO ML-1(CD) (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-1, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Millen) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Community Activity Center Place Type for this site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: Although the petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map the surrounding area is characterized by large-scale, low-rise manufacturing, warehouse buildings, offices, and other assembly and distribution facilities. The petition would be compatible with the character, building form, and land uses in this historic industrial corridor. The petition is reasonable because it aligns with the existing development pattern. The request supports continued reinvestment in an area long characterized by industrial and employment-based uses. Although the Policy Map calls for the Community Activity Center Place Type on the site as a result of previous entitlements, the rezoning request has preferred adjacencies and locational characteristics for the application of the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type. Additionally, the site does not abut any Neighborhood 1 zoned areas. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 6: Healthy, Safe & Active Communities may be facilitated by dedicating a 35-foot easement to Mecklenburg Park and Recreation for a greenway. 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity may be facilitated with the entitlement of industrial uses that could create job opportunities. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Community Activity Place Type to the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Community Activity Center Place Type for this site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: Although the petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map the surrounding area is characterized by large-scale, low-rise manufacturing, warehouse buildings, offices, and other assembly and distribution facilities. The petition would be compatible with the character, building form, and land uses in this historic industrial corridor. The petition is reasonable because it aligns with the existing development pattern. The request supports continued reinvestment in an area long characterized by industrial and employment-based uses. Although the Policy Map calls for the Community Activity Center Place Type on the site as a result of previous entitlements, the rezoning request has preferred adjacencies and locational characteristics for the application of the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type. Additionally, the site does not abut any Neighborhood 1 zoned areas. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 6: Healthy, Safe & Active Communities may be facilitated by dedicating a 35-foot easement to Mecklenburg Park and Recreation for a greenway. 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity may be facilitated with the entitlement of industrial uses that could create job opportunities. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Community Activity Place Type to the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type for the site.

Councilmember Johnson said I had some questions for either staff or the developer. The question I had was about the native trees. We've all heard from Commissioner Elaine Powell, so I did want to follow up. There's a commitment to native trees, and I want to know if that commitment is just for the buffer or for the entire property?

David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development said so, our understanding is all required buffers that are on this site would be planted with native species, as approved by Urban Forestry.

Ms. Johnson said so, all required buffers. So, will there be trees outside of the buffers in the development?

Mr. Pettine said there may be with parking lot trees or some street trees, but those would also have to be per the approved species list through Urban Forestry.

Ms. Johnson said and it's my understanding that we have a list of invasive species trees.

Mr. Pettine said we have a list of approved species, but it doesn't contain invasive, it just contains the ones that are approved for planting.

Ms. Johnson said one of the concerns that I know she had was if we're not requiring native trees on the entire property that it could be counterproductive, because the other trees I guess may be counterproductive to the native trees.

Mr. Pettine said I don't know if I would understand how to fully respond, but I don't think there would be a conflict, because the trees in the approved list should be planted in accordance with what Urban Forestry has approved for plantings across the site. So, I don't think there'd be a mix of invasive trees. There's not invasive trees allowed that would be planted on site, so they should all be able to co-exist, but the ones in the buffer would be again specific to those native species, and the other trees on the site could just be done through the approved Urban Forestry list.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and do we know the size of the buffers?

Mr. Pettine said the buffer for the space along where the County has property just to the south of the site is a required Class A landscape yard, and they would actually increase the actual plantings in that by 10 percent of that type A standard. I think that is 25 feet for that one. Class A is just under 100, so that would be a fairly large buffer to that site.

Ms. Johnson said and are data centers included in the place types or in the allowed?

Mr. Pettine said they are prohibited as a use per the conditional plan.

Ms. Johnson said okay, that's all I have for now. Thank you.

Mr. Pettine said yes.

Councilmember Mayfield said Mr. Pettine, I think you did answer it. So, what they identified in the area adjoining the parcel identified as the Mecklenburg County's Alexandriana Historic site, the petitioner proposes to install the enhanced landscape. They don't mention a number in this language, but what you just stated is according to our language it will be just under 100?

Mr. Pettine said the Class A, yes.

Ms. Mayfield said for Class A, because it doesn't clarify in the language that they submitted in the proposed request details. It just states the petitioner proposes to install an enhanced landscape buffer. As illustrated on the rezoning plan, this buffer will utilize native plant species and will exceed the standard type A buffer requirements along the Old Statesville Road frontage, but it doesn't actually give me a number. According to your understanding, when this moved this forward, because it's to exceed standard A, it is a buffer that would be considerable.

Mr. Pettine said yes. So, it ranges from about 91 feet down to 81 feet in its smallest area. Let's say you have to plant 25 trees in Class A, I'm just throwing a number out

pti:pk

there, they're going to go 10 percent beyond that. So, if it requires 100 trees, they would get 110 trees. So, they're going to plant more trees in that 91 feet, 81 feet, than are normally required.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, thank you for that clarification. Thank you, Councilmember Johnson.

Mr. Pettine said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said oh, and one last piece, Mr. Driggs. Councilmember Johnson, welcome back. We have missed you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Mr. Driggs said bravo.

Ms. Johnson said it's still early.

Councilmember Mayo said yes, I was just going to comment on Renee's question about the native trees. Random, know a lot about trees based on where I work. Just thinking back on a lot of our trees are naturalized in this area. They've been in the area for hundreds of years. With climate change right now, we know that some of our naturalized trees are actually doing better than some of our native trees. So, I'm sure that whoever the developers are have done a good job with that, and they're following the regulations of the City. Our Urban Forestry Department is stellar, so very excited to see the work that they are continuing to hold our developers accountable for doing right by the environment. So, just wanted to put that out there.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimous.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 024-025.

* * * * *

DECISIONS

ITEM NO. 10: PETITION NO. 2025-021 BY HAROLD JORDAN AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.24 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF E W.T. HARRIS BOULEVARD, AND NORTH OF IDLEWILD ROAD, AND SOUTH OF MEADOWDALE LANE FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 5-1 (motion by Millen, seconded by Caprioli) to recommend denial of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, we do not find this petition to be reasonable or in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type as the proposed use, a vehicle fueling facility, is not permitted in the Neighborhood 1 zoning district. The site is abutting other Neighborhood 1 Place Type at the northeast corner of the intersection of East WT Harris Boulevard and Idlewild Road. Vehicle Fueling Facilities are permitted in the NC zoning district under prescribed conditions that are intended to improve site design for these uses. The constraints of the site, including variables such as the size, utility easements, and required landscape yards, may create challenges to accommodate the type of design that could better support the goals of the Neighborhood Center Place Type which intend to support walkable, mixed-use

environments that serve surrounding neighborhoods with a mix of residential, retail, office, and civic uses. The petition could improve access to essential goods and services, which is identified as a priority in this area. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood Center Place Type for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to deny this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, we do not find this petition to be reasonable or in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type as the proposed use, a vehicle fueling facility, is not permitted in the Neighborhood 1 zoning district. The site is abutting other Neighborhood 1 Place Type at the northeast corner of the intersection of East WT Harris Boulevard and Idlewild Road. Vehicle Fueling Facilities are permitted in the NC zoning district under prescribed conditions that are intended to improve site design for these uses. The constraints of the site, including variables such as the size, utility easements, and required landscape yards, may create challenges to accommodate the type of design that could better support the goals of the Neighborhood Center Place Type which intend to support walkable, mixed-use environments that serve surrounding neighborhoods with a mix of residential, retail, office, and civic uses. The petition could improve access to essential goods and services, which is identified as a priority in this area. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood Center Place Type for the site.

Councilmember Driggs said alright, so we have a motion to deny. In this case, we are not actually denying the Zoning Committee recommendation, because we're actually voting in accordance with the recommendation of the Zoning Committee. So, in that case, I will ask if there is any discussion on the motion?

Councilmember Ajmera said well, this petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map. Staff, as well as the Zoning Committee, denied it, and with that I will support the denial motion. Thank you.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said I am motioning to deny this petition and to support staff's recommendation, because we are currently saturated with gas stations in District Five, and like I've mentioned to my colleagues before, I think we need more amenities and more third spaces for community to gather. As we have approved the sales tax that will fund more public transportation options, we need to become a less car-reliant city and really embrace walking 10-minute neighborhoods, as well as buses and rail and transportation. So, those are the reasons to enhance the quality of life for District Five residents that I am motioning to deny this petition. Thank you.

The vote was taken on the motion to deny and recorded as unanimous.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: ORDINANCE NO. 1120-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-030 BY TRYON ADVISORS, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.65 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF MT HOLLY-HUNTERSVILLE ROAD, EAST OF ROZZELLES FERRY ROAD, AND SOUTH OF DUNN COMMONS

PARKWAY FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Gaston) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent from staff analysis based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as the Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed zoning of N2-B(CD) (Neighborhood 2-B, conditional) is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation. However, the site is abutting properties designated as the Community Activity Center, Commercial, and Neighborhood 2 Place Types by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed Neighborhood 2 zoning could provide a more appropriate transition to the adjacent Place Type designations than the current Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The proposed development is within a quarter-mile of Mountain Island Market Place shopping center which boasts a wide variety daily goods and services such as retail, restaurant, and financial institutions. The petitioner will contribute \$50,000 to be applied toward future intersections improvements at Rozelles Ferry Road and Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, enhancing access to and from the site. The site also abuts a Commercial Place Type, as designated by the 2040 Policy Map, at the intersection of Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and Rozzelles Ferry Road. The plan includes a 12-foot multi-use path along the site's frontage on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, connecting to existing sidewalks and crosswalks. This will allow residents to access daily needs such as retail, restaurants, fitness studios, and bus stops within a quarter-mile distance by walking or cycling. The site is located along the route of the CATS number 1 and 18 local bus providing transit access between the Callabridge Commons Walmart and the Charlotte Transportation Center (CTC) and the Rosa Parks Community Transit Center. As well as the 88x express bus providing commuter access to Uptown. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10-Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion The approval of this petition will revise the recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

The petitioner made the following changes to the petition after the Zoning Committee vote. Therefore, the City Council must determine if the changes are substantial and if the petition should be referred back to the Zoning Committee for review.

