

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Zoning Meeting on Monday, June 16, 2025, at 5:11 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Pro Tem Danté Anderson presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Tiawana Brown, Ed Driggs, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, and James Mitchell.

**ABSENT:** Mayor Vi Lyles, Councilmembers Malcolm Graham and Victoria Watlington

**ABSENT UNTIL NOTED:** Councilmembers Marjorie Molina and Edwin Peacock III

\* \* \* \* \*

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said okay, good evening, everyone. We are going to go ahead and get started with our meeting this evening, June 16, 2025. It's our Zoning Meeting this evening. Welcome, and I'd like to call the meeting to order, and before I do so, we will start 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**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** explained the Zoning Meeting rules and procedures.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **INTRODUCTION OF THE ZONING COMMITTEE**

**Andrew Blumenthal, Chairman of the Zoning Committee** said thank you very much, Mayor Pro Tem, and thank you, Council. My name is Andrew Blumenthal. It is my pleasure to serve as the Chairman of the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission. Please allow me to introduce my fellow committee members. Starting immediately to my left, we have Commissioners Theresa McDonald, Erin Shaw, Robin Stuart, Shana Neeley, and Rick Winiker. The Zoning Committee will next meet, actually not until Tuesday, August 5, 2025, at 5:30 p.m. At that meeting, the Zoning Committee will discuss and make recommendations on the petitions that have public hearings this evening. The public is welcome to attend that meeting; however, please note that it is not a continuation of any of the public hearings that are being held here tonight. Prior to that meeting, you are welcome to contact us to provide input. You can find contact information, as well as information on each petition, on the City's website at [charlotteplanning.org](http://charlotteplanning.org). Thank you, again, Mayor Pro Tem.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said please note that these petitions meet the following criteria. They've had no public opposition to the petition at the hearing, staff recommends the approval, the Zoning Committee recommends the approval, and there were no changes after the Zoning Committee's recommendation. Are there any consent agenda items Council would like to pull for separate vote or question?

**Councilmember Mayfield** said five and six for separate vote.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, five and six for separate vote.

**Councilmember Johnson** said point of order, Mayor Pro Tem. I assured the residents back in April 2025, when I met with them, that there would be an interpreter here. So, I know we're going on with the meeting, and we planned to have an interpreter for the specific petition, but I wanted you all to know, I mean, I would've hoped the interpreter would be able to interpret, so you all could hear what's going on, but let me assure you that someone is here to interpret the petition, so I apologize.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said yes, Ms. Johnson, someone will be able to provide simultaneous interpretation during the actual hearing for the petition. Thank you. Did you have any items you'd like to pull?

Ms. Johnson said no, thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, thank you. Ms. Ajmera, you have a question around the consent items?

**Councilmember Ajmera** said no, actually, I wanted to follow up on Councilwoman Johnson. Thank you, Councilwoman Johnson for making this possible, especially interpreting. I know as part of our EEE (Environment, Engagement & Equity) Committee, we wanted to make sure that our City services are being accessible. So, I appreciate it, because we did receive some calls and messages about that.

**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.**

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to approve the consent agenda as presented with the exception of Item No. 5, and Item No. 6 which were pulled for a separate vote.

The following items were approved:

**Item No. 3: Ordinance No. 981-Z, Petition No. 2025-010 by David Phillips amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 1.04 acres located on the east side of Rockford Court, north of East Woodlawn Road, and south of Stacy Boulevard from N1-B (Neighborhood 1-B) to N1-C (Neighborhood 1-C).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Sealey) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent 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 Neighborhood 1 Place Type. 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: Advances Goals 1 (10-Minute Neighborhoods) and 2 (Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion) by allowing more housing types in an established area. Both N1-B and N1-C zoning districts allow the same housing types (e.g., single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes), but N1-C permits smaller minimum lot sizes and widths. This allows for modest increases in housing density while maintaining neighborhood form and character. The subject property is significantly larger than nearby lots; and the surrounding residential area, in particular this block, lacks an established lot pattern. As a result, this rezoning wouldn't result in a disruption of a well defined residential character. The site is surrounded by other N1-zoned parcels but is located just north of East Woodlawn Road, where zoning transitions to commercial and multifamily districts (e.g., CG, UR-2(CD), R-8MF(CD)). This petition offers a gradual zoning step between single-family uses and more intense development. Rezoning to N1-C preserves the residential character of the neighborhood while

enabling housing diversity. 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 (2022) from current recommended place type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 144-145.

**Item No. 4: Ordinance No. 982-Z, Petition No. 2025-012 by Northpointe LLC amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 6.11 acres located on the east side of Statesville Road, on the north and south side of Twin Lakes Parkway, and north of Metromont Parkway from OFC (Office Flex Campus) to ML-2 (Manufacturing and Logistics - 2).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by McDonald, seconded by Neeley) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent 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 Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type. 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 would align the site with the surrounding area and the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type recommendation for the area. The petition is more compatible than the existing office zoning and helps to achieve what is envisioned for the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. The site is within the Access to Employment Gap according to the Equitable Growth Framework. Additionally, the petition has the potential to maintain or increase the number of middle skill jobs in the area. The ML-1 district will allow some manufacturing, and logistics uses that are not allowed in the OFC (office) zoning. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 146-147.

**Item No. 7: Ordinance No. 985-Z, Petition No. 2025-018 by Oyster Development, Inc. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 2.98 acres located in the northeastern quadrant of the intersection of Sam Wilson Road and West Pointe Drive from N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B) to ML-1 (Manufacturing and Logistics-1).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Stuart) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent 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 recommends the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type. 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 would align the site's zoning with adopted policy. The surrounding land uses, with industrial uses to the north and heavy commercial uses to the south, make this location more suitable for uses permitted in the ML 1 district than those allowed currently entitled in the N2 B district. The subject property is the only property with access to West Pointe Drive that is not zoned for manufacturing and logistics uses. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 152-153.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 5: ORDINANCE NO. 983-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-014 BY PULTE HOMES AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO**

**AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.50 ACRES LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF WEST SUGAR CREEK ROAD, ON THE NORTH SIDE OF GLORY STREET, AND SOUTH OF HONDURES DRIVE FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N2-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Shaw) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. Therefore, 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 petition is appropriate and compatible with the surround land uses as the site is designated as a Neighborhood 2 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The site is adjacent to a multi-family attached project located to the south across Glory Steet and zoned N2-B. The site is also adjacent to other properties zoned N2-B and designated as the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. The site is within a one-eighth-mile walk of a designated Neighborhood Center Place Type containing uses such as retail, restaurant, childcare, and religious institutions. The proposed development would fill a need for housing in an area that has been identified as lacking Access to Housing Opportunity by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The site is within a three quarter-mile walk of Sugar Creek Station on the Lynx Blue Line. The site is directly served by transit with the number 211 CATS local bus, providing service between Sugar Creek Station and Tom Hunter Station on the Lynx Blue Line. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10-Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

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 consistent based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. 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 appropriate and compatible with the surround land uses as the site is designated as a Neighborhood 2 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The site is adjacent to a multi-family attached project located to the south across Glory Steet and zoned N2-B. The site is also adjacent to other properties zoned N2-B and designated as the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. The site is within a one-eighth-mile walk of a designated Neighborhood Center Place Type containing uses such as retail, restaurant, childcare, and religious institutions. The proposed development would fill a need for housing in an area that has been identified as lacking Access to Housing Opportunity by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The site is within a three quarter-mile walk of Sugar Creek Station on the Lynx Blue Line. The site is directly served by transit with the number 211 CATS local bus, providing service between Sugar Creek Station and Tom Hunter Station on the Lynx Blue Line. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10-Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said I have concerns that, even with the entitlement that was only for 293 trips, with this additional multi-family in this area, this proposed zoning could more than double that to just under 800 trips, based on this 110 multi-family unit dwelling, as well as when we are talking about diversity in neighborhoods, we are seeing an increase of multi-family in some areas that is causing the impact. So, I will not be supporting this project.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Johnson, and Mitchell

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 148-149.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 6: ORDINANCE NO. 984-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-017 BY THE DROX GROUP, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 3 ACRES LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF NATIONS FORD ROAD, SOUTH OF ECHODALE DRIVE, AND NORTH OF WANDA LANE FROM OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS) TO N2-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Stuart) 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 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 proposed multi-family attached dwellings would diversify the housing options along this segment of Nations Ford Road. The Equitable Growth Framework identifies housing as a priority need in this area. The site is adjacent to EE Waddell High School and within a half mile of Nations Ford Elementary School, an employment campus, commercial node, and a proposed Mecklenburg County community resource center. A bus stop for CATS Route 24 is located along the site's Nations Ford Road frontage. The site is a remnant parcel surrounded by property owned by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Campus Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, 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 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 proposed multi-family attached dwellings would diversify the housing options along this segment of Nations Ford Road. The Equitable Growth Framework identifies housing as a priority need in this area. The site is adjacent to EE Waddell High School and within a half mile of Nations Ford Elementary School, an employment campus, commercial node, and a proposed Mecklenburg County community resource center. A bus stop for CATS Route 24 is located along the site's Nations Ford Road frontage. The site is a remnant parcel surrounded by property owned by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Campus Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said this project is to approve a development that has interior privately owned roads. We are already seeing challenges across the City with who is responsible, and conversations with HOA (Homeowner Association), which are out of our control and falls squarely in North Carolina General Assembly, regarding who is responsible for maintaining these roads. So, I have concern that opposed to, at the beginning, this being identified if it's going to be City road, i.e., public road with access versus coming back later, a project being approved, that is going to potentially create an undue burden on the residents.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Johnson, and Mitchell

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 150-151.

\* \* \* \* \*

### DEFERRALS/WITHDRAWALS

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to defer: a decision on Item No. 8, Petition No. 2025-015 by Wilkes Asset Management to August 18, 2025; and a hearing on Item No. 14, Petition No. 2025-021 by Harold Jordan to August 18, 2025.

\* \* \* \* \*

### DECISIONS

**ITEM NO. 9: ORDINANCE NO. 986, PETITION NO. 2025-047 BY CHARLOTTE PLANNING, DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – TEXT AMENDMENT. THE CHARLOTTE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) REQUIRES PERIODIC UPDATES TO MAINTAIN ITS STATUS AS A "LIVING DOCUMENT." THE PURPOSE OF THIS TEXT AMENDMENT IS TO UPDATE THE UDO TO IMPLEMENT AND SUPPORT THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE CHARLOTTE FUTURE 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. THIS INCLUDES UPDATES TO REFLECT BEST PRACTICES, ADDRESS NEW AND EMERGING TRENDS, ADDRESS IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED BY EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS, AND CORRECT SCRIVENER'S ERRORS. UPDATES ARE PROPOSED TO 27 OF THE 39 ARTICLES.**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Sealey) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition could facilitate the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, 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: A major document such as the UDO requires updates, adjustments, and revisions after adoption to address trends and best practices, add clarity, adjust use permissions and prescribed conditions, and correct minor errors. The proposed text amendment will make the UDO a more user-friendly ordinance and result in better functionality.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition could facilitate the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. 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: A major document such as the UDO requires updates, adjustments, and revisions after adoption to address trends and best practices, add clarity, adjust use permissions and prescribed conditions, and correct minor errors. The proposed text amendment will make the UDO a more user-friendly ordinance and result in better functionality.

**Councilmember Driggs** said this is our text amendments, right?

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said that's correct, this is our text amendments.