1. Intersection improvements to Rozzelles Ferry Road and Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road: the petitioner has committed to increase their contribution to \$100,000, from \$50,000, to be applied toward future intersection improvements at Rozelles Ferry Road and Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and/or other mobility improvements in the area.
2. Reduction of driveways on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road: reduced the number of access points on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road from 2 to 1.
3. Additional building material standards: a minimum of 60% of exterior wall area will be constructed of brick or stone on buildings facades fronting Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road.
4. Prohibited vinyl and aluminum as a primary building material.
5. Enhanced parking requirements: committed to providing off-street visitor parking within site.
6. Committed to electric vehicle charging infrastructure as an option to home buyers.

David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development said staff believe that the changes are minor and do not warrant additional review by the Zoning Committee, and we'll take any questions.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Owens, and carried unanimously not to refer back to the Zoning Committee.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, and seconded by Councilmember Owens to deny Petition No. 2025-030 by Tryon Advisors, LLC.

Councilmember Graham said this has been a petition that has been certainly in front of me and others for well over I guess eight, nine months, since I first walked the site with the petitioner, as well as members of the congregation. First, let me say thank you very much to both of you for your willingness to dialogue back and forth, making concessions along the way for the last, literally seven, eight months, that both petitioner and the residents have been working together. However, I made a commitment about two years ago to take a different look at what's happening in the Mountain Island area, specifically relating to Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, with residents who have certainly organized themselves in a way to respond to some of the rapid growth that is occurring over there. In addition, not only is it rapid growth, but the infrastructure is not keeping up with it, many of which are state-owned roads, which creates a dilemma for a wide variety of projects in that area. Those roads are not slated to be improved or upgraded for years.

I think it's really important that, as a District Representative, that I listen to the people, and be an honest broker when items come before this Council and I think I've done that. I want to make sure that the residents over there are organized, that they have participated in a wide variety of Charlotte Area Plan studies and charrettes. They understand what's happening on the ground that's impacting their neighborhoods and their communities, and it's just not this petition. There are a number of others in the Mountain Island Lake area that feeds into Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road that cause much consternation for residents, neighborhood associations, and individuals who live in that particular part of the District. So, I ask the Council to take the lead of those individuals on the ground who've been doing the work who understand the impact of this particular project. It's not that the residents are opposed of housing; they're opposed of housing at this location. It's a problematic location based on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, and I urge the Council to vote with me and vote no.

Councilmember Mayfield said as Councilmember Graham has mentioned, this one has been a difficult conversation. I have been extremely vocal throughout the conversation regarding the impact, both infrastructure wise and design wise for this project. I do want to acknowledge, however, that we had a very similar conversation regarding a project in another part of the City not too long ago that was in my colleague's District where they're having to say infrastructure challenges. I also recognize that young people today don't necessarily want a single-family home. A lot of young people are looking for access to townhomes. I do appreciate the petitioner, really at the beginning, addressing a number of the concerns that were identified. I know the community would like to have a smaller number financially; that one really isn't as feasible to reduce the number, but for me, the two driveways were a major concern. Reducing down to one, which is the one that's mainly used now, is an added win. Identifying brick as far as the design of the structure, how it will be facing. It is honestly very difficult. I cannot say no for the sake of no. I hear, and I have been in communication with the community. Ya'll know I do love to say no, but most times that I say no, I have a good bit of research and information to go along with it. The infrastructure piece, although very concerning, we have to work to get our General Assembly, and that we is you, the community, need to help us work with the General Assembly to get the support that we need back to our community. It is very difficult for me to not support this, and I have been going back and forth, which is why I don't tell petitioners or anyone else where I'm going to land on any particular piece, but I do want to acknowledge and say thank you to the community for actually moving the needle

quite a distance, and getting more for the community than what was initially identified for the beginning of this process.

Councilmember Driggs said so, I don't see anybody else. I would just like to comment that I appreciate Councilmember Graham's engagement on behalf of his constituents and his reasoning arriving at the conclusion he has. My own experience over 12 years is that denials are exceedingly rare, and here we have a case where Zoning Committee approved 6-0, and staff recommends approval. So, I wouldn't advocate for approval of this, but I am not going to be on board with a denial for procedural reasons. I'd like to clarify also, this motion is a motion not to adopt the Zoning Committee's recommendation and to deny the petition, just so we're clear about that.

Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said this is simply the motion to deny. So, if that passes then you will adopt the inconsistency statement.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, so it's simply a motion to deny.

Councilmember Anderson said that was my point of information, that we typically have language when we do denials.

The vote was taken on the motion to deny and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Mazuera Arias, and Graham

Motion failed.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said now you can entertain a motion to defer or a motion to approve.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent from staff analysis based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as the Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed zoning of N2-B(CD) (Neighborhood 2-B, conditional) is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation. However, the site is abutting properties designated as the Community Activity Center, Commercial, and Neighborhood 2 Place Types by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed Neighborhood 2 zoning could provide a more appropriate transition to the adjacent Place Type designations than the current Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The proposed development is within a quarter-mile of Mountain Island Market Place shopping center which boasts a wide variety daily goods and services such as retail, restaurant, and financial institutions. The petitioner will contribute \$50,000 to be applied toward future intersections improvements at Rozelles Ferry Road and Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, enhancing access to and from the site. The site also abuts a Commercial Place Type, as designated by the 2040 Policy Map, at the intersection of Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and Rozzelles Ferry Road. The plan includes a 12-foot multi-use path along the site's frontage on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, connecting to existing sidewalks and crosswalks. This will allow residents to access daily needs such as retail, restaurants, fitness studios, and bus stops within a quarter-mile distance by walking or cycling. The site is located along the route of the CATS number 1 and 18 local bus providing transit access between the Callabridge Commons Walmart and the Charlotte Transportation Center (CTC) and the Rosa Parks Community Transit Center. As well as the 88x express bus providing commuter access to Uptown. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10-Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion The approval of this petition will revise the recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site, as modified.

Councilmember Johnson said this one's a challenging one, because you know I am an affordable housing advocate, but I think Councilmember Graham made a great point that location does still matter. You heard me talk about cumulative impact for years, and Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road is one of those places where we do have challenge with infrastructure and with that traffic. So, I appreciate the church and I appreciate also the concessions that were made by the petitioner, but also as a District Rep who's District overlaps Councilmember Graham's in many areas, I'm going to listen to the District Representative, and also take into consideration the traffic and the cumulative impact and the big picture, and I'm going to support the district rep in this case. So, I won't be supporting the petition.

Mr. Pettine said just to clarify that the motion made by Mayor Pro Tem Mitchell includes adoption of Zoning Committee's Consistency Statement as your own, just to clarify that.

Mr. Mitchell said yes.

Mr. Pettine said okay, thank you.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, and Owens

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Graham and Johnson

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 034-035.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: ORDINANCE NO. 1121-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-129 BY TRUE HOMES AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 5.05 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF WEST W.T. HARRIS BOULEVARD, EAST OF WEST SUGAR CREEK ROAD, AND NORTH OF BROOKSTONE DRIVE FROM INST(CD) (INSTITUTIONAL, CONDITIONAL) TON2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Millen) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Campus Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as the Campus Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed zoning of N2-B(CD) (Neighborhood 2-B, conditional) is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation. However, the site consists of an undeveloped portion of a parcel developed as a religious institution. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for residential development in Campus Place Type that supports the mission of the associated institution. The proposed development will provide housing at an attainable price point, committing to all residential dwelling units being reserved for households earning 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI). The rezoning would amend the 2040 Policy Map to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type, and the site has preferred Neighborhood 2 Place Type adjacencies including Commercial, Neighborhood 2, and Neighborhood 1 Place Types. The proposed rezoning to N2-B(CD) would allow additional residential units, expanding options in housing type and availability. The inclusion of affordable housing provisions may increase the supply of workforce housing, contributing to overall housing supply. The plan proposes live-work units that could provide small business opportunities for residents. The petition commits to enhanced open space standards that exceed ordinance requirements. The site is adjacent to a commercial area that includes daily needs such as retail stores, grocery stores, restaurants, personal services, and institutional uses. The petition could facilitate the following additional 2040

Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion may be facilitated by providing a mix of housing types such as quadraplexes, multi-family attached, and live-work units. 3: Housing Access for All may be facilitated by providing conditions that residential units will be offered for sale or lease to households earning 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) or below.

The petitioner made the following changes to the petition after the Zoning Committee vote. Therefore, the City Council must determine if the changes are substantial and if the petition should be referred back to the Zoning Committee for review.

1. Streetscape shown for future back-of-curb location along Brookstone Drive while existing curb location to remain. Brookstone Drive relabeled as Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual (CLDSM) standards U-05A1, Local Commercial Wide.
2. The option to develop Live-Work dwelling units on site was removed from the plan.

David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development said so that is no longer an option for construction of those units, so no live/work dwelling units are proposed on this plan after Zoning Committee's recommendation.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Owens, and carried unanimously not to refer back to the Zoning Committee.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to deny Petition No. 2025-129 by True Homes.

Councilmember Graham said this one is a tough one as well, certainly a lot closer to home as it relates to Petition 2025-129 by True Homes in District Two once again. Again, I would like to thank the congregation and the minister for really stepping forward and providing me information regarding this petition early on in the process. There were actually two community meetings, one that was somewhat well attended, but many of the residents in close proximity, i.e., the Mallard Grove Homeowners Association, and Brookstone Homeowners Association members as well, did not receive the initial notification about the community meeting. A second one was planned. Those neighborhoods were able to engage, and they too have strong concerns regarding the petition as it is written and amended tonight. Again, the residents are in favor of affordable housing, but yet this is another issue with the location of the site, not the purpose of the site. The site is on the intersection of West W.T. Harris Boulevard and East Sugar Creek. There's also an entrance into the Brookstone/Mallard Grove Neighborhood Associations from West Sugar Creek as well as Brookstone Drive, which is part of the problem with this petition. Both of those intersections are always clearly backed up with traffic as it exists today, both in the mornings, in the afternoon. Brookstone Drive, if this petition is approved, will certainly be a cut-through through the neighborhood of Brookstone and other dwellings along that drive.

There's a legitimate concern of parking on Brookstone Drive, and the community just over the last several months and years, Councilmember Johnson, worked extremely hard to eliminate parking of 18-wheelers on Brookstone Drive. So, this development's main entrance, one of two, will be on Brookstone Drive, driving traffic on that street and adding to the congestion that's already existing there as well. So, for those reasons as well as others, I am asking the Council to vote no based on traffic issues relating to that particular petition. Residents also continue to deal with congestion on West Sugar Creek and Brookstone Drive, as well as West Sugar Creek Road and Harris Boulevard. Adding more homes at this location will only make an already difficult situation worse. Again, many residents support affordable housing, but this is the wrong location and will intensify traffic and congestion at this intersection. For that reason, and others, I urge the Council to deny this petition. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said this one is even harder than the first one. First of all, thank you to University City United Methodist Church. I also live very, very close. You all do great work. I support the Boy Scouts, the cookout every year, and actually to be honest, I used to host a support group for loved ones of brain injury survivors in that church. That church is gracious. They do great work, and the developer does great work, but I would be curious, and I'm not asking for an answer, how many of the congregants live in the area? We have to listen to the residents, and I've been one to push for balanced infrastructure and too much development in Mallard Creek and W.T. Harris, and this is just not a great location. I appreciate the work that you all do. I appreciate again the work of the developers, but I'm going to support the District Rep on this one, and I ask him to support me, and you have. So, I think it's important that we stand together with the District Reps as Council members in order to raise the standard throughout the entire City as we're listening to our residents. So, I won't be supporting this, but it's not because I don't understand the great work and your intent, and then you have God on your sign, so we're like, but I'm a former realtor, and location does matter. So, I won't be supporting this. Thank you.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said I will support the District Rep on this one, because it is, if not almost, the exact scenario that we faced with Wilora Lake last time where location does matter, where density does matter, and traffic concerns do matter. I would love my colleagues to refer to state statute on zoning that I read earlier today, that if we're going to deny a rezoning, it is because it's not going to enhance or improve the quality of life of residents, particularly if it comes to traffic congestion and other obstacles that prohibit the quality of life for residents to improve. I can share that with you all after our meeting, but I will support the District Rep on this one as well. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said so, I would like to take the [inaudible] position on this. The concern I have is that this exemplifies in many respects exactly what it is we are trying to achieve, in terms of housing affordability, partnership with private investors, partnerships with churches. So, there are issues as there are in most locations, frankly. I think if we hold out to find a location where nobody is opposed, we're not going to get much done, and I'm concerned that by denying this or not approving this tonight, that we will discourage others who might want to follow True Homes example. True Homes is unusual, in that they actually help to achieve a structure like this with a soft equity financing component. So, they actively support it, the church supports it, we got a strong recommendation from Bishop Alexander, and other emails in support, as well as in opposition, but it just concerns me. Zoning Committee 6-0, staff approves, it aligns with our policies, and we are talking not only about failing to approve it, but denying it, and I'll repeat what I just said before. I think a denial is a rare outcome for us. If you look back over the history of Council votes, it is very uncommon that we actually actively deny; it's a slap. It would be sufficient if there isn't enough support for this to pass to just let it not pass, and express the lack of support from Council that way. Denial is kind of an act of hostility. I don't see a foundation for that given the engagement by True Homes and the church. So, on this occasion I can't agree with the District Rep, and I will be supporting the petition.

Councilmember Anderson said I definitely appreciate the District Rep's perspective, and listened to the comments being made. You know colleagues, I think this is an example of how some of our priorities become at odds with each other when it becomes time for execution. A couple of years ago, the Mayor stood up a Faith In Housing effort, specifically to address affordability to try and advance our housing stock, and tap into real estate that the City doesn't have control over, but allow our faith-based organizations to lend their land to help with workforce housing, housing for our first responders, teachers, and others. This is a great effort, and Ms. Mayfield has done a great job leading that charge for us, but this is another petition with under the Faith In Housing effort that we're discussing denying, even though it has successfully gone through our rezoning process and our Planning Committee has fully supported it. I understand the battle and the battle with the intersection of infrastructure, growth and concerns with affordability and increasing housing stock, but this particular petition, as an example if it were a case study, it would be a great case study of how a faith-based

organization is lending their land to not only advance housing stock and create additional housing stock, but specifically for workforce individuals who we say constantly that we want to ensure they have affordability within the City of Charlotte, so they don't have to live in another community, but then drive to work. We have tough decisions all the time. I know our decisions have impact on community and entities, but I think this is a great example if we were to look at this petition it would be a great case study of a Faith In Housing effort.

Councilmember Mayfield said so, as was noted, I've had the opportunity to lead our Faith In Housing initiative, not only lead it, honestly, work with staff and we built it from the ground up and identified what it would look like. I think there's a part of this conversation that I know I don't want to get lost, and that is, just because you can, doesn't mean it's always in the right location. So, we have churches throughout this City, and our religious community has been wonderful supporters. They were doing this work long before we identified the initiative and the policy language to help move us forward. Yet, at the same time, I've been saying now for over 12 years, if we want residents to be able to age in place and stay in place and have community and neighborhoods, then we need to be conscious of the decisions that we're making. Is this a great project? Yes, it is a great project. For this location? Not for me. In a different location, this would be an even better project.

When we look at the way our City has grown and the developments that we collectively have approved, there's some areas where more development has happened than in other parts of the City. We can say, well, it's due to cost. Well, a number of us have been around here for more than a decade, so we can see what we thought was going to happen in development many years ago, and what the reality of that is. The comments that came from community were reasonable from the residents, not just from the religious community. A lot of us don't attend the churches that's in our neighborhood. My church is 20-something minutes from where I live. I pass probably about five churches heading to my home church. When something's happening in the community, outside of showing up to volunteer, I'm not going to try to direct development, but when we have residents that send an email, as an example, to say I experience the day-to-day effects and will experience the day-to-day effects on this development on the community and the quality of life, when we are interested in building a city, not just for those who are moving into Charlotte, but those who have been here and who have invested and whose taxes has helped us to grow to this point.

I appreciate that the community and the religious community have come out to show support with their signs. I'm more concerned about the emails, the calls, the text messages that we have received from the residents, and it is difficult, because I just voted yes for a project because of concessions and things that were made and because of the type of product that it is, and I am going to be supporting Councilmember Graham on the no on this one. I do want us to be very clear. I am not here for any part of the conversation where just because you say well, it falls under Faith In Housing, that's an automatic check; that doesn't work for me. Anyone that has ever watched more than two meetings, much less the 10-plus years of me being on Council, knows that that isn't something that works for me. I need a good project. I need our religious community to come together. I need us to create the language, but I need to be in a location that is going to build a stronger neighborhood, not create additional challenges, especially when we have a North Carolina General Assembly creating language and potentially trying to create policy language where we're going to be tied in a tax rate and we're going to be locked in, and as we grow we're not going to be able to fund the infrastructure that is needed. I do want to be very clear that there is no version where it will be okay with me for you just to put a stamp that you created to say, well, this falls under Faith In Housing so we should move forward. It needs to be the right project in the right location that helps build community, not create additional infrastructure that we're going to have to later figure out how to fund in order to balance. Thank you.

Mr. Graham said I just want to reiterate that word choice matters, and just because a member or members request denial of a petition, that it is not hostile. It's based on what we're reading, what we're hearing. We are digesting the information, actually gone to

site and walked the site. A number of homework and action steps are taken before I or any other members ask for a denial; it's not a hostile act.

Secondly, I think Ms. Mayfield's correct, and just because, who can be against Faith In Housing? It's an initiative. You can be against the location of the Faith In Housing project, and I am against the location of the Faith In Housing project for this particular petition. West Sugar Creek and Brookstone is a congested intersection going into a neighborhood. Less than a block down, West Sugar Creek and Harris Boulevard is congested as well. The entrance to this project is on Brookstone. While it may fit nice on that intersection, it will devastate the incoming traffic going to the community and creating yet a thoroughfare through the community. Great initiative, great project, wrong location. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you, Councilmember Graham, for that clarification. This is not a hostile decision, nor is it a slap for us to oppose a petition. Our residents expect us to thoughtfully consider each petition. So, another thing I do want to add, and Councilmember J.D., you've got a lot of props, if you will, for talking about that affordable housing in District Five last month, and I know we're not going to talk about it, but one of the things you talked about was location. We have to build communities in our City in locations and consider that. So, when we talk about affordability and affordable housing, we have to be considerate of the big picture. University City, and if you've led District Four, I think you did, Councilmember Mitchell, years ago, our residents have been asking for a restaurant, a sit-down restaurant for years. We don't get sit-down restaurants, because we're told that we don't have the income requirements or it's not an ideal area. We have a wonderful piece of property in District Four that would be ideal for a sit-down restaurant, but you know what's going to go there, a hair supply store. So, we have to be cognizant of how we're growing our areas, and this an opportunity to take a look at that. Again, it's a great project, I support affordability, but we've got to look at this from a cumulative perspective, from a location perspective, and this is just not the right fit for that area. Thank you.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said I'd like to echo what my colleagues are saying. I sincerely, generally think this is not a hostile denial. I think that really sets us up for failure for future partnerships. I think Councilmember Graham is very correct in terms of location. I also think that sometimes our priorities might be at odds, because policy is more complex than putting numbers and attaching it to people. Lived experiences also matter. The quality of life that people experience every single day also matters. It's not black and white. There's definitely a lot of gray area that needs to be interpreted, and if you're on the ground and if you're talking to community day in and day out, you'll understand that it's not just policy or policy wonkiness or just attaching numbers to people and saying, just because this is an initiative we have to go for it; it's the lives of people. I don't know if my colleagues know this, but we received overwhelming letters of opposition of residents who live in this neighborhood. With all due respect, I love staff, we weren't elected by Zoning staff, we weren't elected by the Zoning Committee, we weren't elected by bureaucracy. We were elected by the residents and constituents of the City of Charlotte, and we should listen to the residents and constituents of the City of Charlotte, and right now, overwhelmingly, our inboxes are filled. So, what is representative democracy if we're not listening to the people that elected in these seats to begin with.

The vote was taken on the motion to deny and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Graham, Johnson, Mazuera Arias, and Mayfield

Motion failed.

Mr. Driggs said alright so that fails, therefore we go back to a motion to approve?

Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said either a motion to approve or a motion to defer.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs, to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Campus Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as the Campus Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed zoning of N2-B(CD) (Neighborhood 2-B, conditional) is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation. However, the site consists of an undeveloped portion of a parcel developed as a religious institution. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for residential development in Campus Place Type that supports the mission of the associated institution. The proposed development will provide housing at an attainable price point, committing to all residential dwelling units being reserved for households earning 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI). The rezoning would amend the 2040 Policy Map to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type, and the site has preferred Neighborhood 2 Place Type adjacencies including Commercial, Neighborhood 2, and Neighborhood 1 Place Types. The proposed rezoning to N2-B(CD) would allow additional residential units, expanding options in housing type and availability. The inclusion of affordable housing provisions may increase the supply of workforce housing, contributing to overall housing supply. The plan proposes live-work units that could provide small business opportunities for residents. The petition commits to enhanced open space standards that exceed ordinance requirements. The site is adjacent to a commercial area that includes daily needs such as retail stores, grocery stores, restaurants, personal services, and institutional uses. The petition could facilitate the following additional 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion may be facilitated by providing a mix of housing types such as quadrplexes, multi-family attached, and live-work units. 3: Housing Access for All may be facilitated by providing conditions that residential units will be offered for sale or lease to households earning 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) or below, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Mayo, Mitchell, and Owens

NAYS: Councilmembers Graham, Johnson, Mazuera Arias, and Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 69, at Page(s) 036-037.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 17: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-077 BY SHORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.52 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF NORTH WENDOVER ROAD, NORTH OF CHURCHILL ROAD, AND EAST OF WENDOVER HILL COURT FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Councilmember Driggs declared the hearing open.

Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development said thank you, Council. 2025-077 is a 2.52-acre site, located along the north side of North Wendover Road, east of Randolph Road. The plan proposes the development of up to 40 multi-family townhomes on a vacant lot. The site is currently zoned N-1A. The proposed zoning is N-2A(CD). The plan is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. This proposal calls for the development up to 40 townhome units. A 12-foot multi-use path with eight-foot planting strip will be installed along North Wendover. All units fronting North Wendover will have direct pedestrian

connections to the sidewalk. A 10-foot Class C buffer planted to Class B landscape yard standards is provided where abutting the Neighborhood-1 Place Type, with an increased 15-foot setback along the western boundary next to the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. Buildings abutting the street will be limited to a maximum of five units per building, building height is capped at 48 feet, and vinyl is prohibited as a primary exterior material.

While the plan is not in alignment with the Policy Map, it is consistent with the goals and policies of the South Middle Community Area Plan. The Community Area Plans provide information that staff uses to determine consistency with the plan, and specific criteria to recommend minor map amendments to the Policy Map. This plan meets minor map amendment criteria to update the Policy Map from the Neighborhood-1 Place Type to the Neighborhood-2 Place Type. This criteria includes exceeding the minimum required acreage when combined with existing developments abutting the site, preferred Place Type adjacencies, so Place Types that are in the area of this site, which include Neighborhood-2, Campus and Commercial, and the site is located on an arterial road. It has proximity to transit, and it's located in a housing gap as identified by the comprehensive plan. The plan could help facilitate the Community Area Plan priority goals one and two, 10-minute neighborhoods and neighborhood diversity and inclusion.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation, environment, and site and building design. As the proposed N-2 Zoning is compatible with the surrounding residential, commercial and institutional uses, it's located along North Wendover Road, which supports the comp plan goal for placing multi-family housing along arterial roads with transit access. The site is adjacent to existing multi-family developments. It's within half a mile of Wendover Plaza offering convenient access to daily needs and services, and I'm happy to take any questions following the petitioner's presentation.

Paul Pennell, 1213 West Morehead Street, Suite 450 said thank you, Councilmember Driggs. City Council, Mayor Pro Tem, thank you for the moment this evening to present Zoning Petition 2025-077. I am Paul Pennell, representing Kyle Short of Short Development for a petition generally located at 600 North Wendover. Just a few slides here. I think we're probably going to be heavy on questions after this, so I'm going to leave a lot of our time for that process after we're all done with our presentations. Just a little bit of reference as to the location of the site along North Wendover. It's approximately a half a mile to the east of Randolph Road.

A little bit about the current development pattern within the area, a lot of N-2 and UR-2(CD). There is a predominate N-1 District with a lot of single-family detached neighborhoods, existing well-established N-1 neighborhoods to our south. Then also across North Wendover a few years ago, there was a quite dense townhome community that was proposed, went through a rezoning process, and it's well established today. So, it's directly adjacent our site, and to the east there is an older multi-family stacked project as well. So, the current rezoning plan, there's still some work to do as Maxx had previously alluded to, but we're happy to continue to work with the community and adjacent neighbors through that. I believe Council may have a few questions tonight regarding topography, and then also pedestrian safety along North Wendover. We can certainly talk about that, and earlier when we had our community meeting on December 6, 2025, there were some questions regarding topography and stormwater environmental impacts as well.

The next slide here that we've provided community members and wanted to include in our presentation tonight, shows a lot of that topography and how it will be addressed on site. The three-story townhomes, which are being proposed here along Wendover would be a two-story townhome fronting the right-of-way, and it would be a basement park below, so that's one way that we're planning on addressing some pretty severe topography on site as well. The townhomes in the rear would be a full three-story product, but in doing that we're able to include that basement parking for the units along Wendover. We're actually able to kind of tuck these units in a little better than if they were a full three-story product fronting Wendover. We have done a grading study. We

have provided that grading study to adjacent neighbors. We do think that there will be a need for some walls on site, but not as extensive as we had originally thought during our community meeting back in December 2025. There are some areas of parking on site, some surface parking, 11 parking spaces. Those parking spaces will likely be the primary location for a retaining wall on site. They will probably be about five to six feet tall.

Stoops along the back of the townhomes, those stoops would also help to make up the remaining grade on site, so there's an opportunity for stoops to be raised up fairly high, four feet approximately, and those townhomes would front the green space, the existing stream on site as well. Also, with this cross-section elevation illustrative, we wanted to show the proximity of the proposed townhomes to the existing single-family homes that are within the community to the south. Those distances range from approximately 230 to 260 linear feet, and they are separated by a stream buffer that will remain. With that, I know I have plenty of time left, approximately five minutes left, but I'll go ahead and wrap up the presentation here, I'll let the community speak and have their presentation, and then we can go into some questions.

Mr. Driggs said you're not actually required to use all your time, so we appreciate that.

Mr. Pennell said you're welcome.

Andrew Trifan, 4021 Churchill Road said good evening members of City Council. My name is Andrew Trifan, and I've been a resident on Churchill Road in the Cotswold neighborhood for the past nine years. I'm here today on behalf of many of my neighbors who share serious concerns about the proposed high-density development along Wendover Road. Over the years, traffic on Wendover Road, like throughout the City, has increased substantially. This is not just an inconvenience; it's become a growing safety issue. The proposed development is located just beyond a sharp curve in the road, a stretch where visibility is limited and where unfortunately speed limits are not always observed. This creates a dangerous situation as drivers often have very little time to react. Many of us have witnessed accidents along this stretch over the years. To better understand the extent of the issue, we requested public data from NC-DOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation) for this section between Randolph and Marvin Roads. From 2021 through January of 2026, there have been approximately 162 reported accidents within this three-quarter mile stretch. Of those, around 65 involved injuries, fortunately no fatalities, and just under 100 resulted in property damage with an overall monetary amount of about \$1.3 million. This averages to roughly 30 accidents a year. This data is available for you to review. I'm also happy to forward several other links to articles involving traffic accidents over the last few months, some significant enough to have made the news. I can also provide information on several accidents that have just happened over the last few weeks on our street. Our concern is that introducing a high-density development in this location will significantly increase traffic entering and exiting onto an already hazardous roadway.

It's worth noting that back in 2016, pre-staff analysis on Rezoning Petition 111 had identified Wendover Road as heavily trafficked. We believe that the 2040 Plan had taken this into consideration when it continued to have this area zoned as N-1. The proposal here includes just two access points, both directly onto Wendover Road. In contrast, the development across the street has multiple points of access on different roads for vehicles to enter not just forcing all the traffic onto Wendover Road. The other nearby mentioned developments are also positioned farther from the curb or located near signalized intersections. We understand there could be up to 90 parking spaces associated with this development. Concentrating that volume of traffic into these limited access points along a dangerous stretch of road raises serious safety concerns, not only for our residents, but for all commuters who use this road each day. I believe I can safely speak for all my neighbors that even now attempting to cross Wendover from our exit on Churchill Road can be extremely difficult during peak hours due to the constant flow of traffic in both directions.

To be clear, our position is not one of outright opposition to development, rather we believe any development should be consistent with the character and safety of the surrounding neighborhood. Developing this parcel under its current zoning, which will result in significantly fewer vehicles, could help mitigate the risk of additional accidents compared to a higher-density project of this scale. At a time when traffic safety and responsible growth are critical priorities for our city, we respectfully ask that you consider the wellbeing of both current and future residents as well as all Charlotte commuters who take this heavily driven portion of Route 4 each day. We urge you to reject the proposed rezoning in its current form and encourage a lower-density alternative that better aligns with the safety needs of this corridor. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Marc McManeus, 4033 Churchill Road said hi, Council. I'm Marc McManeus. I'm a native Charlottean. I've lived my whole life here, really love the City and love to see the growth that's happening here. I've got geezer glasses on because of my age, so I'm going to do the same thing and read this. In 2015, I stood before the Council asking them to vote no on a development plan similar to the one before us today. Very few things have changed in the 11 years since that Council voted unanimously to deny the rezoning petition. In fact, the few things that have changed were against the petitioner. This time we have far less detail in the plan than we did before. Their plan does not comply with the City's 2040 Plan. Their plan does not comply with the City's tree save minimums. In fact, out of the 44 compliance items the City staff has listed for this zoning petition, Short Development has failed to adhere to 21 of them. Almost half the items listed, the petitioner has failed to comply on.

Our neighbor, Kelly Strickland, who's up here with us today, has pointed out in light of the new UDO's (Unified Development Ordinance) adherence to the intent reflected by the setback shown on the original subdivision plat maps, which I have and can leave for you all to review, is the original intent of the subdivision itself. The original subdivision map does not depict the subject property or the proposed developments as original lots, and it certainly does not reflect an intent for multi-family development along Wendover Road. Another neighbor who couldn't make it, Phillip and Molly James, they asked a pretty succinct question, "Why approve a rezoning petition when the developer has not demonstrated an ability to honor standards?" So, yes, with Charlotte's growth, we need more housing, and single-family homes are still the best use for this land and is consistent with Charlotte's 2040 Plan. Let's tap the brakes on some of these questionable precedent-setting rezoning requests. I sure do appreciate that time.