Mr. Driggs said I'm kind of blind here, my computer's not working. So, these are text amendments that are going to occur on a six-monthly basis. I think we're all familiar with that. So, we've talked through them. There are a number of types of text amendment related to kind of cleanup, or to adjustments that are being made as a result of our experience. This will be a continuing process. The UDO is a living document, and we can expect to see another update in six months, I believe. Anyway, I support it, and I hope everybody else will too. Thank you.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 154-703.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 10: ORDINANCE NO. 987-Z, PETITION NO. 2023-074 BY C INVESTMENTS 2, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 26 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF PROVIDENCE ROAD, NORTH SIDE OF COUNTRY LANE, AND SOUTH SIDE OF KUYKENDALL ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL) AND N1-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Shaw) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent and consistent 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. 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 Development Area A is inconsistent, while Development Area B is consistent with the Policy Map designation. The site is adjacent to properties zoned N1-A to the northeast, south, and east, and zoned INST(CD) to the north, and designated the Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The site is adjacent to properties zoned N1-A and designated the Campus Place Type to the west across Providence Road. The proposed solid waste facilities on site should be located as far from adjacent property boundaries and screened to the greatest extent practicable. The Comprehensive Plan's EGF identifies that the site is within an Access to Housing Gap and has a low housing diversity score due to a lack in diversity of housing types outside of traditional single-family housing. Development of "missing middle" housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes would be appropriate to fill the housing gap in the area. The proposed development has frontage on two Arterial Streets as defined by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Providence Road is designated by the Charlotte Streets Map as a 6+ Lane Boulevard and Kuykendall Road is designated as a 2+ Lane Avenue. The Comprehensive Plan calls for Neighborhood 2 Place Types to be located on arterial streets designed to accommodate alternative modes of transportation. The proposed plan includes a 12-foot multi-use path along the site's frontage with Providence Road. The site is located within three-quarter mile of an area designated as a Community Activity Center by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed site plan proposes a signalized crosswalks spanning Providence Road that would facilitate easier access to daily good and services found within the Community Activity Center. The site is along the route of the CATS 61X express bus providing service between the Charlotte Transit Center (CTC) and Johnson and Wales campus and the Waverly, Arboretum, and Strawberry Hill shopping centers. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 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 Development Area A of 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. Commitment to a minimum of four duplexes to be constructed in Development Area A.
2. Solid waste service areas moved away from property lines adjacent to the Neighborhood 1 Place Type, to the extent feasible.
3. Condition added that no driveways to individual dwellings will be constructed on Country Lane in Development Area B. (Not captured on Final Staff Analysis)
4. A double yellow centerline will be striped on Country Lane from the intersection of Providence Road to the intersection of Genevieve Court. (Not captured on Final Staff Analysis)

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said these are changes that they worked on with the community, and staff believes that they are minor, do not warrant additional review, do not change the material nature of the project, and we're happy to take any questions you may have.

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

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent and consistent 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. 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 Development Area A is inconsistent, while Development Area B is consistent with the Policy Map designation. The site is adjacent to properties zoned N1-A to the northeast, south, and east, and zoned INST(CD) to the north, and designated the Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The site is adjacent to properties zoned N1-A and designated the Campus Place Type to the west across Providence Road. The proposed solid waste facilities on site should be located as far from adjacent property boundaries and screened to the greatest extent practicable. The Comprehensive Plan's EGF identifies that the site is within an Access to Housing Gap and has a low housing diversity score due to a lack in diversity of housing types outside of traditional single-family housing. Development of "missing middle" housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes would be appropriate to fill the housing gap in the area. The proposed development has frontage on two Arterial Streets as defined by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Providence Road is designated by the Charlotte Streets Map as a 6+ Lane Boulevard and Kuykendall Road is designated as a 2+ Lane Avenue. The Comprehensive Plan calls for Neighborhood 2 Place Types to be located on arterial streets designed to accommodate alternative modes of transportation. The proposed plan includes a 12-foot multi-use path along the site's frontage with Providence Road. The site is located within three-quarter mile of an area designated as a Community Activity Center by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed site plan proposes a signalized crosswalks spanning Providence Road that would facilitate easier access to daily good and services found within the Community Activity Center. The site is along the route of the CATS 61X express bus providing service between the Charlotte Transit Center (CTC) and Johnson and Wales campus and the Waverly, Arboretum, and Strawberry Hill shopping centers. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 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 Development Area A of the site, as modified.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 704-705.

**Councilmember Molina arrived at 5:27 p.m.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 11: ORDINANCE NO. 988-Z, PETITION NO. 2024-124 BY AVIATION METALS OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC. AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 7.32 ACRES LOCATED ALONG BUSINESS CENTER DRIVE, WEST OF LITTLE ROCK ROAD, EAST OF MOORES PARK DRIVE, AND NORTH OF INTERSTATE 85 FROM N1-A ANDO (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY) TO ML-1(CD) ANDO (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-1, CONDITIONAL, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Neeley, seconded by McDonald) 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 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 located along an interstate frontage road, adjacent to an industrial use to the east, and within the Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay (ANDO). The site could be best suited for nonresidential uses. The petition commits to providing a minimum 100-foot undisturbed buffer to mitigate impacts to the established single family detached residential uses to the north of the site. The petition prohibits many of the most noxious uses permitted in the ML-1 zoning district. The site is within two-thirds mile of the Little Rock Road interchange with Interstate 85 and within two miles of Charlotte Douglas International Airport. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map (2022) from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type.

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. A row of large maturing evergreen trees was added along the rear parking and loading area, adjacent to the 100-foot undisturbed buffer and 100-foot Class A landscape yard.
2. Lighting standards were added including limiting height to 30 feet, requiring all freestanding fixtures to be fully capped, shielded, and downwardly directed, and prohibiting wall-pak type lighting.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said these were items that were, again, coordinated with in conversations with the community, from our understanding, and do not change the material nature of the project. Staff believes they are minor and do warrant additional review by the Zoning Committee.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said I have a question for Mr. Pettine.

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said Mr. Pettine, do any of those changes actually address any of the concerns that came from the community in regard to this petition?

Mr. Pettine said I know there were some conversations about how far the uses were, some screening. I know that came up at some point. I don't know if they addressed every material item that they had. The petitioner or the members of the community probably would be better to answer that. We got these changes presented to us following some of those conversations. So, our information is that these were things that they had asked for that would satisfy some of their concerns, but again, that'd probably be a better question for the petitioner.

Ms. Mayfield said so, based on the information that you have, you did mention, because we can barely hear you. So, I want to confirm, did they expand the current 100-foot buffer zone?

Mr. Pettine said they added a large row of maturing evergreen trees, basically where that buffer zone would kind of start where the parking areas are and the loading area. So, it'd be that undisturbed row of large, maturing trees, and then the buffer itself beyond that.

Ms. Mayfield said so, the answer is they did add to it?

Mr. Pettine said they did add to it, yes.

Ms. Mayfield said did they reduce the building footprint?

Mr. Pettine said not that I'm aware of, no. That would've been a change we would have captured as well.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. Any additional question or comment?

**Councilmember Brown** said absolutely. I have been working extensively with the community, been out there numerous of times with Mr. Norman Phillips, and Mr. Carmichael, can you come down, please?

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said hang on, Ms. Brown. Right now, we're voting as to whether or not we want to send this petition back to the Zoning Committee, because there were changes after the Zoning Committee's meeting. So, unfortunately, we can't have the gentleman come down, but once we vote on that, then we can have deliberation on the actual item.

Ms. Brown said okay.

Motion was made by Councilmember Brown, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously not to refer back to the Zoning Committee.
--

Motion was made by Councilmember Brown, 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 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 located along an interstate frontage road, adjacent to an industrial use to the east, and within the Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay (ANDO). The site could be best suited for nonresidential uses. The petition commits to providing a minimum 100-foot undisturbed buffer to mitigate impacts to the established single family detached residential uses to the north of the site. The
---

petition prohibits many of the most noxious uses permitted in the ML-1 zoning district. The site is within two-thirds mile of the Little Rock Road interchange with Interstate 85 and within two miles of Charlotte Douglas International Airport. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map (2022) from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type, as modified.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said so Ms. Brown, would you like to have a comment, however, you can't call anyone to the podium.

Ms. Brown said can't call them, okay.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I want to make sure we're following the proper rules.

**Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney** said Ms. Brown, you can actually ask a specific question of Mr. Carmichael. You can't reopen the public hearing, but if there's a particular question that you have for him.

Ms. Brown said I'll just make comments.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said you can comment, and you can ask him a specific question.

Ms. Brown said I don't need to ask him anything. I can just comment on the work that I've done with the petition note and more.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said so, the floor is yours, Ms. Brown, absolutely.

Ms. Brown said yes, thank you so much, I greatly appreciate it. I don't need to ask Mr. Carmichael anything. I've worked with Moores Park Two team forever, and Mr. Carmichael has been very diligent. Moores Park Two is a community that I favor. It's a very nice community. They really didn't want any development at all in their neighborhood, and I understand that. Development is going to continue to happen in all of the City of Charlotte, it just depends on the nature of it. I commend this Petition, Aviation Meadows, because Mr. Carmichael came out several times, being willing to meet with the petitioners, and the neighborhood didn't want the petitioners out there, but he's done everything he could possibly do to answer all of their concerns, all of the questions that they had, even being willing to, even after tonight, to go back and to meet with them, and he's made that commitment to me. I was out all last week. So, we were working really hard behind the scenes with this. I've been out on the ground. I've walked in the woods. I've seen all of the pinpoints. I've seen the tree canopies. I've seen the stormwater work. I really worked hard on this petition. So, not an easy decision, but a fair decision, and I'm about fairness. So, for me, I'm going to move forward with it, because of all the work that I put in, the zoning team, staff recommendations, and then just the petition itself, allowing and being very flexible where it's coming back and forth, it's like a tug of war. So, it's a fair decision for me, not an easy decision, but it's a fair decision, so I'm going to move forward with it. So, thank you, Mr. Carmichael.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, Ms. Brown, and thank you for the work that you've done on this particular petition. Are there any additional comments?

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Johnson, Mitchell, and Molina

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 706-707.

pti:pk

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 12: PETITION NO. 2025-005 BY EB PROPERTY GROUP, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.96 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF CLEVE BROWN ROAD, SOUTH OF HAMILTON RUSSELL LANE, AND NORTH OF HACKBERRY CREEK TRAIL FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N1-D CCO (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-D, COTTAGE COURT OVERLAY).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Neeley) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent 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 Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, 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: This petition is appropriate and compatible as the site is within an area designated by the 2040 Policy Map for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The Cottage Court Overlay District allows for a reduction in minimum lot size and reduced setbacks to permit the development of small residential communities that are structured around common open space designed in a cohesive manner that are to be shared by all residents. The development pattern prescribed by the Neighborhood 1 Place Type and permitted by the Cottage Court Overlay zoning district is consistent with the character of this area. The petition could help facilitate the goal of providing a variety of housing types within an area where single family dwellings are the predominate housing type. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

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 consistent 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 Neighborhood 1 Place Type. 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: This petition is appropriate and compatible as the site is within an area designated by the 2040 Policy Map for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The Cottage Court Overlay District allows for a reduction in minimum lot size and reduced setbacks to permit the development of small residential communities that are structured around common open space designed in a cohesive manner that are to be shared by all residents. The development pattern prescribed by the Neighborhood 1 Place Type and permitted by the Cottage Court Overlay zoning district is consistent with the character of this area. The petition could help facilitate the goal of providing a variety of housing types within an area where single family dwellings are the predominate housing type. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

**Councilmember Johnson** said so, this is in District Two, but it's very close to District Four, and I remember when this petition was first filed. I think the developer might have met with me, but I'm very familiar with this area. If you recall last month, this was the petition that we had shared some concerns, because it was a conventional versus a conditional. This is right in the middle of a subdivision. I believe, if I'm correct, that it's on the dead end of a residential street, is that right, Mr. Pettine?

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said yes, it is at the end of, let me get an idea of the road name again.

Ms. Johnson said so, it's in a residential neighborhood. There was opposition?

Mr. Pettine said yes, you're correct.

pti:pk

Ms. Johnson said right, there was opposition from the residents. We don't have a lot of information about what this will be. Furthermore, it's being rezoned to a Cottage Court Overlay. Mr. Pettine, can you give me a little information about Cottage Court Overlays?

Mr. Pettine said sure, yes. The Cottage Court Overlay is a development option in our Neighborhood-1 Districts. It is really an option that would allow for smaller lot sizes, smaller unit types. There is a cap of how many total units could be in a project, that would be 30. It doesn't mean that 30 units will always be built. It depends on site constraints and other things, but the goal of the Cottage Court Overlay is to allow for, again, some of those smaller lot options. All the units are to be comprised around common open space, so they all front on some type of open space, rather than fronting on a road or something else. So, it's a bit of a tradeoff in design to work with these smaller sites to get some additional units, but again, build all that around common open space and a uniform unit type.