Justin Jones, 4017 Churchill Road said hi. I have only nice things to say about Paul. I've spoken with him a lot. He's personable, professional, I've learned a lot from him, and he's been good about sharing information. The developer, on the other hand, has not demonstrated any desire to communicate with the neighbors. I don't think that the developer really cares about the neighborhood. I don't think that the developer cares about the impact of traffic and public safety on Wendover. I don't think that the developer cares if the future residents of this housing can easily and safely make turns in and out of their new homes. I don't think the developer is interested in developing more affordable housing for Charlotte. These start at \$600,000, and every decision I've heard about is based on market forces. I believe that these may be expanded from 20-foot to 24-foot buildings. I think the height of two stories to three stories are all based on market considerations, and not considerations for any of the aforementioned areas of concern. I don't blame a developer for seeing it that way. It's not their job to care about those things necessarily, although, I certainly respect developers who are members of the neighborhoods that they develop in, and take those things into account, but it's my job to care, and I think it's your job to care too, and make wise decisions about this when a developer trying to maximize profits oversteps what is reasonable.

Councilmember Owens was generous with her time to visit the site with us, and we live next to the site. I can see it from my backyard. I can see it when I drive on Wendover. If any of you would like to see it as well, I invite you to come. We'd be glad to take you to see it. From a top-down view, it seems like you could build this. In a three-dimensional

view, there are severe challenges to the terrain, slope, the water stream going through, the money that Charlotte has invested into that waterway.

I think there's some comparisons to the things across the street, which technically I believe are in a separate 2040 area, if I'm not mistaken, but briefly when comparing the apartments across the street, I have a few notes, the recent reports make a comparison to the existing townhomes across Wendover. These are built on a larger parcel of land, they have a nice open space in the middle that's accessible to all the apartments, all the units, unlike this. It's built on flat terrain. Most of the neighboring properties are community service, such as Atrium Health Medical Campuses. The residents of these townhomes also have a similar right turn only exit onto Wendover, but are also served by a separate exit onto Billingsley Road, which leads to a traffic light on Randolph where they can safely enter and exit their neighborhood. The impact on Wendover traffic is apples to oranges comparison. I think a lot of comparisons across the street are apples to oranges. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have about that as well.

This has always been zoned for N-1 single family. That's what makes sense to build on this in my opinion, and I think I would be interested, as you examine the actual terrain, if you agree. We would welcome single-family development. In 2016, there was another petition to change this from N-1 to N-2, and that petition was unanimously denied by the City Council at the time. This proposal is nearly identical, but substantially similar to that proposal, and I hope that when you examine it, you may reach the same conclusion. I think this developer bought the properties at a good price from the developer who failed to get them upzoned, and when we moved to our house three years ago, my wife and I wondered what might go in here. We looked at the website for Kyle Short, and if you look at it today, I believe it still says there are five to 10 single-family homes planned to go in here. When we asked them December 6, 2025, whether that was being considered, they said it's not being considered at all. I hope this developer has their petition denied and I hope they sell it to someone who will build single-family homes or he decides to build single-family homes. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Pennell said I won't take the full two minutes, but it is true that the City of Charlotte traffic has gotten greater in the last few years, and in fact Wendover Road is referred to as Route 4, as we all know, and in fact I lived in a townhome directly adjacent Route 4 that fronted on this road. So, I'm very intimately familiar with what it's like to live in a townhome community not all that different than what's being proposed here, and look out my window and see a lot of cars and traffic and be concerned with that. Good development is about being creative with the land that you have provided and that's left in the City of Charlotte. As we have grown, flat parcels of land, which were right across the street are few and far between, and we're focused on trying to come up with creative solutions for good housing for people that want to live in this City. I welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the community. I'm happy to discuss the 21-point plan that was just referenced, or the 21 points that are concerns or problems with this petition, and we can go through those line by line with the community and work through this diligently. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said well, first, I agree with one of the public speakers who said Paul is great to work with. He definitely is. I've enjoyed working with you, Paul. A couple of questions for staff. So, one of the speakers mentioned that there have been accidents that have happened near this site. Is this part of the high-injury network?

Mr. Oliver said I'm getting notice from our C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) colleagues, it is not part of the high-injury network.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, other question I have in terms of the height. Do we have a picture? What is the view like from the neighboring home in terms of the height? I want to see if it will be towering over other homes.

Mr. Oliver said I believe the petitioner had an exhibit that could demonstrate that.

pti:pk

Mr. Pennell said so, the townhome product would be a three-story product. The units that are fronting on Wendover would not address Wendover as a full three stories. It would address Wendover as a two-story product, and then you would pull into the community from Wendover, go down a hill essentially to access a rear basement that would be tucked beneath the third story. So, essentially, the first story would be accessed from the alley, and then two stories above that would be the two stories that front on Wendover. So, essentially, it would still follow the same three-story pattern of townhomes, but in that instance the first floor would be a tuck-under basement. Then, the units that are adjacent, the natural area, the creek in the back, those would be a full three-story product.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so it's different heights depending on what part of the site it is on. So, my question is, if we can go back to the site, is this the site design? So, these are all homes right adjacent to the site? These are all single-family homes, correct?

Mr. Pennell said those are all single-family homes, all approximately 230 to 260 feet away from the townhomes in the rear.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, I'm interested in seeing what the view will look like for the single-family homes if they're looking at these townhomes.

Mr. Pennell said let's see here. So, we tried to illustrate that with these three cross sections, and in the top right-hand corner there's a site plan with the three cross sections and where they're located on site, and I'm happy to share this presentation with you as well, and this exhibit so you can better understand it. Generally speaking, there's quite a lot of natural area between the townhomes that are being proposed and the existing single-family homes to the south of the development.

Ms. Ajmera said so, what's that buffer like?

Mr. Pennell said well, the buffer itself I believe it's a 25-foot PCO (Post-Construction Ordinance) buffer, so it'll be 25 feet on both sides of the stream. We are trying to protect as much of that as possible. There is actually a comment that has come in from City staff requesting that we increase a setback along Wendover. We would like to have further discussion about that, because the more that we push these townhomes away from Wendover, the more we encroach into that natural area. So, there's a fine balancing act there on how are we going to protect those natural areas, keep the viewshed between the single-family homes and these townhomes. So, there's some more work that has to be done here with staff.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, knowing that there are single-family homes nearby, there certainly needs to be a smoother transition, because townhomes are definitely a greater density in terms of intensity. So, there needs to be a way where we are introducing density at a gradual level. I know you mentioned about 21 points?

Mr. Pennell said one of the speakers tonight had mentioned that there were 21 points how this petition is not complying. Hopefully we can coordinate with them, so I can better understand what those 21 points are.

Ms. Ajmera said so, was that Mr. Trifan?

Mr. McManeus said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, could you please come down and talk about your 21 points, and obviously we don't have a lot of time, because I want to be mindful of everyone's time. If you could just summarize and then provide us a copy of the 21 points.

Mr. McManeus said so it's actually online. I just went out and looked at the petition, and what the City had given back, they have in red circled the areas that are in noncompliance. There are 44 total points, and 21 of those points are circled in red and they include some pretty significant stuff.

Ms. Ajmera said oh, that's just staff's assessment?

Mr. McManeus said that's just staff, yes.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, but I mean with the staff's assessment, even if it was approved they still have to address those 21 points.

Mr. Oliver said currently, as mentioned in the presentation, there are some outstanding issues, and they come from C-DOT that have to be addressed. There's also a couple Urban Forestry outstanding issues, as well as a few asks from Entitlement Services, the rezoning group. When a plan is going to public hearing, they tend to be fairly minor, like most of it is just for additional clarification. For example, one of the Urban Forestry's comments was regarding showing the location of the tree save area, so not necessarily a matter that they're not providing the tree save, it's a matter that they're not showing it in a way that's clear and we need to address that prior to decision. For rezonings they're just requesting entitlements, so there's a certain maximum level of development that could be achieved, and if it was to be approved and they go to permitting, they have to comply with every standard of the UDO, which includes things like zoning requirements, like setbacks and landscape yards, and also stormwater ordinance, street requirements, that sort of thing.

Ms. Ajmera said if this was to get approved, they still have to comply with all of this [inaudible].

Ms. McManeus said would've like to have seen that done before the hearing, that would've been fair to us, I believe.

Ms. Ajmera said I hear what you're saying. Mr. Pennell, I have confidence in your ability that we will work with the community and the petitioner to have some sort of consensus here, and I know Councilmember Owens will definitely work on this, but I really hope that in next month there is some sort of decision where the community and the petitioner agrees on, so we don't have to pick a side. Thank you.

Mr. Pennell said thank you all.

Councilmember Mayo said yes, thank you. I had a bit of a question about some of the buffers. Paul, you're planning for that to be undisturbed, so just thinking as the residents, single-family, and then having these townhomes kind of adjacent to them, have you all committed to that?

Mr. Pennell said we can certainly make those commitments, that's the intent, because we believe that the natural space is good for both of these communities, for the townhome community that's proposed here and for the single-family that's lived adjacent this for so many years.

Ms. Mayo said I think that would be a great addition. I hope that you'll work with staff on that, so that it is very clear in the language if this is to pass, that there is some real buffer and I think leaving the area undisturbed with the trees. This is something I've been talking to Steeleberry Acres a lot about. They had a buffer, but it was not undisturbed, and then you're planting these little trees there, that doesn't feel like a buffer to me. So, hoping that we're getting ahead and thinking through some of these things before we are approving things.

Mr. Pennell said we can certainly do that.

Councilmember Owens said thank you. So, it's already been spoken into the room that I did go out and meet with the neighbors and luckily had my boots on and went tromping through the woods. I will say that a couple of things that I take away, from both that exchange and then looking at what we've got here, is a real concern around the grade of the building and the changes that are going to be necessary. It was a pretty steep slope down into there, and when you're envisaging coming up out of that

development, and God forbid you should try to make a left-hand turn, hopefully we're already looking at some restrictions that would make that right-in/right-out, but coming up you really don't have visibility, and the proximity of that curve is something that has not really been changed, and so that does give me pause. I am, as you can see from some of the folks tonight, particularly supportive of dense housing. I think I made that very abundantly clear to the neighbors that I don't necessarily think that this is only a single-family house situation, but it may well be a bit less dense than what you've got there, particularly if we are looking at what I think you've said, or what the Entitlement Services has suggested with a 55-foot setback at the front. That really does begin to give me some pause about what that looks like for that buffered area, and the distinctions that are going to be made between that area and the creek, and just some of the infrastructure that is going to be necessary to really bring that grade and address what I think is going to be a whole lot of runoff. So, I do have some concerns. I'm appreciative of everybody who's come out, and again, I guess I would throw out to you, are we wedded to this 55 feet from Wendover Road?

Mr. Oliver said we're not wedded to the 55 feet, specifically, but we do want to work with the petitioner to ensure that there's an adequate amount of setback. They're of course meeting the minimum standards, and they will have to meet the standards of the UDO, but we'll certainly continue to work with them to make sure that we get a design that's safe and attractive.

Ms. Owens said and while I do appreciate the one that's up on the screen that shows sort of a cross section, I really would love to appreciate from the developer what you see as grade improvements that are going to be necessary for you to do the vision that you've got out there. This doesn't really capture that for me, so I'm hopeful that can be shared with the neighbors, because I think that is something that was consistent in their comments, both tonight and their comments to me. Thank you.

Mr. Oliver said okay, thank you.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said staff, have we calculated the trips this would add?

Mr. Oliver said yes, there's trip gen included in the staff analysis. So, with the 40 units proposed it would be 182 trips per day under the proposed zoning, existing zoning would be 87 per day, so an increase of approximately 100 trips per day.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said 100 trips per day, and do we know if this intersection particularly has been tracked through our Vision Zero data? Is it part of a high-injury network?

Mr. Oliver said it is not part of the high-injury network. There are two intersections proposed, so there's one that's more easterly, it's a right-in/right-out only that aligns with the northern development that's right-in/right-out, and they're where you get a little bit clearer view, straighter section of road, more room, you have a left turn potential.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said cool, thank you. Councilmember Owens, this is like right near the border of our district, so if there's anything we can do to work together in terms of alleviating that congestion, and particularly those left turns that are pretty dangerous. That area is very congested. There's commercial as well there that has been made. You have a Starbucks, a Chick-fil-A, a Food Lion in that area, and so whatever I can do to help with this petition in terms of getting more community benefits, let me know.

Ms. Owens said I appreciate that. I just also will say having been there out at the site, I am really appreciative of road signage and things that we do try to encourage our drivers to adhere. While I was out with these gentlemen, I must have seen three people go ahead and make a left turn, even though it says right turn only. So, there's a certain amount of me that does want us to be very thoughtful about further enhancing some of the engineering that we do, so that we are not relying only on people doing what they're told to do, but also making it a tad more difficult to do the wrong thing and put themselves in harm's way. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said so, if there's no further comment, do I have a motion to close the hearing?

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2026-003 BY SLRH ACQUISITIONS, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.84 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF PROVIDENCE ROAD, NORTH OF FENTON PLACE, AND SOUTH OF CHEROKEE ROAD FROM OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).

Councilmember Driggs declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development this site is part of a split-zoned parcel. The rezoning area itself is under an acre, located along the north side of Fenton Place. It is currently zoned Office Flex Campus, and they are proposing to go to Neighborhood Center, Conditional. Just for context, I do just want to add that the Office Flex Campus District versus Neighborhood Center District is pretty similar in terms of scale, when you think about the entitlements that they could go both upwards of 80 feet in height if you use the bonus provisions, but differ in uses. Office Flex Campus is really geared towards those campus and institutional type uses, whereas Neighborhood Center is for a broader range of activity center type uses. It is recommended for the Neighborhood Center Place Type on the Policy Map, so this proposal would be in alignment with that, and the proposal itself identifies some development standards. They note that the proposed uses on the site would include multi-family stacked residential and commercial uses, and those commercial uses permitted in the NC District could include office, retail, restaurant, bar, personal service, and fitness uses or other NC uses.

Parking would be at the ground floor or within subterranean levels. Portions of the structured parking at the ground floor level may be above grade only when screened from shared property lines with landscaping walls or similar treatments. They also note some setback conditions, so they have increased setbacks for rear and side setbacks along the rezoning area, and they also propose a 10-foot-wide Class C landscape yard with fencing, and this is within the South Inner Community Area Plan. It is in alignment with that Policy Map recommendation, as I noted. In terms of the priority goals that it could be facilitating, it could further priority goal number two for neighborhood diversity and inclusion, because it could offer a range of housing uses and that could contribute to neighborhood diversity in the area. It could also facilitate goal one, 10-minute neighborhoods, by allowing a mix of uses in the area that could create more goods and services near the established neighborhoods that we have along that corridor.

Staff does recommend approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues, just a couple of minor ones related to site and building design, as well as their requested technical revision. The site is located within a Neighborhood Activity Center on the 2040 Policy Map, and the petition zoning request would allow entitlements that are consistent with the goals and intent of a Neighborhood Center. The conditions of the plan note what mix of uses may occur on the site and enhanced [inaudible] setbacks that are being committed to, and a condition for underground parking. The site is currently underutilized as surface parking, and the existing OFC Zoning is more limited to campus activities rather than a fuller range of activity center uses. I'll be happy to take questions following petitioner comments.

Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700 said good evening, Mr. Driggs, members of Council, and members of the Zoning Committee. Bridget Grant, Land Use Consultant with Moore & Van Allen. I'm pleased to be here tonight with Jeff Brown, my

colleague, as well as representatives from StreetLights Residential, as well as Eastern Federal. We appreciate staff's detailed presentation, and as you know I'm accustomed to giving short presentations when we have staff support, and no speakers in opposition. So, I'm just going to hit on a couple highlights. This one's a little more unique, because it's more of a technical alignment rezoning. We aren't seeking any deviations in the permitted height or setbacks or deviations on the uses that are generally permitted broadly across the site. By rezoning our back portion of the site to NC, we're able to put residential units where there's currently only allowed to be parking for residential uses.

Holly hit most of this, so I'm going to jump to this slide. This really does a lot to describe the majority of what's happening on the site. So, we have 2.77 acres that are currently zoned CG under the UDO. It allows multi-family stacked, but when you develop multi-family you follow Neighborhood Center design standards, which are a higher level of standard. The back 0.84 acres is zoned to OFC, so that doesn't allow us to zone the site with unified design standards. By rezoning that back portion to NC, we're able to do unified higher-level design standards across the site, which is why we're only seeking to rezone that back portion of the site. We had extensive community engagement throughout this process. We're pleased to say that we will continue to collaborate with the community. I will say we left you a number of letters for your consideration and review that we received from community members, and with that we're happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Owens said so, thank you for that, I appreciate it. Apart from a number of community members who have some concerns that I'm certain have been escalated to you, I just want to park on those for a little bit. No pun intended when I say park on those. Squirrel Park, which is across the street, there's a lot of anxiety that I will communicate around future widening of Providence Road. I think there's a deep appreciation for the fact that Providence Road, an NC-DOT road, is not really a great commute experience for many folks. I am unaware of any immediate plans to widen it, but the concern that has been expressed to me is around the bounds of this construction. I do get that it's a split-zoning, and so we're really talking about the front of the project and not the back, but just writ large I think there's a concern that going forward if it is widened it would take a really substantive portion of Squirrel Park. Do you have any thoughts on that? I appreciate that you're trying to rezone the back and not the front, but can you speak to that?

Ms. Grant said you're correct, and there aren't any road widening plans to my knowledge either. I think C-DOT can speak to that. We've been collaborating with both C-DOT and NC-D as part of this preliminary process, and we're going to continue to collaborate with the representatives for Squirrel Park as well.

Ms. Owens said okay, thank you, I appreciate that. One of the other concerns that has been raised is around the character of the building, the façade, the sorts of things that would be done. I know that this has not been designated as a historical property, but can you speak some to the intentions with respect to what this project will look like? I know you've not done a site plan, so I don't think there's much of a visual.

Ms. Grant said we don't have the visual assigned with this, because we are only talking about rezoning the back portion of the site. That said, we've spent a good bit of time with our architecture and design team talking about elements, and I believe you may have received an updated letter from Stewart Gray with some of the considerations we're looking into as we look at the overall architectural character and how we can incorporate some of the site's history into future redevelopment of the site, and that's going to continue to evolve as we navigate through both this rezoning process and the land development process. I know we signed up all of our speakers, so if any of my team would like to join me, they're welcome to, if there's anything I'm not hitting.

Ms. Owens said okay. So, one other comment that I just to again put out into room is concerns from the neighbors with respect to the impact on this already very crowded

corridor. Can you speak a bit to ingress/egress? What the plans are with respect to access along ancillary roads or what's the in and out strategy here?

Ms. Grant said absolutely. So, I think anyone who has been to this site or any part of the site knows that there are about 11 curb cuts into the site, kind of hard to distinguish what's a curb cut and what's not when you're trying to get onto Providence Road. So, we're going to be reducing the number of curb cuts and access onto Providence. We're intentionally looking at one access point off of Providence, and our other access points will be off of Fenton and Cherokee. Again, though this whole site isn't going through rezoning, we've had conversations with C-DOT to really look at how we can improve circulation from the site and make it better than what it is today.

Ms. Owens said okay. I probably can answer my own question, but is there any appetite to bring this entire thing in, so that the community has a greater sense? I appreciate that you don't have to, but I also appreciate that it's very hard to really envision what this will look like without a bit more of a sense of the entire site.

Ms. Grant said I think one of the unique things about the UDO, and just from my experience and working both on the staff side and on the private side, was that the UDO increased the design standards significantly in terms of the amount of clear glass that would be required on the ground floor, where our access points were, where pedestrians would enter at the site. So, we were really relying on the strength of the UDO when it comes to design standards to implement it, and that's one of the reasons why we weren't sure what else would go into the site.

Ms. Owens said well, I will finally share that the neighbors that I've talked to are very concerned about this project and about it setting the standard for what else happens on Providence Road, and so I'm hopeful that there's continued engagement with them in a really deep and meaningful way.

Ms. Grant said absolutely, and I will say we have continued to meet with them, and we have shared preliminary concepts, and I believe we'll continue to do that.