Ms. Johnson said when we talked about it earlier, did you use the word innovative or creative?

Mr. Pettine said yes, it allows some flexibility and creativity, and again, those lot size standards.

Ms. Johnson said so, because there was neighborhood opposition, because this is an existing neighborhood, and because this is a conventional versus conditional, we just don't have enough information. So, I won't be supporting it. I think 1.94 acres, in an existing subdivision, I think we need a little more information of it, than to allow a creative or innovative or new type of rezoning. So, I won't be supporting. Thank you.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said Mr. Pettine, question for you. What you just mentioned is that the Cottage Court allows for creativity in the area. In our policy language, do we take into consideration the impact of current neighborhoods when we allow creativity? Because we can see examples, if you drive up 4<sup>th</sup> Street, with homes that are much more modern than the neighborhood, they completely look outside. Do we take into consideration the impact of a neighborhood when we have language like that?

Mr. Pettine said so, the changes that you would primarily see that would be different than just an N-1 District is the lot sizes. So, even though it's zoned N-1A in the lot size standard and N-1A, let's say, I don't know off the top of my head, 60, 80 feet, you could shrink that down in a Cottage Court for smaller lot options, again, to make sure that then all those units are built around a common open space area, so that when folks walk out the door they're seeing green space, they're built around that type of design standard, but building heights are all the same, so they can't be taller or anything out of context with what's already allowed in N-1. So, 48 feet would be the building height, but the goal of the Cottage Court is to really maximize smaller unit types, so units that could be 1,000 square feet or less, to provide a housing type that maybe is more affordable, but doesn't trade some of those design standards and open space quality for a project. So, we had some examples of them, more historic context, like in Elizabeth there's some on Hawthorne as you're getting right to the bridge, there's a really good example of one. They are townhomes and they all front on open space right before Bay Street, that's a really good example, and that's really the context of what the ordinance was built off of. We haven't seen a lot of projects to date under the Cottage Court. We've only one rezoning approved so far. So, I don't have any examples from the UDO to show you, but that is the context they're going for.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

**Councilmember Mitchell** said I want to be sensitive, because our colleague, Councilman Graham, is not here this evening. So, I guess, staff, I have a question. If it's not time sensitive, I want to be respectful of Councilmember Johnson's question as well, that we defer this until we have at least Councilmember Graham here, this is his district, and so we can be fair to both parties. So, when is our next Zoning Meeting?

Mr. Pettine said I believe it is August 18, 2025.

Mr. Mitchell said August 18, 2025.

Mr. Pettine said yes. We don't have any July meetings.

**Councilmember Molina** said I would second that motion.

Mr. Mitchell said yes, I just think we've got to be fair.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Molina to defer Item No. 12, Petition No. 2025-005 by EB Property Group, LLC to the August 18, 2025, Zoning Meeting.
--

Mr. Pettine said what we can do in the meantime, as well as just try to get ya'll some more information on the Cottage Court Overlay, what it's intended to do in terms of development outcomes, so you guys have that a little bit more clear in front of you for that decision in August 2025.

Ms. Johnson said that would be great, and if it could be a conditional rezoning.

Mr. Pettine said yes.

Ms. Molina said just really quickly, just to add onto what Councilman Mitchell said. I think it's important to note that, and I think that my colleague here, Ms. Johnson, has brought up some valid questions that should be addressed, and I think withstanding the fact that Councilman Graham's not here, it'd be good for him to be here and be able to get some information from him on the work he's done, if any. What the sentiment of the neighbors and residents are. So, that's one of the reasons why I'm agreeing to continue the conversation and get those questions answered.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Johnson, Mitchell, and Molina

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 13: ORDINANCE NO. 989-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-016 BY KINGDOM DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 11.16 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF PAW CREEK ROAD, WEST OF TODDVILLE ROAD, EAST OF BRESLIN STREET FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Neeley, seconded by McDonald) to recommend approval 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. 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 need for additional housing units and additional housing types in the area supersedes the current lack of connectivity to the site by means other than automobiles. While the site lacks proximity to amenities such as daily goods and services, and transportation, it is close to a large employment center, Charlotte-Douglas International Airport which needs housing to support necessary employment. The site is also close to the CLT Destination District,

pti:pk

adjacent to Charlotte-Douglas International Airport, that will see additional amenities developed in the future.

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. Commitment made that a minimum of 30% of the multi-family attached dwelling units will be affordable and restricted to households earning 80% Area Median Income (AMI) or less for a period of not less than 15 years from the initial issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO).
2. Multi-family attached buildings adjacent to Neighborhood 1 Place Type/Zoning will not exceed three stories in height or 48 feet.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said staff believes those changes are minor and do not warrant additional review by the Zoning Committee.

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

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Molina, and carried unanimously to approve 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. 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 need for additional housing units and additional housing types in the area supersedes the current lack of connectivity to the site by means other than automobiles. While the site lacks proximity to amenities such as daily goods and services, and transportation, it is close to a large employment center, Charlotte-Douglas International Airport which needs housing to support necessary employment. The site is also close to the CLT Destination District, adjacent to Charlotte-Douglas International Airport, that will see additional amenities developed in the future, as modified.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 708-709.

\* \* \* \* \*

## HEARINGS

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said okay. So, we are going to transition into our hearings, and our very first hearing is Item No. 15. If you could just give us a moment, we have provided simultaneous translation on this particular petition. So, if you can just give us a moment or two. Council members, please place your earphone in your ear and make sure the volume is up, so when we begin this you'll be able to hear.

**Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney** said Mayor Pro Tem, I'm not sure if we can find out from staff who's going to be doing the interpreting, and if we could maybe get like a test.

**Councilmember Peacock arrived at 5:45 p.m.**

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said yes, we've done the test. The gentleman, raise your hand, he's right there, and then anything that we are saying back in the form of questions will be translated with the young lady at the top into Spanish. Alright, so any

more questions before we begin? Please have grace with us. This is our very first time doing this process here is a Zoning Meeting. So, there might be a curveball here, but we'll get through it.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said Mayor Pro Tem, one more thing, and because it is our first time doing this and we may have some challenges, at your discretion Council, we suggest that there be an accommodation of 15 minutes instead of 10 minutes when the opposition speakers take their time.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said yes, because there's some time for translation, just the understanding, we've decided for a reasonable accommodation shift. So, when the opposition is speaking, they'll have 15 minutes instead of 10 minutes to speak in aggregate, yes, okay. Welcome, Mr. Peacock, if you could get your earphone going here, you'll need it in just a minute.

**ITEM NO. 15: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-127 BY WOOD PARTNERS FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 19.49 ACRES LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF PROSPERITY CHURCH ROAD, ALONG EITHER SIDE OF NADA PARK CIRCLE AND BUTNER TRAIL LANE, SOUTHEAST OF BENFIELD ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-C (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-C, CONDITIONAL) AND NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said 2024-127, it's about 19.5 acres located on the west side of Prosperity Church Road along either side of Nada Park Circle and Butner Trail Lane. As mentioned, the property is zoned Neighborhood-1A. The proposed zoning is N-2C, Conditional, as well as Neighborhood Center, Conditional, so N-2C and NC, Conditional. The Adopted Place Type for this property is Neighborhood-1, as recommended on the 2040 Policy Map. You can see we do have a Community Activity Center just to the south of this property, as well as on the east side of this property. The proposal is broken up into two development areas. The first development area for residential would be for up to 395 residential units across two of those development areas. Development area one would be multi-family attached units or townhomes. Development area two would permit any residential type allowed in N-2C. There is a portion of this project that is also proposing non-residential uses, that's that area in red that's along the east side or right side of the projects, that you can see up on the screen, that is for up to 25,000 square feet of non-residential uses, that is considered development area three. Prohibited uses in that area would include things like gas stations, auto repair, group homes, vehicle rental, self-storage, and similar intensive uses.

There is a workforce housing commitment within this project, and that states that at least five percent of the units in area two would be workforce housing, and they would be income restricted at no greater than 80 percent AMI for a minimum of 15 years. There is also open space and public parks being proposed to improve public park areas, each with at least four features, such as enhanced plantings, public arts or sculptures, speciality paving, shaded elements, seating or interactive experiences. There's transportation improvements that are a part of this petition as well, improvements to access via Prosperity Church Road, Benfield Road and Cardinal Point Road. It also delivers on some capital improvements, like bike lanes, sidewalks, storm drainage, curb and gutter, and also a roundabout at Prosperity and Benfield. There are also eight-foot planting strips and eight-foot sidewalks along both major frontages. It does also extend Cardinal Point as a public street that would be built to office and commercial standards, and that would connect directly to the Activity Center just to the south. Their network streets A and B would both be public as well. There are, again, buffered bike lanes on Benfield Road, and a 50-foot pedestrian zone at the main access with also a sidewalk connection to the CNIP (Comprehensive Neighborhood Improvement Project) greenway. There are design commitments and architectural commitments built into the proposal as well for those residential structures, as well as



some of the design and site layout. As mentioned, staff does recommend approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to site design. It is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for Neighborhood-1, but as it transitions out of that Activity Center, and is immediately adjacent to it, it does provide direct access to those options for goods and services that are part of some of those goals of the 10-minute neighborhood. It's also within the Prosperity Village CNIP area, which will improve Prosperity Church Road between Old Ridge and Benfield. It'll improve curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm drainage, bicycle lanes, on-street parking, as well as that installation of the roundabout at Prosperity Church Road and Prosperity Ridge Road. Again, there are workforce housing commitments and other aspects of the petition that staff do believe, while inconsistent, do make it a project that staff, again, is recommending approval of upon resolution of those outstanding issues. So, with that, we'll turn it over to the petitioner, as well as the community, and we will take questions following both of those presentations. Thank you.

**Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. Bridget Grant, Land Use Consultant with Moore & Van Allen. Pleased to be here this evening representing Wood Partners. I come before you with a number of petitions, and this is undoubtedly one of the more difficult ones we've had to navigate. We appreciate staff's support, but we know we have a little bit more work to do on this one. The owner made the difficult decision to sell the property after 60 years, and though this does not come without it's challenges, I think it's really important for us to clarify that with or without the rezoning, the mobile home operations are set to shutter on May 29, 2026, and this aligns with some of the communication that was shared by the seller in May of 2024. That said, I'm here tonight on behalf of the petitioner who's seeking to buy the site, and who understands the magnitude of this change, and is willing to work with the residents as part of this rezoning on a transition plan over the next month or so.

So, nonetheless, I wanted to give you a little bit of that background before I step in to some of the basics, we typically share with you during the public hearing. As Dave mentioned, this is a 19.49 acre site in Prosperity Village. It is directly adjacent to the Activity Center, and when you look on the map, you can see there's a strong mix of a range of zoning types in this area that really speaks to the range of commercial uses, as well as residential uses and density. We are right on the edge of the Activity Center, and it is not uncommon for areas like this to be considered for rezoning because of their proximity to resources, amenities, schools, and other desirable services. So, again, in terms of the timeline, in May of 2024, the property owner, not the petitioner, notified the mobile home residents that they intended to cease operations. The site was put on the market for sale, and Wood Partners went under contract and filed a rezoning in October of 2024. In November of 2024, we sent out notices, per the City's list, for a community meeting, and in December of 2024, we had our community meeting and had about 21 attendees. There was a little bit of a pause in the process, because we were working through the transportation analysis, and confirming that we were meeting all of the requirements of the rezoning process related to site plan changes and transportation.

In April of 2025, Councilmember Johnson was kind enough to host a follow-up community meeting, specifically for the residents of Forest Park, so we could try to provide some clarity about what was going on in the process and confirm what the seller was anticipating in terms of next steps. When you look at the proposed site plan, I think Dave did a pretty job of hitting the highlights, you can see the site is turned, but our site is bound by Prosperity Church Road, Benfield Road, and does offer the extension of Cardinal Point Drive through the site, which is something desirable when you're considering rezoning is when we're extending our overall transportation network to provide relief. This gives you a little more detail and shows a little more of the open spaces. We are proposing up to 395 residential units. About 18 of those are townhomes, the remainder are apartments, and we do have 25,000 square feet of retail, restaurant, and personal service uses. This is intended to align with the goal of Community Activity Centers and supporting the idea that we're creating 10-minute walkable visions in proximity to our Activity Centers.

So, when you look at the rezoning rationale and the plan benefits, strictly in terms of land use, this is located adjacent to an Activity Center, with good proximity to schools, parks, and services. As Dave mentioned, we're approximate to I-485 within a fourth of a mile of the 52X bus stop. As proposed mix of residential uses that does provide a good transition between the Activity Center and the surrounding residential uses, it also increases the amount of housing availability in the area, provides an opportunity for additional retail services, and commits to a minimum of five percent of the multi-family stacked offered at 80 percent AMI or below. I think it's, again, important to just close by saying that the petitioner and the property owner are committed to continue to work to ease this transition upon the sale of the mobile home park, and I know we have a lot of speakers signed up, so I'll go ahead and keep it short, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Councilmember Molina** said so, Mayor Pro Tem, my wonder is, do we need someone to tell them those rules in Spanish? Where is the translator? Are you able to tell them that?

**Unknown** said I just did.

Ms. Molina said you just did, okay.

Unknown said [inaudible].

Ms. Molina said they have it in their ear as well.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said some of them do, the four Spanish speaking ones.

Ms. Molina said okay, good.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said so, all the names that I have read are speaking in opposition. We simply have four Spanish speaking individuals, but the rest are English speaking individuals.

**Councilmember Johnson** said how many people have on headsets?

Ms. Mayfield said 13.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said 15. If they've requested a headset, and they were available, they have them. Alright, we will get started with 15 minutes, and por favor, di tu nombre (please say your name).

**Yolanda Reyes, 4703 Butner Trail Lane** (Spanish/Español) Hola buenas noches soy Yolanda Reyes yo vengo a ponerme que hagan el desarrollo porque hace 16 años que yo vivo ahí estado esforzándome sacrificando todo lo que tengo para poder mantener mi casa bien estado activa con la comunidad cuando compartimos con los niños cuando salen a jugar, viendo que estén bien que no haya carros que pasen tranquilamente estamos ahí ayudando a que la comunidad tenga una area bonita con jardines con compartimos con los vecinos nos cuidamos los unos a los otros hemos desarrollado un respeto y un ambiente de amabilidad de confianza de cuidado entre nosotros desarrollando lo que ustedes dicen que son valores de una comunidad valores de una ciudad. Nosotros estamos en desacuerdo con el desarrollo porque no nos habían avisado o sea nos dijeron se tienen que ir no nos dan otras alternativas nosotros hemos estado ahí, esforzándonos por nuestras casas. Ha llegado de ahora. Todo el Desarrollo que ha llegado es de ahora. Nosotros cuando llegamos ahi no habían estas casas era lo más alejado que había de la ciudad por eso estamos en desacuerdo porque los urbanizadores han hecho y han hecho y han hecho y han hecho y están cargando nuestras comunidades con mucha gente con muchos lugares gente pero no hay esa confianza todos entran a su departamento a su casa y no se conocen. No hay una amistad no hay una confianza para decir aqui estamos para todos. Gracias.

(English) Hello, good evening. My name is Yolanda Reyes. I am here to oppose this development because I have lived there for 16 years, working hard and sacrificing everything I have to keep my home in good condition. I have been active in the community—spending time with the children when they go out to play, making sure they are safe and that no cars pass by speeding. We are there, helping to keep the area beautiful with gardens, sharing with our neighbors, looking out for one another.

We have built respect, kindness, trust, and care among ourselves—what you call the values of a community, the values of a city. We are against this development because we were not informed. They simply told us, “You have to leave,” without giving us any other options.

All this new development is recent. When we first arrived, there were no houses—it was as far from the city as you could get. That is why we disagree: the developers have built and built and built and built, overloading our community with too many people and too many buildings, but without building trust. People go straight into their apartments or houses and don’t know each other. There is no friendship, no trust to say, “We are here for everyone.” Thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said there are 13 minutes left.

**Yolanda Valentin, 4746 Butner Trail Lane** (Spanish/Español) Hola buenas tardes a todos. Venimos a pedir de su apoyo para que no se apruebe el Proyecto que quieren hacer en nuestra comunidad. Nosotros tenemos 20 años viviendo en ese lugar. Y nosotros hemos invertido mucho en ese lugar y hemos invertido, son unos \$80,000 or \$90,000. Todos nuestros ahorros ahí han estado en nuestras paredes, en nuestros pisos. jardines. Y pues nuestros hijos no se quieren mover de ahí porque ahí tienen sus escuelas cercas y sus medicos mi esposo tiene su trabajo ahí. Hay cerca? Y practicamente tenemos todos ahí. Y pues estamos muy bien con todos los vecinos, somos un pueblo. Practicamente nos conocemos todos. Hay Buena Amistad con todos con los niños. Y es por eso que no nos queremos ir de esa comunidad. Y pues esperemos que pues nos apoyen y que nos apruebe ese Proyecto y nos dejen ahí. Gracias.

(English) Good afternoon, everyone. We are here to ask for your support so that the project they want to build in our community is not approved. We have lived there for 20 years, and we have invested a lot—around \$80,000 or \$90,000. All our savings are in our walls, our floors, our gardens.

Our children don’t want to move because their schools are nearby, their doctors are nearby, and my husband’s job is close. Practically everything we need is there. We have a great relationship with all the neighbors—we are like a small town. We all know each other. There is friendship with everyone, including the children.

That is why we don’t want to leave our community. We hope you will support us, reject this project, and let us stay. Thank you.

**Moria Albarran, 7225 Nada Park Circle** (Spanish/Español) Hola todos yo soy María Albarrán y yo vengo que nos apoyen en este proyecto porque si no nos apoyan nos dejan en la calle como mucho todos vivimos ahí yo llevo 18 años viviendo ahí en esa área de las traerlas, desde que tenía seis años Yo crecí allí fui a la escuela hice amigos donde dice vecinos ahí con todos es un lugar muy bonito ahora yo tengo un hijo de tres años y estoy esperando otro hijo y yo quisiera que mis hijos crecieran ahí fueran a la escuela donde yo me gradué donde yo crecí, y es un lugar muy tranquilo que yo, que en otros lugares donde hay delincuencia roban en los apartamentos y si yo me saliera de ahí, no voy a encontrar otra tranquilidad para mis hijos como ahí en las traerlas Yo soy hija mayor de mis papás que son indocumentados son inmigrantes de aquí y no tienen como ellos poder sacar un crédito o un una casa un pago entonces ellos dependen de mí no hace mucho, Yo compré mi tráela hace tres años le he invertido le puse siding piso y ahorita nos quieren sacar cosa que no me quiero ir, porque para mí

es mi casa ya yo no soy como yo no me creo que estoy pagando renta al contrario me siento ya dueña de esa tráela mi hijo tambien se siente feliz ahí con los niños que juegan afuera. Y yo quiero que nos apoyen para mí y toda la comunidad que están ahí en las traerlas Para que nadie se quede sin su hogar Buscar una forma para que nadie se quede en la calle y espero que tengamos su apoyo de ustedes.

(English) Hello everyone, my name is María Albarrán. I am here to ask for your support, because if you don't support us, we will end up on the street—like many others. We all live there. I have lived in that trailer park for 18 years, since I was six years old. I grew up there, went to school there, made friends with all the neighbors. It's a beautiful place. Now I have a three-year-old son and I'm expecting another child. I want my children to grow up there, to go to the same school where I graduated, to have the same peace and safety. In other places there is crime, apartments get broken into. If I leave, I will not find the same security for my children as I have there.

I am the eldest daughter of my parents, who are undocumented immigrants. They cannot get credit or buy a house, so they depend on me. Not long ago—just three years ago—I bought my trailer. I invested in it, put siding and new flooring, and now they want to remove us. I don't want to go, because for me it is my home. I don't feel like I'm paying rent—on the contrary, I feel like the owner. My son is happy there, playing outside with the other kids.

I ask you to support me and the entire community in the trailer park so that no one loses their home. Let's find a way so no one ends up on the street. I hope for your support.

**Sonia Hernandez, 7205 Nada Park Circle** (Spanish/Español) Buenas noches mi nombre es Sonia Hernández y vengo a pedirles por favor que que reconsideren en aprobar este proyecto porque ellos ellos están planeando hacer nuevas casas pero qué pasa con todos los que vamos a quedar sin casa a ellos no les importa que nos quedemos sin hogar porque muchos pueden salirse y buscar otro otra casa, pero no todos contamos con el dinero. Todos hemos invertido en nuestras casas y para nosotros nunca pensamos salirnos de ahí, todos tenemos nuestro dinero invertido, nuestros ahorros, nuestra vida en esas casas. No es justo que vengan, y nos digan que no tenemos que salir en dos años nadie va ahorrar dinero para comprar una casa Por favor, apóyennos

(English) Good evening. My name is Sonia Hernández, and I am here to ask you to please reconsider approving this project. They plan to build new houses, but what will happen to all of us who will be left without a home? It seems they don't care if we end up homeless.

Some people can leave and find another place, but not all of us have the money. We have invested in our homes and never planned to leave. Our savings, our lives are in those houses. It is not fair to tell us we must leave in two years—no one can save enough in that time to buy a house. Please support us.

**Joshua Teague, 4734 Butner Trail Lane** said thank you. I just want to ask for your consideration. I've been living in the park almost 20 years. I found a home there. I found neighbors that I consider friends and family, and when times were hard, I could turn to them neighbors, like my friends [inaudible] and [inaudible], and when I needed their help, they were there. I consider them family. I don't want to leave the park. I want to stay with my family. Please, vote no on this.

**Leonel Chaves, 7361 Nada Park Circle** said good afternoon, Council. My name is Leonel Chaves. I'm 24. I've lived in Forest Park area for close to 15 years. I come here today to speak for my family and for my community, and I hope to gain support to vote no on the rezoning of the area. Renee, I want to give you a special thank you for responding to the emails and working on this since February 2025. We, as a committee, are not against development, but we are against displacement. Not only is this a neighborhood, it's a whole community. Some have lived decades in their homes, the

majority having families and family members in the neighborhood, and all of us have invested tens of thousands of dollars into our homes. We are homeowners, we can't afford to just leave it all behind, and we can't move the homes either, because of the age of the homes, or the additions that we made to the homes, and some because they are simply just older, and have everything invested into their homes, now at risk of losing everything. Nowhere in the Charlotte area will we find \$500 affordable housing, and apartments around the Forest Park area cost three times that just for a studio apartment.

For over a year, since being told that we may have to leave our homes, we were kept in the dark, being told that we would stay informed and that letters were being sent out, yet we never received them, and we were never given the option to do something about the rezoning. My mother and many of my neighbors are immigrants who work hard every day to provide for their families, and now have something else to worry about, besides being ripped away from their families. It feels unfair and unjust, because we thought our representatives would protect us from situations like this. This place is my childhood. No other community is like ours. Help is given when it's needed. All we ask is to stay, or at least give us options, for our community for all the time, money and work that was put into our community, and to also protect us from predatory buyers who want to take advantage of the situation.

So, once again, I ask the Council to please support us and to say no. Also, with the other developments in the area, there's an increase in traffic, increase in crime. My sister lives in some apartments really close to where we live, and they have stolen her car before, and it seems like every day the crime is just increasing. Also, the land use right now, I feel like what we've done to the area has been great, and that'll be all. Thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you very much. For any of the other individuals who had signed up to speak in opposition, you still have four minutes if you want to leverage that. So, if I've already called your name, and you didn't speak, you do have four minutes if someone would like to utilize it now. You have to utilize it now, though.

**Raul Ramirez** said hello everybody. My name is Raul Ramirez. I've lived in Forest Park for about 20 years.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said hang on, Mr. Ramirez. Had you signed up? I don't see your name on the list.

Mr. Ramirez said no.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I'm sorry, I may have misspoken, but only if you have signed up in opposition, and I read those names a few times, then you can utilize the four minutes, but otherwise we can't have you speak if you haven't signed up.