Ms. Owens said okay, thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said so, I wanted to follow up, to Ms. Owens' point. This is not a conventional, this is a conditional request?

Ms. Grant said Tier 1 conditional, so there are notes.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, I'm trying to picture the site. So, this is the Panera right in the front. So, is this taking the parking in the back?

Ms. Grant said the rezoning is limited to the area that's identified as OFC on the site, and that's the back parking lot behind the Manor Theatre. The ultimate redevelopment of the site will be both the CG and the OFC portions of the site. The CG portion already is zoned to require NC standards for us to do a mix of residential and ground floor retail uses in that location. The OFC portion of the site would allow us to do structured parking without changing the zoning. We believe it's better for us to have residential units with at-grade or subterranean parking in that location in proximity to the adjacent residential that's there.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. Yes, I mean parking is an issue when I have had meetings at that location, especially in the front. Well, I look forward to seeing more in coming weeks, but that's all I have. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said so I just want to point out, Ms. Owens, there's a 2055 MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) that schedules all of the [inaudible], so you'll be able to see in there, and since I have a shared concern about Providence Road all the way down in my District, I can tell you it's not soon. I think you can probably answer that question.

pti:pk

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-128 BY AREG US OPP IV SHOPTON RD HOLDCO LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 15.16 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF SHOPTON ROAD, EAST OF STONECLIFF ROAD, AND WEST OF I-485 FROM BP(CD) (BUSINESS PARK, CONDITIONAL) TO N2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

Councilmember Driggs declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just over 15 acres, north of Shopton Road, just north also of our Charlotte Premium Outlets, in an area where we have a range of multi-family housing directly to the west of this site, some single-family housing, and quite a bit of vacant land, in addition to some activity center uses. The current zoning is Business Park, Conditional. That's from a 2001 conditional plan that called for an office park on this site. They are proposing to go to Neighborhood-2B, Conditional. That is partially in alignment and partially out of alignment with the 2040 Policy Map. So, as you'll see here, a portion of the map does call for Neighborhood-2 on the site, so that's where it'd be in alignment, and then a portion of the Policy Map does call for Commercial Place Type and that's where it'd be out of alignment. The proposal itself does include in site plan, so it calls for up to 330 multi-family units on the site. They also note that they are coordinating with Park and Recreation for access easement on the site for a future connection to Berewick Park. Notes some transportation improvements including upgrading sidewalk and planting strips, and also would provide a separated bike facility along Shopton Road, and they also note some offsite transportation improvements as identified in their traffic impact study. They also identify open space areas and some enhancements that would occur in those areas per our preferred standards that we have in the rezoning process.

The site is within the West Outer Community Area Plan. Like I said, it's not in alignment with the recommendation for the Commercial Place Type, but in alignment with the Neighborhood-2 Place Type for a small portion of the site. In terms of the priority goals for the West Outer Community Area Plan, it could facilitate goal one for 10-minute neighborhoods by adding housing within a 10-minute walk, bike or transit to a Community Activity Center. That Community Activity Center is to the south here, again, where we have Charlotte Premium Outlets Mall, and then we could also be potentially facilitating goal two, neighborhood diversity and inclusion, by allowing for a housing type that could be multi-family in an area that is mostly single-family residential, though you are in a site that does directly abut other multi-family residential that would be similar to the product proposed on this site.

This project also went through our minor map assessment criteria. So, when we have projects that are proposing a rezoning that is out of alignment with the Adopted Policy Map recommendation, we work it through this evaluation tool to see how it aligns with the vision and goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan for a Place Type change to Neighborhood-2. So, it's going from Commercial to Neighborhood-2 for a majority of the site. So, we identify here what the preferred criteria is, and how the site is meeting it, so it is above the minimum acreage for the minimum acreage threshold of two to four acres. It also has preferred Place Type adjacencies for Community Activity Center and Parks and Preserves. It also is within a quarter mile of the Outlets Boulevard and Designer Drive bus stops. It's also again directly adjacent to Community Activity Center within an access to housing gap, and it does have frontage along an arterial road. So, generally, very much meeting our minor map criteria for a change to the Neighborhood-2 Place Type.

Staff does recommend approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues. The property has that older Conditional Zoning plan for an office park that may no longer be congruent with the development trends that we're seeing in this area. The Neighborhood-2 uses would complement the adjacent activity center, which offers goods and services for potential future residents. It's in an area that would have ample transit access, and can generally support this type of multi-family product. I'll be happy to take questions following petitioner comments.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street, Suite 100 said thank you, Councilmember Driggs, Council members, Zoning Committee members. Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner. Palmer McArthur from the petitioner is here as well. Holly did a great job with the summary. This has got an old zoning, when there were some different plans for the area, Councilmember Mayfield, this was her District, when Charlotte Premium Outlets came through and kind of changed the tone for the area, and so we're left with one of the last pieces of the puzzle. It is zoned by one of the original landowners. So, the petitioner has a plan proposal to kind of fill in that gap. We've been in touch in Councilmember Mayo throughout this process. Many of ya'll know the Steele Creek Residents Association, an umbrella organization down there, they don't love multi-family. I do think there are needs with them. They've kind of acknowledged, hey, if it's going to go somewhere, this would be a good place for it. It is close to a lot of employment. There are actually three schools probably within a quarter mile of the site. So, we've been working closely with the design team on a development plan that works. This is a constrained site; it's got some topographical challenges that've kind of pushed us into a plan, but we do have buffers on each side. We do continue to work with the County and Parks and Recreation on a connection to that park, and so we do feel like this is a good opportunity to create some housing opportunities in an area that is walkable to employment and activities and restaurants and schools and parks, and also as Holly mentioned, has good connectivity to transit. Happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Owens said I'll just thank you again, Collin, for your work with Steele Creek Residents Association. I really enjoy ya'll's conversations that you have with them, the collaborative nature of those, so just want to not really a question, but very excited to continue to see ya'll working and collaborating and being thoughtful with connectivity as well with the existing Park and Rec and greenway, and also thinking through the school that is nearby. As a former teacher, I think that is so imperative. At one point, I lived right across the street from the school I worked at, and that made life a lot easier. So, I'm hoping that more teachers and other public servants will also be able to live in the community where they work, so appreciate you building density in an area where we need that. Thank you.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-136 BY LARRY COOPER FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.02 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF WEST SUGAR CREEK ROAD, WEST OF BURGANDY DRIVE, AND NORTH OF KNEIGHTON LANE FROM (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N1-C (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-C).

Councilmember Driggs declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just over two acres along the West Sugar Creek corridor in an area where we have predominantly single-family housing immediately adjacent to the site, though quite a few commercial and institutional uses walkable from the site and just to the north and the south. The current zoning is Neighborhood-1B, and they are proposing to go to Neighborhood-1C, so that is just one step up in our Neighborhood-1 classifications. The 2040 Policy Map

recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type, so this request for the Neighborhood-1C District is still considered in alignment with that Adopted Place Type. This is a conventional request, so we don't have any proposal information to go through, but this proposal is considered consistent with the goals and policies of the North, Middle and Outer Community Area Plan. It's in alignment with that Policy Map recommendation. In terms of our priority goals, it could be facilitating neighborhood diversity and inclusion with the ability to develop more infill housing along a major arterial and near commercial areas.

Staff does recommend approval of this petition. This site was evaluated using our Place Type Five criteria, which is outlined in the Creating Complete Communities section of every single Community Area Plan, and we do that for every single Neighborhood-1 upzoning that we have for rezoning requests to essentially make sure that they are appropriate and make sense for the areas that they're sitting within. So, some of the criteria that we look at for this petition is, is there an existing lot pattern in the area? So, where this site sits, and you can see it a little bit better here, there's no real existing lot pattern that this site is sitting, and it's also located along a major arterial, which is a point in its favor for going up in the Neighborhood-1 classifications. In terms of average lot dimensions for the area, this has much larger lot dimensions than some of the adjacent parcels, and certainly the parcels to its east and parcels directly to its west along the other side of West Sugar Creek Road. So, when we evaluated the Place Type Five criteria for this site petition, we felt it met those criterion for that one step up in classification to the Neighborhood-1C Zoning District, and we believe that this is an appropriate request, and be happy to take any questions following petitioner comments.

Elise Smith, 1230 West Morehead Street, Suite 304 said good evening, Council. So, most of what I've got has already been covered by Holly, but name is Elise Smith. I'm with Landworks Design Group, and we're here tonight on behalf of the property owner and petitioner, Larry Cooper and Sharetha Cooper. So, this is a conventional rezoning located at 1800 West Sugar Creek, 28262. That's me and that's Larry the petitioner and Sharetha the property owner. This is existing N-1B, the existing use is single-family. The Policy Map calls for Neighborhood-1, and we are proposing from N-1B to N-1C. Both the existing and proposed zone matches the Charlotte Policy Map, as staff has indicated and you'll find in your packet.

So, we had a successful neighborhood meeting on Thursday, March 5, 2026, with a few neighbors. We were primarily answering questions about the rezoning process, explaining the difference in lot sizes that would come with this potential change. You can find the description of those changes in your packet, and just for clarity, this would be the same allowable building types with both. We had no objections from the neighbors at the neighborhood meeting, and I'm happy to answer any other questions.

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Mayo, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-142 BY THIRD & URBAN LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.90 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF TUCKASEEGEE ROAD, EAST OF BERRYHILL ROAD, AND WEST OF GESCO STREET FROM MUDD-O (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT-OPTIONAL) TO IMU(CD) (INNOVATION MIXED-USE, CONDITIONAL).

Councilmember Driggs declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said good evening. This site is just under two acres. It's located at the intersection of Berryhill Road, Tuckaseegee Road, and Thrift Road. The site is developed with a warehouse. It's surrounded by a mix of uses. You have single-family to the northwest across Berryhill Road. You have a

historically industrial neighborhood to the east and south that's been transitioning towards commercial, office and some residential uses. The current zoning is MUDD-O, that's Mixed-Use Development-Optional, and that was established by a 2021 rezoning. Proposed zoning is IMU(CD), that's Innovation Mixed-Use, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Innovation Mixed-Use Place Type.

This is a Tier 1 rezoning request with a list of conditional notes, some prohibited uses, mostly those that are autocentric, including vehicle dealership, vehicle fueling facility, vehicle rental and repair, as well as parking lot as a principal use. Also, a note that if residential units are constructed on the site, they would have a minimum parking ratio of one parking space per residential unit, and building height would be limited to 75 feet.