Unknown said let him speak.

Unknown said let him speak.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, that's not where we're going.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said hang on. We have conducted this cordially and through the rules with reasonable accommodations, and we've said it a few times. Okay, if you can't be civil and allow the process to continue, then we're going to have to ask you to leave and have you removed. So, I hope that you will allow the process to continue, because it's actually been very helpful.

Mr. Ramirez said okay, I understand, no problem. Thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, I appreciate that. So, Ms. Grant, you can now come up and have your rebuttal.

**Carter Siegel, 521 East Morehead Street, Suite 350** said Mayor Pro Tem, Council. My name is Carter Siegel. I work for Wood Partners. It's difficult to be here in front of a strong community like this. We're in business for building communities, and it's not often that we're in this position. Typically, we're coming in, in areas where there are old warehouses, as the City evolves, as we build multi-family, but we're in the business to build communities, and I completely appreciate the spirit and emotion behind me. That having been said, the City has changed a lot. The owners that own this mobile home park have owned it since the 1960s, and Charlotte has changed a lot since the 1960s. As some mentioned earlier, this used to be farmland, and now we have an interstate next door, and it's become a critical part of Charlotte's growth corridor. I can't be here and say the transition is easy. I can fully appreciate that any transition, particularly if you've been in a home for 20 years or longer and you've raised your family there, any kind of transition is going to be difficult. What we can commit to today, before Council, before the community, is that we will work hard to try to make that transition reasonable. The owners of the park, they went out of their way, they made notice a year ago, and to give the residents as many as two years to find a home, appreciating the transition is difficult. Many folks would not have done that. I give them a lot of credit and the owners that credit. During that time period, they've not increased rents, they've kept rents in this community below market. I think they deserve credit for that as well for what it's worth, but we're here to offer what we can to ease this transition. That's all I can say. Thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you and thank you for allowing us to proceed with the process. We're going to open it up to the Council for questions.

**Councilmember Ajmera** said this one is a difficult rezoning. So, if I can bring petitioner up here, I have a few questions, someone from Wood Partners, if they could come up. How many residents are at this site currently residing?

Mr. Siegel said I believe existing, 60 homes.

Ms. Ajmera said 60 homes. So, do you know how many residents we are talking about here?

Ms. Grant said so, Wood Partners does not own the site. It's owned by a different family. So, as purchasers they're not privy to the number of residents who live within that community.

Ms. Ajmera said I think if you can provide us that information, that would be helpful, in a follow-up report, because we are talking about a major displacement here. So, I think that would be important for me. Also, some of the residents I heard, they shared that they were not given sufficient notice. Could you tell me about the process of providing a notice to our residents, and what steps were followed to ensure all the residents were given proper notice?

Ms. Grant said so the notice was between the property owner and the residents, and it's our understanding that in May of 2024, they provided letters in both English and in Spanish, and the property manager delivered them to each of the residents, and I think several of the speakers acknowledged that they had received some letter of communication. There has not been any significant movement during that time, other than that the plan hasn't changed to sell the property and hopefully close the operation of the mobile home park in 2026.

Ms. Ajmera said so, what was the timeline, you said, when that notice went out?

Ms. Grant said May of 2024.

Mr. Siegel said April 2024.

Ms. Grant said sorry, April 2024, with the hope that providing two years.

Mr. Siegel said I'm sorry, May 20, 2024, excuse me. I'm looking at it, May 20, 2024.

Ms. Grant said with the hope that two years would help ease the transition and provide more time than is typically given in this type of situation.

Ms. Ajmera said so, May 20, 2024. So, they have until May 2026.

Ms. Grant said that's correct.

Ms. Ajmera said two years. Was there any relocation assistance being provided?

Ms. Grant said that's part of what we're working on right now. This is something that we're going to look at a transition plan and resources that we can find to assist in that process.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, could share that with us?

Ms. Grant said that's our goal.

Ms. Ajmera said before the decision.

Ms. Grant said absolutely.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. I appreciate all the residents for coming out. This is a difficult decision, not just for me, but I can tell for many of our colleagues. I look forward to working with District Councilmember Johnson as we make a decision on this next month, but I appreciate the work Councilwoman Johnson has done to engage with the community. I also appreciate Jessica and Robert Dawkins, with Action NC, to ensure that residents were aware of the process, that they had access to interpretation service. I appreciate the work that City Clerk has done and our staff. This shows that we are being equitable in our approach to engaging community. That's all I have. Thank you.

**Councilmember Brown** said I just want to make sure I acknowledge my colleague, Councilmember Johnson, and the work that she's done, and follow her leadership, but the amount of community that has come out, and the concern for displacement, and whatever we can do to offset that, of course, my sentiments what Councilmember Ajmera has just said to the public as well, with the community engagement, Action NC, Robert Dawkins, and his team, making sure that they led as a community in the right steps and in the right direction. So, we care, we hear you, and we hope that we can definitely come to a viable solution to support you and your families, thank you. We will follow Councilmember Johnson's lead, as it is her District.

Ms. Molina said thank you, Mayor Pro Tem. So, (Spanish/Español) Puedo hablar con la gente que han venido aca y Yo se que eso es algo demasiado dificil. Toda la familia que estan asi prmero yo se que eso es dificil de venir aca.

(English) I can speak with the people who have come here, and I know this is extremely difficult for families.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said Ms. Molina, momento. She has to be able to capture it. So, do you have an earpiece?

Ms. Molina said oh, okay. I do, I have an earpiece. So, (Spanish/Español) No hay una manera de decir eso directamente a ustedes no me dejan hablar en Espanol para poder hablar directamente contigo pero quiero decirte algo.

(English) There is no way to tell you this directly—I'm not allowed to speak in Spanish here to address you directly—but I want to tell you something.

So, I've got to switch to English. I don't have the ability to tell you directly in Spanish. So, what I will say is thank you to all of the families that came out today. I know that this is not an easy thing to come before this Council. Many of the families that came have been in the neighborhood for a very long time, and I think we realize that. This would be so much better if I could tell you in Spanish. I really want to tell you in Spanish. I can't, no, because she's got to be able to capture my words.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said she has it now.

Ms. Molina said oh, so I can, oh, okay.

**Councilmember Peacock** said Councilmember Molina, I hope that you will speak up and please speak to this, because the process is very intimidating. Most people who come to this room here do not understand our process. This is not a decision tonight. This is a hearing, and that something will happen. I hope you will please explain that, and who these individuals are here, as well too, and that they represent citizens who were appointed, and that we pride ourselves in a very fair and open process. The petitioner is going to be working with them and the residents as well too. You all have been to these decisions, just like I have, and I know how sensitive this is. So, please articulate.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said absolutely. Just before we pass it back over to Ms. Molina, Mr. Peacock, we've had simultaneous translation with the process with individuals who requested headsets. So, that's been good.

Ms. Molina said (Spanish/Español) La cuestión aquí es que lo que quiere hacer la gente que acaban de comprar el terreno es que ellos quieren hacer otra cosa y la persona que está encargado del lugar ahora no es el mismo de la persona que que quiere comprar el terreno y hay la persona que No es la misma persona la que quiere desarrollar la zona. Así que hay gente que quiere comprar la propiedad y está el propietario actual, que es quien la ha tenido durante los últimos 60 años, por lo que son dos personas diferentes. Así que, me parece a mi que en este caso, según lo que me han explicado hasta ahora, me parece que las personas que han sido propietarias durante los últimos 60 años son las que se lo están vendiendo a esa otra persona, y no sé si esa persona que lo esta comprando que lo podrá mantener intacto el parque de caravanas, pero eso no significa que no haya forma de que podamos ayudarle, como concejala de su zona. Puedo ayudar y puedo estar allí. La persona que esta al lado mio, es la persona responsable de su zona puedo ofrecerle mi ayuda. Puedo hablar español con ella, para que pueda entender lo que dicen las familias. Como no he estado en todo el proceso, es muy difícil porque no he estado in the whole procesos es demasiado difícil, lo entiendo, y no lo sé. No quedan lugares con alquileres de 500 dólares, y hay muchos factores, pero hay dos cosas que están sucediendo en este momento. Displacement ni se como decir eso en Espanol. There is displacement and a pettiton, but that doesn't mean there isn't a way to....

(English) The issue is that the people who just bought the land want to do something different. The person currently in charge of the property is not the same as the person who wants to buy it. The current owner has had it for the last 60 years. It seems to me, based on what I've been told, that the long-time owners are selling to someone else. I don't know if the new buyer will keep the mobile home park as it is, but that doesn't mean there's no way I can help you as the council member for your district.

I can help, and I can be there. The person next to me is responsible for your area, and I can speak Spanish with her, so she understands what the families are saying. Since I have not been involved in the entire process, it is very difficult. I understand it is extremely hard. There are no more places with \$500 rent. There are many factors, and



two things are happening at the same time—displacement, and a petition. But that doesn't mean there is no way forward.

There's displacement and then there's a petition. They are two different things, but that doesn't mean that there's not a way to help the people who are existing and what the petitioner is doing. I have to say this, I don't know if denying the petition will stop the displacement. I think that's a very important statement to make. I don't know if there is, with the denial of the petition, stopping displacement. There's more questions to find out, but I do know that the petitioner has said that they're willing to help with any potential displacement, but I think it's important to be honest in that way. This is probably one of the most difficult petitions I've seen in a long time, to have so many families that have been in one place for so very long, and there's already been a decision to sell, and a need to help so many families. So, what I know for sure is that these conversations are going to be ongoing. Tonight is not a decision. I think the Council member that's here to my left is going to be heavily involved in the process in making sure that there is communication between both parties and finding out if there is a comfortable resolution here. I feel confident that every Council member that's sitting here is probably in the same place where this is equally as hard for them to listen to. It's equally as challenging to hear, and like I said, I think it's something that we'll all be tuned into to see if there is a way to do both things at once, if that is what moves forward. Like I said, this isn't a guarantee that this petition will even move forward or not. I think it's important to say that one thing is a petition, where a new buyer is interested in doing something else, and the person who currently owns the land has made a decision to sell, and he is in charge of what is currently there, and then there's a new petition that would still probably move forward if this petition were to go through.

So, I just look forward to staying connected with the Council member for the District to make sure that we're kept up to date on what the challenges are. That's the best way I can put it, because this is hard. So, people that have lived [INAUDIBLE] the last 18 years [INAUDIBLE] very hard. That's all I've got to say. Gracias.

Ms. Mayfield said Mr. Pettine, I am not as versed on mobile homes, so help me understand, because some of the residents mentioned their home and what they've invested in it. So, what we're currently talking about is land that is owned by a company individual, but the actual mobile homes, I'm renting a spot at the mobile home, because they also mention a rent price. So, I wanted clarification on that with how that works.

Mr. Pettine said yes, your understanding is correct. So, it's one property owner, they have available spaces, four units to be located there, so the folks that have their units there likely own those, and they rent the space to locate them in on that property.

Ms. Mayfield said do we ever look at North Carolina General Statute? So, back in 2021 and 2022, there was House Bill 1110 that actually gave some clarification around specifically mobile homes. It was specifically the Mobile Home Park Act. Basically, it says, enacts Article 8, General Assembly, Chapter 42, to be cited as the Mobile Home Park Act, sets the scope of the Article to apply to mobile homes only defined as a single-family dwelling built on a permanent chassis designed for long-term residential occupancy and containing all the things, electrical, plumbing, all of that. So, knowing that we have that legislative language, which identifies mobile parks, if Council were to move, and say Council did not support this particular petition request, by-right what could be done with this land, because they own their building, but they don't own the land. So, help me understand what are the rights that the residents have, so that we can have a fair conversation.

Mr. Pettine said yes, that's probably one I don't know if I would way too much into, because I'm not an expert on that myself. I'm not familiar with the piece of legislation you're talking about, so I'd like to take a look at it.

Ms. Mayfield said so, let me pause right there. To our City Attorney, that's part of your question before, as we move on with this hearing, to get clarification on how House Bill 1110 from 2021, 2022, could be interpreted for this conversation. Okay, Mr. Pettine.

Mr. Pettine said so, is that the question then? Is it going to be for followup?

Ms. Mayfield said that was that part [INAUDIBLE] for the rest of the question.

Mr. Pettine said and so, the rest of the question is, what could they do by-right? So, the property currently, I believe, is zoned N-1A. So, it could be all uses under N-1A without a rezoning. So, that'd be single-family, duplex, triplex. They could use compact development or conservation development to maybe get a few more additional lots than what could be allowed by-right with just all standard development regulations, but without any kind of rezoning, then N-1A would really only allow those uses in the UDO, which again are those duplex, triplex, quadraplex, in instances where that fourth unit is affordable.

Ms. Mayfield said so, whether we move at a later date, when it's time for decision, to approve or deny, that still does not impact whether or not these units are going to stay on this land, because the owner of the land is in the process of selling that land, and that new owner then has an opportunity to do something very different than what's currently there, for clarification?

Mr. Pettine said that's correct, yes.

Ms. Mayfield said okay. Ms. Grant, question for you, because you mentioned, which is our process, the letters went out in May of 2024, but it went to the property owner, not to the individual residents. It was the property owner's responsibility to send it to each of the units, or you sent the notifications to each unit?

Ms. Grant said as Councilmember Molina articulated, I think it's important to note that there are almost two processes going on. One is a property owner has decided to sell their land and basically close their business, and so that was the first one.

Ms. Mayfield said okay. Just to make sure that we're on the same page for the specific question that I'm asking.

Ms. Grant said in May 2024.

Ms. Mayfield said a notification?

Ms. Grant said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said just for the notification to the residents. Did it go to the property owner, or did it go directly to the residents?

Ms. Grant said there are two different notifications. The May 2024 notification was a notification from the property owner directly to the residents. That was not tied or affiliated to the rezoning, and therefore, that's what went to the residents. Then there is a separate process for rezoning, and when we followed the rezoning process, we used the City mailing list, and the rezoning notifications go to the property owner.

Ms. Mayfield said so, our notifications for this conversation of rezoning. I wanted to clarify that, because what was mentioned in your comments and in our discussion, is the fact that the property owners sent information to the residents, but we did hear that some residents say they didn't receive. So, I want to make sure that we clarify those are two separate conversations, as far as you coming here tonight in preparation for this hearing, you all did not send any notifications. So, there could be some residents that learned about it as far as this evening. You're saying the owners had expressed that they sent notification directly to the residents to give at least a year's notice, to your

understand, because since you weren't a part of the process, you don't know if it was done, but to your understanding, that was what was done?

Ms. Grant said that's correct. I mean, I've seen the letter, and I think it's important to note that when the owner was selling the property, they did not mention that it was contingent upon a rezoning. They basically indicated that they were closing the business, hoped to sell, and intended to close operations in May of 2026, to allow two years. So, I think there's a little bit of a gap in that the rezoning process is not necessarily tied to the communication shared with the residents in the mobile home park.

Ms. Mayfield said so, two separate conversations, but what I was getting to, is making sure that we had clarity on, you all did not send notification to the current residents.

Ms. Grant said that's correct.

Ms. Mayfield said you're saying that that came from the owners of the property, and when we say two years notice, we're in 2025 now having this conversation. For your client, if this were to move forward, what was the expectation of the property being vacated by?

Ms. Grant said May of 2026.

Ms. Mayfield said so, we're having this hearing now, may come up for decision before we end 2025. So, what you all have expressed to the residents is that there's an expectation to vacate the land by May of 2025, and you mentioned that you had some conversations regarding possible assistance with relocation?

Ms. Grant said I want to clarify, 2026. We're in 2025. It's a year later that they would be looking at. Yes, as part of the rezoning package, we think it's an opportunity for us to use the rezoning process to try to find a way to ease the transition and provide more services as part of the process.

Ms. Mayfield said so, for clarification, so that I completely understand. From tonight's conversation, I am specifically asking if the expectation for the property to be clear, if this were to move forward, has been expressed to the residents that they will have until May of 2026 to vacate?

Ms. Grant said that's correct.

Ms. Mayfield said so, that is why you mentioned two years from when the notification was sent. Thank you for the clarification.

Ms. Grant said you're welcome.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I wanted to just make a couple comments myself. Sir, you can't speak from the room, so thank you. So, thank you for coming out tonight, and not only for tonight, but I see that there was good participation in the community meetings as well. So, thank you all for being engaged and paying attention to what's going on in your community. A couple of things that I've been learning over the last few days is, as it was mentioned, there are two separate processes, and the current landowner has provided notification back in May 2024 through the property manager of their intention to sell the property and do something else, and so in essence giving a two-year window to allow people to make certain decisions and prepare themselves, which I think is admirable to do that. I do think a two-year window is admirable to do, that level of notification. However, it sounds like many of these residents have lived in this particular neighborhood for decades and have invested in their mobile homes in a permanent way. Perhaps, and this is a question, Ms. Grant. So, perhaps under the lens that there wouldn't potentially be a time where the land would be sold, has there been any conversation around, we're talking about what we've heard tonight from residents

is, tens of thousands of dollars being invested in their mobile homes. Any conversation in the community meeting or individually around, was there any misunderstanding that this was effectively a rental situation?

Ms. Grant said I appreciate the question. I think it's difficult for me to speak to the terms of individual leases with the people who are leasing the lot that they've moved their mobile home to, and so, it's unfortunate in any situation when you don't own the land. You are essentially subject to the conditions of your lease, and if there's a desire to terminate the lease or change the conditions, I think that's what the property owner has the right to do, but I can't really speak to the specifics of the lease. Again, I think that the family has owned the property for over 60 years, and they made the choice to divest, because it's sort of an outlier in their overall business portfolio, and so for them it was time to close that particular business. I'm not sure about the individual leases and what that meant in terms of the individual investments.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said go ahead.

Mr. Siegel said I'll speak. It's my understanding that they're 30-day leases. So, I think everyone has an existing lease, is my understanding, but they're rolling 30-day leases.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, because my question was going to be around potentially looking at the leases from a landlord residential lens to ensure that the language was proper in the lease. So, maybe we can just underscore that to make doubly sure that that was clear, because it sounds like there's been tremendous investment in property that may potentially have been under a 30-day notification. That's a difficult situation, as Ms. Molina stated, a difficult situation.

The other piece that I want to just be clear of is, the current owner has the right to sell his land, of course. However, the connection with the landowner and this particular petition, is there any connection? It sounds like there's no connection. If this petitioner were to withdraw the petition, or if the Council were to decline the petition, the current landowner would proceed to move forward, as they have indicated back in May 2024? Is that accurate?

Mr. Siegel said yes, I would add, it's my understanding that, again, they've owned this for a long time. The family's gotten older. It's an old property. What I've been told is it's very difficult to get a mobile home park like this insured these days, so the insurance has been difficult to get full coverage. So, among other reasons, they're just kind of tired of owning and operating a mobile home park, frankly. So, they made that decision to move on. They contacted us. We've been in Charlotte for a long time, and I've been before this Council many times on rezonings, and so they trusted that we would be a good steward to go through and trust that we could build a quality development on the property, but we have it under contracts. They are not part of this rezoning, so they're totally separate. Did that make sense?

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay. My concern is, there are other mobile home neighborhoods or parks throughout the City of Charlotte, even one or two in District One, and my concern is that this might be one of the first times in recent history that we're dealing with this. Again, as you actually stated in your comments, the City is everchanging, growing rapidly. This situation may come up again, and so Mr. Pettine, and just for staff, I think we need to be able to have a point of view of some type of outlook from a prescriptive perspective of how many of these other neighborhoods and parks are out there, and how much potential displacement can occur, and could we somehow get in front of it from a policy perspective and wraparound services.

I also commend the current landlord for offering displacement services. That was also thoughtful. I hope that can happen, Ms. Johnson, as early as possible. Given that the notification went out in May 2024, again, it sounds like regardless of this petition, there will be some level of change on this property, based on the current property owner. So, I just want to make sure that we are doing as much as we can do to mitigate negative

impact from that perspective. So, we're in June 2025, and then we come back in August 2025, and so, you're in the eighth month of the year, just want to make sure, the holidays can come around very quickly, and then we find ourselves at May 2026. So, I just want to make sure that work is getting done. I know we're about to go on a break for Council, but I don't want the work to stop or pause throughout the summer recess.

Ms. Grant said I think this is a great opportunity for us to use the next two to three weeks to reconvene our team with the residents to come up with some type of package and begin to look at options.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay. Those were the most pressing questions that I had. Again, I just want to underscore that this is a really unfortunate situation, because there are two separate processes going on, and they're not tethered to each other, however, they have impact on one another. So, that's the real rub of it, is that these can be untethered, but there will still be impact at some level. So, I recommend all the residents to stay engaged over the summer months. Of course, work with Ms. Johnson. We'll continue to get updates on this over our break, but please stay engaged and stay attuned to what's going on, because this can happen very quickly, very quickly.

**Councilmember Driggs** said this is difficult for us, because it runs against what we're trying to accomplish in terms of preserving affordable housing and allowing people to stay where they are, but we need to be clear. We do not have the authority as a body to prevent the landowner. So, we could deny this petition, but we can't stop the landowner from exercising the rights of the landowner, as a landowner. They have rights under the law, and we don't have the authority to countermand them. So, what we're hoping for is that the exercise of those rights can be aligned better with our priority in terms of housing and protecting people. At the same time, the zoning itself, and I think the point has been made, but just to be very clear, whether or not this rezoning is approved, you're on a schedule that was announced by the owner to the residents last year saying that in two-years' time they intend to do something. Now, as part of that, a potential new owner has applied for this rezoning. That doesn't change the intention of the owner to sell the property. So, that's your issue. Your issue is that last year you were told the owner intends to dispose of this property, and we have to consider the rezoning according to our rules for land use. My point is, whether or not we approve it, the timeline that was announced to you before, is not something that's within our control. I did have one question, I think for the Attorney, or actually maybe for Mr. Pettine. These are so-called mobile homes. Can they actually be relocated? Or maybe petitioner?

Ms. Johnson said I can answer that too. I've done some research.

Mr. Driggs said well, let's find out.

Ms. Johnson said okay.

Mr. Siegel said it's my understanding it's personal property. Mobile homes are their personal property. I think they're just renting the pad.

Mr. Driggs said but can they be relocated?

Mr. Siegel said I don't know the age of the mobile homes, honestly. Many are probably too old to be safely transported on the roads, but I don't know the ages of all the different [INAUDIBLE]. It's an old mobile home park. It's been there since the 1960s. So, I'm sure some of those buildings maybe are rusted out on the bottom, I'm not sure.

Mr. Driggs said so, I'm just curious about the possibility that, in the course of these events, property of the people in the room is just demolished, and it seems to me there ought to be some law around that, protecting their ownership interest. So, I'll be curious to learn more about that. I don't think we're going to resolve it tonight, but Ms. Johnson, I look forward to hearing from you as you continue to work on this. Thank you.

**Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney** said Mr. Driggs, I will say, Ms. Mayfield already mentioned that there is a General Statute that addresses protections for mobile homeowners with respect to landlords, and there's a commission that is set up to resolve disputes. We really have not dug deep into that, because of course, the City is outside that process. That's the private contractual process between the mobile homeowners and the landlord, but since Ms. Mayfield did bring it up, I think that it's something that the mobile homeowner should be aware of that there is a bill that speaks to their protections.

Mr. Driggs said so, I think that was my point, though, about the separation between the two-year timeline and the owner announcing the intention to sell, and the rezoning. It may be that you have rights that are not within our authority, and that you might need to get legal advice according to that law, but that would not be for us. So, I'm looking forward with interest to learning more about things like that, but the reason we're squirming here is because we don't like to see this kind of thing happen, and yet, it's not up to us.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said yes, Mr. Driggs, I think that's a great delineation, in that we're speaking about this particular petition this evening; however, you may have rights that are outside of our purview, and I would encourage you to speak to your state legislation representatives about those rights, because we can't influence those from a local level, and we're not fully scrubbed in on the inner workings of those as well. So, I would definitely encourage you to interface and engage with your General Assembly representation as well.