The petition is consistent with the goals and policies of the West Inner Community Area Plan, and also in alignment with the Policy Map recommendation for the Innovation Mixed-Use Place Type. While the petition does not directly facilitate any of the priority goals for the Community Area Plan, it may facilitate the Comprehensive Plan goal for 10-minute neighborhoods by proposing uses aligned with the IMU Place Type.

Staff recommends approval of the petition. There are no outstanding issues. The conditions of the plan prohibit autocentric uses, encouraging development that may be more oriented toward pedestrians and in line with the newer projects in the area. The petition is consistent with recent rezonings in the vicinity that include both adaptive reuse and new construction to permit Mixed-Use Development. I will turn it over to the petitioner team.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street, Suite 100 said thank you, Councilmember Driggs, Council members. Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner. Joe did a good job, so I'll move very quickly. Third & Urban, the petitioner, if you've been out to Lower Tuck, it is a dramatically different place than it was 10 years ago. They have been one of the leading developers on that transition, and I think have done a very nice job of adaptively reusing a lot of these old industrial buildings, breathing new life into them with creative office, with neighborhood-serving retail and restaurants. So, this is one of the last pieces in the puzzle, as they've kind of developed the other blocks, and we're really just bringing this into conformity with our new UDO. As you know, the UDO is very much a form-based code, and so we're trying to get away from our detailed conditional zonings. We had a good community meeting involving some of the leadership from the Enderly Park neighborhood. They mentioned to us a couple concerns; one, parking, height, uses, and so those are the conditions that Joe mentioned that we've incorporated. Again, we're trying to keep it simple with just a Tier 1, but we've ruled out some of those uses that I think everyone agrees they don't want there. As I mentioned, Third & Urban owns and operates these other buildings with restaurants, so they want to make sure that there's enough parking, so we were fine adding additional minimum parking standard, as well as an overall limit on height. I did get a very nice letter from the Enderly Park neighborhood today, so I'll share that with you prior to the next meeting. Happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Mayo said yes, just a quick question, Collin. Will this site include some aspects of native plants? So, I know when I drive around there or walk around, they've done a great job of being thoughtful of using native plants, which is better for the environment, with pollinators and just using less water, as a result, like drought resistant. So, just curious if ya'll are planning to use that same kind of theme with this as well?

Mr. Brown said I'm happy to talk with you and learn from you. I have been warned, and I appreciate you saying earlier, there's invasive, which is bad; there's native; and then there's naturalized. So, I may need your help, because sometimes I think Urban Forestry tells us that maybe some of the naturalized are more hardy in our current environment. So, they'll be happy to work with you and get my vocabulary right.

Ms. Mayo said okay, yes, I'll touch base. I'm just curious of that. Also wondering, this area has a lot of connectivity going on, just thinking like the bike trails. Is that being

integrated into what ya'll were doing? Because I know Tuckaseegee, we have permanent bike lanes right there. We have those little thingies. Are ya'll continuing that, or any type of improvements based on what ya'll are doing at that site?

Mr. Brown said so, Third & Urban has been pretty involved in the overall redevelopment of the area, and are generally supportive of things that are going to serve that area. I don't think we've got any specific recommendations on the site, but I'm happy to kind of follow up.

Ms. Mayo said okay, yes, I'll just email you, but I'm just curious, want to make sure that it's aligned with the rest of that area, and kind of the vibe that ya'll were going for, which I think it looks great, but I just want to make sure. Oh, can you go back to that other slide.

Mr. Brown said this is current, so that's pretty nice. Obviously, this would be getting rid of that sea of parking and coming in with some active uses, but that is the current, that looks pretty wide to me.

Ms. Mayo said yes, I'm just curious about the bike lanes further down Tuckaseegee. So, yes, I'll just connect with you on that, because I just want to make sure that we're maintaining the standard that the City is already doing when it comes to connectivity, particularly in that area as it has so much mixed-use. So, it has the residential, it has the commercial, it has jobs. I mean, it's just a great example of us being thoughtful of 10-minute cities and want to make sure that we're continuing that trend. I just can't tell from this picture.

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2026-002 BY ZHI ZHANG FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.16 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF VERBENA STREET, WEST OF NATIONS CROSSING ROAD, AND EAST OF GILEAD STREET FROM ML-2 (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-2) TOTOD-NC (TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT-NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER).

Councilmember Driggs declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said this site is less than a quarter of an acre, located on the south side of Verbena Street, between South Tryon Street and Old Pineville Road. It is developed with a small commercial building surrounded by a mix of uses, somewhat similar to the last petition where we have an older industrial area that's transitioning to a mix of commercial, office, residential uses. Current zoning is ML-2 with a proposed zoning of TOD-NC. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Community Activity Center Place Type. This is a conventional petition, which is consistent with the goals and policies of the South Inner Community Area Plan, and also in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Community Activity Center Place Type. It may facilitate the target goal for the South Inner Community Area Plan for trail and Transit Oriented Development by establishing TOD Zoning within three-quarters of a mile of two LYNX Blue Line Stations and allowing for a range of transit-supportive uses in an activity center.

Staff recommends approval of this petition. The site is surrounded on three sides by property zoned for Transit Oriented Development. The petition follows many other nearby petitions that rezoned properties from Industrial Zoning to Transit Oriented Zoning Districts. The site is less than three-quarters of a mile from two LYNX Blue Line Stations in Scaleybark and Woodlawn, and the Lower South End area has transitioned

rapidly from automobile oriented commercial and industrial uses to a mixed-use walkable community. I'll hand it over to the petitioner.

Zhi Zhang, 4500 Pine Valley Road said good evening, Council members. Thank you, Mr. Mangum, for all your help. You've been most helpful. Thank you so much.

Mr. Driggs said please state your name, sir.

Mr. Zhang said oh, I'm sorry, sir. My name's Zhi Zhang.

Mr. Driggs said okay, I got it wrong, I apologize.

Mr. Zhang said oh, yes. Well, my friends call me Chi, but it's spelled Zhi, which is okay, it goes both ways. I've been in Charlotte for 33 years, and this is my forever home. I bought a place next to this property that I just acquired. It's such a vibrant neighborhood. It's Lower South End. It's really close to the OMB Sugar Creek Protagonist, the Rally, and this is kind of like the last piece of the puzzle too. My Godfather built this building. He was a contractor, and he's 76, Army Vet. He says, "You know, I don't think I can do anything with it anymore, so Godson what do you want to do?" So, I said, "Oh, well, you know, I live in this neighborhood, I love it, I love the walkability." The apartments within an eighth of a mile, we've got like five apartments everywhere near the Breweries. So, my wife and my 4-year-old and my 6-year-old, we live right here, and I said, "Let's do a mom/pop coffee, beer, wine shop, you know sit in, take out, things like that." I just want to capture all the vibrant neighborhood feel and walkability, and thank goodness, fortunately we have lots of street parking. So, really, we don't have much traffic going in and out and that's amazing to know in such a small little place. I wanted to make it really homey and mom and pop feel. I welcome for any questions, sir, ma'am.

Councilmember Mayo said yes, I did have a quick question. Thank you so much for, one, I just wanted to thank you for hosting the second community meeting, just so community members could attend, so wanted to thank you for that. I did want to briefly talk about something I'm hearing from a lot of business owners kind of in that area. With kind of people coming into shops and kind of messing things up, I'm wondering like how are you planning on being proactive? One thing I can think of, like Thousand Hills Coffee over there has like a code for people going into the bathroom. I think as we continue to have more density in areas, just thinking through how are we proactive to mitigate and minimize behavior we don't want? We can't use CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) as like personal security for organizations. So, hoping that you and I can talk more, or other CMPD can do things like that to have conversations about being proactive. I just know that area. Chief Odom and I just had a conversation about that last week, and just want to make sure that we're giving you all, all the tools you need to be successful and minimize any kind of issues that ya'll were having.

Mr. Zhang said yes, those are great questions, and some of them I can answer, is that the area's such a vibrant up and coming, but really closer there's a lot of kind of like closed down motels and things like that, you know Lower South End. So, we do see some unwanted activities, things like that. So, living right next to this building with my two little ones, I think priority is to make sure this place will make it even more safe for the neighborhood, and seeing this office building vacant for the last 10 years, because Godfather, he's older now, leaving some place vacant is a lot more unsafe, where people might kind of like go check it out, why is nobody there. I can put a little beer/wine shop there, people sitting out, and the neighborhood's walking their dogs, coming and see people, and people see people, and I think that will really make the neighborhood safer; that's my hope, because I live right next store to it, like literally, I walk out my front door and that's it, so that's how close it is. I need to make sure that the clientele and the demographic and the people that go in, I'll be really, I will even pray to have even friends or officers like hey, you know you want to just swing by here and things like that. I have all these ideas, and that's the exciting part, once I get through the rezoning process and then the permits and things like that, but these are a lot of questions to

answer. I won't know all of them, but when I'm able to open, I think having the first customer ready, I'll just be really excited just to see how I can make it safer and better along the way.

Ms. Mayo said thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said just clarification. I thought I heard two things, and maybe it's my subconscious. Did you say it was a coffee shop, or did I hear beer and wine?

Mr. Zhang said oh, so I've been in the service industry for my whole life, since 16 years old, so it was like 32 years ago. I wanted to do something. I was from a busboy, server, just dishwasher, manager, everything in the restaurants, and I'm trying to step away from the full-service kind of sit down, but I do want to do like a small maybe coffee, beer, wine shop, you can sit down, it's cozy, maybe some snacks, small bites. It's going to be that picture right there, so that way the neighborhood, customers, people walk by, they can come into this mom and pop. I'll always be there, or April will be there, or somebody. It's going to be small operating, really small. I was telling Joe a long time ago, it was like, "Oh, I don't need like 10 people working, I just need myself, my wife, or someone else, and that should be great." So, it's going to be very cozy.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Mr. Zhang said you're welcome.

Mr. Mangum said I did want to point out, it is a conventional request, so anything that could occur under the TOD-NC Zoning District would be possible under the rezoning request.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

Mr. Driggs said that was our last one. Mr. Wilson's class, thank you for your interest in planning. You have a great teacher. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.


Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 11 Minutes
Minutes completed: May 27, 2026