Ms. Molina said thank you, Madam Mayor Pro Tem, and just for a quick follow-up. Again, a lot has been said, and [INAUDIBLE] people who can communicate with people like us, because [INAUDIBLE]. So, we are going to be in contact with Ms. Johnson [INAUDIBLE] we can talk about what are your rights. [INAUDIBLE] the laws and the states, which is different than the things that we have in the City. Those are very difficult to understand. So, we will be in contact with the people that are in charge of all of that, so that we can see if there is a way that we can help you to understand what are your rights. I do have one question for the person that's representing the petitioner. So, I want to make sure that I'm clear, and that [INAUDIBLE]. The petitioner, who is the person who's purchasing the land, they're willing to, in whatever ways that they can, help the residents that are living in the park right now, is that correct?

Mr. Siegel said that's correct, yes. That's what we're here committing to, yes.

Ms. Molina said okay, and they're willing to work through this process with those residents, right?

Ms. Grant said that's correct.

Ms. Molina said okay. So, I think [INAUDIBLE] or need some help with that. I don't know, I'm just asking to see what that means. Are they willing to help in the case that there is potential displacement, and to make sure that the people who have come have a good grasp on what these laws are that we're referring to, because to say, oh, there's another law, I realize how difficult that is. Sometimes just to know that there's a local government, then a county government, then a state government, and then to understand what we all do and what those differences are, sometimes that can be a very difficult process. So, to make it as least confusing as possible, there's a number of people that can be in place to make sure, as best as we can, that some of those things are explained to make sure that no matter what is happening here, your protections are in the forefront. So, I'll say that, and that's just my followup, because I know I heard that, but I just wanted to make sure that I was clear in that the petitioner is willing to assist in that process as well. Okay, that's all I have.

Ms. Ajmera said it's great to see my colleagues asking some tough questions. There were some questions around personal property protection that Councilmember Driggs

raised. I think that is important here, and we need to do more work in that space. So, if we can get some answers about that, Ms. Hagler-Gray, about personal property protection. I know that's not within our purview, and there is a House Bill on that, but if you could just provide us some references to that, that would be good.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said yes, and we'll have to check further, because it was filed. It was in a previous session. We'll have to make sure that it actually did pass, but the General Assembly was considering those protections.

Ms. Ajmera said because what I worry about here is, we heard from our residents, some of them have invested over \$90,000. So, to Mr. Driggs' point, if some of these units are not movable, where they are fixed, I mean, this is hundreds of thousands of dollars of losses. I mean, that is unimaginable. So, we just need more information on this. Even by August 2025, I don't know if we can get all this information in terms of personal property protections, how many units are going to be able to move to a different site, what are the alternatives. I know you are working on the package to give us that information about what the relocation assistance will look like, and also, if you could give us information on how old is the newest lease, because I think that is very relevant in this case? Let's say if the lease was just started back in 2023, and a year later they got a notice, then it certainly plays an important part. So, I don't know if there are any protections in the bill that states, hey, if the lease is new, there might be additional protections, but certainly we need to do more homework here. I look forward to getting some information from Bridget, as well as our Attorney's Office. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you to my colleagues, but thank you most of all to the residents who showed the courage to come out and advocate for yourselves. I know this is difficult for everyone, and I want you to know that we hear you. You hear the compassion for this situation from all of my colleagues. It's challenging. It's extra challenging, because many of you own your unit, but as we've learned, that the units are considered personal property. So, hopefully, that new bill, there might be some extra protections. When I learned about this petition in late 2024, one of the first things I did was speak to the City Attorney, and I walked the mobile home park, and I gave my cards to a couple people. I left it at the store. I wanted you all to reach out to me. There were a few people that reached out. One young man, and I won't say his name, but one young man was very helpful in getting some residents together. So, I did have a community meeting. The City Attorney was at that meeting. We had Planning staff. We had the developer at that meeting. So, I want to make sure that we communicate. These are things that I say all the time. This will be an opportunity, Mr. Pettine, for that zoning sign to have a barcode and be translated in Spanish. I've said that before. So, this is the reason why outreach and communication and accessibility is so important. I do have a question for City staff. This petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map, but yet, it's recommended by the staff. Can you elaborate on that some, please?

Mr. Pettine said yes, sure. We did take a look at surrounding land uses. We also took a look at the existing Activity Center, the road network that was being proposed. We do acknowledge that we've got some conflicting goals. We've got the goal of preserving housing. We also have the goal of 10-minute neighborhoods, and providing density in places that make sense, and have goods and services access and infrastructure, and those types of things. So, as we looked at it, our evaluation was strictly from the proposal of the project, and what they were proposing in conjunction with the Activity Center, and again, the uses that were surrounding it immediately to the north and on the other side of Prosperity, and saw that it did provide compatibility. It did provide a range of mix of uses. It provided connections to that Activity Center where folks, if the property was redeveloped, would live in proximity to those. So, that was our evaluation of it against the Policy Map, even though it was inconsistent, but again, we do acknowledge there are some conflicting goals between both that preservation of affordable housing and establishing 10-minute neighborhoods, and again, providing some of that density and housing options in places where we've got existing infrastructure and existing access to those goods and services.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. So, there have been questions about the notice. I would say that the owner gave the notice. The residents acknowledge that they received information in May 2024. There was a public meeting, I think, in November 2024, I had a meeting. The issue is affordability in the City. Where do people go where they can pay \$500 a month, and these residents have taken the extra steps to protect themselves in purchasing a mobile home. This happens all throughout our City, and this is a bigger issue for this Council, and the same energy and this compassion that we have in protecting individuals, we need to look at this from a policy perspective. Developers are redeveloping hotels and motels where individuals are staying. There's low-income units. There's mobile homes. This is not the first one. There was one on Statesville that was just developed. So, until we as a Council actually walk our talk and really put some things in place to protect residents like this, this is going to continue to happen in the City. So, I look forward to continuing to work with Council, to change policies, because as the representative said, this seller is intent on selling this property. They've been very clear. You all have to understand that. The seller has said that this mobile home park will terminate in May 2026. So, if we deny this one, deny the next one, we cannot prohibit this seller from selling. So, what we as a Council need to know is that our decisions affect folks like this, and we really have to figure out what we're going to do. I talk about it all the time, individuals on fixed incomes. I met a lady who receives \$1,000 a month, her rent is \$1,800 a month. Individuals on social security, SSI (Supplemental Security Income), I talk about this all of the time. So, this is a problem in the City. It's not for a Zoning Meeting, I know that. It's a policy issue. So, we have to do something as Council members, but again, I thank you all for coming out. What we need to do Council is figure out what the next steps are for you all. So, thank you so much for coming out. Muchas gracias.

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

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you all so much for coming out. For those of you who do have the headsets, if you can put them back in the bag and someone will be receiving them, and Council members, if you all could put your headsets back in the bag, Ms. Ariel will come over and collect them. There are wipes if you would like to. Thank you. Muchas gracias.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 16: HEARING ON PETITION 2024-112 BY DREAMKEY PARTNERS FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.4 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF BEATTIES FORD ROAD, SOUTH OF SLATER ROAD, AND NORTH OF CINDY LANE FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N2-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development** said Petition 2024-112 is approximately 4.4 acres located on the east side of Beatties Ford Road, south of Slater Road and north of Cindy Lane. The site is developed with one single-family home currently is surrounded by institutional uses, as well as some single-family residential. Current zoning is N-1B. Proposed zoning is N-2A(CD). The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. The proposal would allow for a community of 40 multi-family attached residential dwellings in buildings of no more than six units. Commits to a workforce housing program for a minimum of 30 percent of the total number of units for a period of 30 years at 80 percent or less of the Area Median Income. A class C landscape yard will be located along the northern, eastern and southern property boundaries. An open space, tree save, and stormwater detention areas will be at the eastern corner of the site. There is a 70-foot natural gas easement



along the northern property boundary that would be maintained. Access will be provided by constructing the fourth leg of the intersection of Beatties Ford Road and Capps Hill Mine Road, and a public street network with an east/west street, as well as a north/south street, that provide access to units. The units will be in two building areas that would be bisected by that north/south public street, and an eight-foot planting strip and 12-foot multi-use path would be located along the site's Beatties Road frontage.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to site and building design. Petition is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for Neighborhood-1 Place Type. However, the proposed multi-family attached dwellings would provide an additional housing option in a housing gap. The petition commits to providing a workforce housing program for 30 percent of the units for a period of 30 years at 80 percent AMI. The site is within a quarter mile of a commercial node at Beatties Ford Road and Cindy Lane. It includes retail service and institutional uses. Also, would be improvements to the intersection of Beatties Ford Road and Capps Hill Mine Road, and I'll take any questions following comments from the petitioner and the community.

**Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. Bridget Grant, Land Use Consultant with Moore & Van Allen. It's a pleasure to be here tonight on behalf of DreamKey Partners. We appreciate staff's support on this petition, and I believe David, Howard, and the Pastor stopped by prior to the meeting to confirm their support of this petition. Staff did a great job, so I'm just going to highlight some of the basics. The site's just under four acres, located on the east side of Beatties Ford Road, across from the McCrorey YMCA. It's zoned N-1B, and the proposed zoning is N-2A, to allow development of the site with a residential multi-family community to provide affordable housing opportunities. As you can see, the site's Place Type recommendation is N-1. It's a little bit odd, though, because when you look at the surrounding context, it's not surrounded by N-1. It's surrounded by churches, schools, office uses, and the YMCA. So, it's a little misleading when you look at the context, and in fact, I think you'd find that this proposed use and density is probably appropriate in this location providing access to those uses.

This is a high-level view of our site plan. It shows that our access point is off of Beatties Ford Road. We have a 12-foot multi-use path and an eight-foot planting strip along the front of our site. One of the City's goals is always about connectivity, and so you can see running sort of planned north to south, we've got a new public road that will allow future developments to connect to this, and will provide other access that will get you out to a proposed traffic signal that will be at the access point with this development. There's a commitment to affordable housing, and with that I'm happy to answer any questions. I'm here with Julie Porter, and she'll probably handle the rebuttal for us.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, and welcome, Ms. Porter. So, Mr. Leisy, if you would like to come down.

**William Leisy, 1932 Slater Road** said good evening. I'm William Leisy. I'm the current owner of Parcel 04108123. The property that's under petition meets us at the corner off the gas easement and 1932 Slater Road, where my wife and my family reside. So, we bought the property under the guidance that the 2040 Map would keep the adjoining properties, single-family, obviously, we have the school next door. I believe they had some concerns with this as well. I'm sure Councilman Graham, who's not here today, had their concerns in REN (Residential Event Notification) form, if ya'll received those as well, but their issue was safety and traffic, which obviously is ours, and our surrounding single-family housing neighbors. So, we've lived there for five years now. The area's kind of undeveloped. The more single-family housing that came in, the better the security and lives of the neighborhood and community got. Anyways, so the area got a lot nicer in the past five years with the influx of single-family, so that's kind of what we wanted to keep it to, because people own property, they take care of it, they respect it, they look out for their neighbors, and I feel like bringing in a 40-unit multi-family

dwelling, where it's kind of hidden in the woods, has no amenities, no parks, transportation is kind of at a minimum in the area. So, I just feel like the residents who live there, they won't take care of the property as well as if they owned it, as in a single-family occupation, and also, they have nothing to do, so what are they going to do. I feel like they'll all kind of just flip the improvement of the community and neighborhood, which we have seen increase over the past five years. It'll flip it right on its head and bring it back to the crime, the trespassing, the stealing, and all that that we saw in the past five years that's been improved upon by the single-family zoning in the area. So, that's what I'm here today to help protect my neighbors and my property, and our livelihoods and our future goals for our original purchase within this neighborhood, it's to vote no on this and help us out, and keep the 2040 and the visions we had of our property intact, and not change that on us. Thank you.

**Julie Porter, 4601 Charlotte Park Drive, Suite 350** said Mayor Pro Tem, Council representatives, first of all, I just want to thank you all for your support of DreamKey Partners and affordable housing more generally. We love this property. It's right across from McCrorey YMCA, and really feel like it will enhance the area. This is going to be affordable housing, but it's going to be homeownership. So, it's going to be for people who are 80 percent of Area Median Income and under. It will be a townhome development, and I just wanted to make sure that you knew that we were able to resolve kind of the issue that the school next door had with the connection between our property and their property, so that their residents, or actually their customer's, parents, could actually get to the stoplight, that we're helping to make sure that it's all connected. I'm happy to take any questions.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said Ms. Porter, you actually addressed the question I was going to ask for Ms. Grant. Have you submitted the updated plan to staff yet that shows that connection?

Ms. Grant said that's due on Thursday after public hearing, so that's when it'll get submitted.

Ms. Mayfield said all the questions I had.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to closer the public hearing.
---

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I just wanted to make the comment that this is a great area, especially the McCrorey Y is a historic YMCA in our community. So, having affordable for sale housing to help provide workforce housing for those individuals who are working to be able to access good, safe, affordable housing is certainly, Ms. Porter, you know something that I'm passionate about and many of my colleagues are. I'm happy to see some kind of format of affordable for sale continue to happen in our City.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 17: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-013 BY TRUE HOMES FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.43 ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE NORTH AND SOUTH SIDE OF MINTWORTH AVENUE, WEST OF MARGARET WALLACE ROAD, AND EAST OF WYALONG DRIVE FROM NS (NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES) AND N2-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B) TO N2-B (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said 2025-013, it's 8.43 acres off of Mintworth Avenue, west of Margaret Wallace and east of Wyalong Drive. The current

zoning is Neighborhood Services and N-2B. You can see the N-2B is just that small orange portion there, kind of on the bottom right of the project boundary. The 2040 Policy Map does recommend the Commercial Place Type, mainly based off that NS zoning that is in place currently. The proposal for this project is to allow up to 64 multifamily attached dwellings under the N-2B District. They do have some transportation provisions with multiple access points to the site from Mintworth Avenue and Mintwork Links Lane and Wyalong Drive. They would also extend the current left turn lane on Margaret Wallace to 100 feet. They would provide a 10-foot-wide Class C landscape yard along the western boundary of the site. Also, provide an eight-foot planting strip and eight-foot sidewalk along Margaret Wallace Road, and include bicycle facilities that would be constructed by locating the curb and gutter 28 feet from the center line of Wyalong Drive. The site is served by the CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) 52X bus route, and the petitioner will coordinate with CATS on any of those bus stop improvements. It is directly adjacent to as well, just to the north, a commercial center with a grocery store and some other commercial uses.

Staff does not recommend approval of this petition in its current form. No real concerns with the type of project that's being proposed and the residential component, just some site design features and some transportation items that need to be resolved and worked through as we continue through the process, but again, no overall significant concerns with the proposal, just a lot of details and items that need to be cleaned up before staff can reevaluate our recommendation. From there, we will turn it over to the petitioner, and we will take any questions following their presentation. Thank you.

**Joel Madden, 2649 Brekonridge Centre Drive, Monroe** said I'm Joe Madden with True Homes. Mayor Pro Tem, Council, thank you for having us here tonight. As staff mentioned, we're working through some minor issues with staff. We've been in close communication with really three departments, planning, transportation, and parks and rec, and we feel like we've gotten all of those agreed to in principle, so we'll be submitting an updated plan that we believe addresses all of those issues by Wednesday of this week. Then, just wanted to also add, we held a community meeting, did not have any in attendance in that meeting, and that was an in-person meeting at a nearby church. So, we're going to hold another meeting in mid-July 2025. I think we're targeting July 9, 2025. We're going to do that one online just in case that promotes additional neighborhood involvement. So, other than that, we'll be glad to try to answer any questions you might have.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay. Staff, since you're in opposition, are you okay?

Mr. Pettine said yes, we're good, thank you.

**Councilmember Molina** said so I actually went to that meeting, and I couldn't find it.

Mr. Madden said you're the one.

Ms. Molina said I am the one and I am a Council member.

Mr. Madden said one of the people at church said they saw someone and directed them across the street.

Ms. Molina said yes, and they directed me across the street, and I couldn't find it. So, if I couldn't find it, I know if a resident was interested, they couldn't find it. So, that's first things first.

Mr. Madden said I'm sorry to hear that.

Ms. Molina said secondly, I feel uncomfortable. So, again, what I do, as an elected representative for this 125,000-plus district of human beings is, I look at what our policy says we can and can't do, and then I connect with the residents. In this case, and I'm taking fundamentally just from what I would imagine to be a resident's perspective, this right now is Neighborhood Services. So, there is a potential for, in its current form, there

to be somewhere they could shop, some place they could go, some place where they would be able to buy stuff, and now we're going to take that away and put more houses with less places for them to go and buy stuff and shop, and we haven't talked to any neighbors to see how they feel about that, because that's an important challenge that we have to face as we continue to have people who want to come and live in our City, and how we look at this. We have a Unified Development Ordinance that was developed and has been adopted as policy, and those Policy Maps, right now, they should not even need our implementation. When we're saying that we want to change the Unified Development Ordinance and its application from where it currently stands, I feel like we need to have a reason to do so, because there's already a policy that has guidance for what can and cannot be done.

So, what you're asking for is an exception to the current policy, to change something that is currently existing and fitting for the residents that live there to put more residents there. So, I feel uncomfortable as the representative even considering that until I've talked to some level of representation of the people this decision could affect, to see if this is something that they would be in agreement with, because again, the Policy Map is as it should be. So, it was an extreme undertaking for the Council of that time that made the decision to go forward to say, we're creating Community Area Plans and Policy Maps that are already guiding what we see as far as the people we intend to attract to the City. When we say, hey, you know what, we're going to create increased density, or, hey, we're going to change what the scope of what that alignment is, I think when we're going beyond what the rules already say, I feel real compelled to say, we have to make sure that there's consensus. So, staff, first, I know that you're adhering to what you see could be potentially for that area, but I think we have a responsibility if we're going beyond what the policy states, because I'm not speaking out of alignment with what the policy states. I'm not saying that we can't create density, but based on what Neighborhood Services said, can we even put residents there right now? If it was to remain Neighborhood Services, could you put houses on it?

Mr. Pettine said not on the properties that are looking to be rezoned, particularly along Mintworth. On the south side of Mintworth is two office buildings and what was a proposed Walgreens, and on the other side is one office and two retail spaces, one of which was constructed and one that didn't come to fruition. So, the main entitlements that were still remaining were primarily office uses and a pharmacy that doesn't look like it was ever built or ever came to fruition, but one of the retail out parcels was constructed, and the rest remaining was primarily office uses.

Ms. Molina said okay. So, again, I look forward to an actual meeting where there's some participation from the residents, a decision that says we would take away the possibility for there actually to be. Businesses create jobs, inevitably. A business creates a job, a business creates a place where you can shop. A business does so many different things, and it's already zoned for business. So, to say we're going to take it to residential, we've got to have some kind of feedback. For full transparency, I don't live close enough to the site, but if I leave my house, make one left, go down the street, I shop at that Harris Teeter, just for perspective. I've got two options. I can go to Food Lion or go down the street to Harris Teeter, and sometimes when I want to go to a groovy Harris Teeter I go to my colleague in District One. I go to her, hers be lit, on South Boulevard, but that's when I feel like taking a drive, but if I need ketchup, and it's like 6:00 p.m. and I'm cooking, I'm probably going to go to Food Lion or that Harris Teeter. So, I know the area very well. I've lived there for 16 years. So, yes, I just look forward to continued discussion.

Mr. Madden said yes, ma'am. Do you have a recommendation for an online meeting versus another in-person meeting? Do you have a preference as well to that?

Ms. Molina said honestly, I make time to be present as often as I possibly can, and I actually did go to the in-person meeting, and like I said, I couldn't find it. So, I don't have a preference. I just do what it would take to get as many neighbors to participate as possible. Sometimes we're working with residents that are elderly, and again, I don't

know the demographics, and that's a challenge. If we have elderly neighbors, then sometimes the online is a little bit more accessible, or not. It's just kind of hit or miss, but I'll talk to our staff to see what type of connections that we have with the area to see if we can maybe help you reach out to some of the people that live within that area.

Mr. Madden said we would appreciate that collaboration, absolutely, and we can go either way with that. We tried to do it in person just because I always believe face to face is better, if you can accommodate that, but also understand the accessibility and things like that. So, certainly open to that.

To your points, this was a part of a rezoning that was done originally a number of years ago. You're familiar with the area, of course, with the Harris Teeter and the pizza place, which is fantastic, and there is some shopping there, and this for whatever reason has sat dormant for quite some time, so that's why the property owner reached out to us and said, "Hey, would ya'll consider something here, because it hasn't taken root from a traditional Neighborhood Services Type of arrangement here for." So, yes, we'd love to chat more with you if you'd like to. Any strategies you might have on getting some public involvement, we'd certainly be open to that. We're excited about the project. We think it will bring a lot to the community and feel like we bring a quality home to the area, but certainly understand your concerns, and again, my apologies for the confusion it was with that church, kind of split on opposite sides of the road. I was confused when I got there too to try to figure out where we were supposed to go.

Ms. Molina said yes, I was. Like I said, there was a really nice lady who came out to greet me, and she was like, "Well, try across the street," and then I went across the street, and I was like wandering, looking like I was lost.

Mr. Madden said we were waiting for somebody to walk in after we heard that, and then sent somebody outside, and I think by then you probably gave up on us. So, again, apologies for that.

Ms. Molina said yes, I was like, okay, there's probably not a meeting happening or something. I called staff. Actually, I called the person who helps me. I'm like, I think I'm in the wrong place, so yes, but we'll figure it out.

Mr. Madden said sorry very, very much for that, absolutely.

Ms. Molina said thank you so much. That's all I have, Mayor Pro Tem.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 18: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-020 BY SAGE INVESTMENT GROUP FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.56 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF TUCKASEEGEE ROAD, EAST OF QUEEN CITY DRIVE, AND WEST OF I-85 FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) AND ML-1 (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-1) TO N2-C (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-C, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development** said Petition 2025-020 is just over 2.5 acres located south of Tuckaseegee Road, east of Queen City Drive, and west of I-85. It is currently developed with a motel and restaurant, and currently zoned CG and ML-1, with the proposed zoning of N-2C(CD). The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. The proposal is to adaptively reuse the existing motel to create up to 125 residential units, as well as to maintain the restaurant use as a Neighborhood Commercial establishment. No new structures would be

allowed. All redevelopments will be occurring within the existing building footprints, maintaining existing site infrastructure, including the surface parking. Minor exterior repairs and material updates would occur to meet current code and maintenance needs. There's a coordinated anti-displacement strategy to be implemented in partnership with Crisis Assistance Ministry, which would include a minimum 90-day notice to all existing tenants, individual rehousing plans developed and tracked, weekly coordination meetings to monitor progress, as well as property closure contingent on successful rehousing of all residents.

Staff recommends approval of the petition upon resolution of requested technical revisions. It is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. However, would convert the Extended Stay motel into up to 125 studio apartments, supporting UDO goals related to adaptive reuse, sustainability, and infill development. The proposed N-2C Zoning District is intended to accommodate a range of moderate intensity residential housing types, including multi-family stacked dwellings, which aligns with the petition's proposed use. Though inconsistent with the Policy Map, the proposed residential use is compatible with nearby zoning and land use patterns, which include Residential, Commercial, Office, and Institutional Districts. The reuse of existing building avoids additional impervious surface, preserves site infrastructure consistent with the UDO goals for fiscally and environmentally responsible development. With no petitioner, I'll take any questions.

**Councilmember Peacock** said it wasn't mentioned earlier, but you talked about the coordinated anti-displacement strategy. You heard the original petition tonight about the displacement of a lot of people in mobile homes. Is there anything, staff, that we can learn from what you're recommending here for that petition? Is that possible? Although, I know that's not what you spoke to earlier, but that's the first thing I'm picking up on here, minimum 90-day notice to all existing tenants, individual rehousing plans developed and tracked, weekly coordination meetings to monitor progress, property closure contingent on successful rehousing of all residents, and you're doing it in coordination with Crisis Assistance.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said yes. This is, I think, what we learned from going through this process with some of these previous hotel conversions. We worked with our Housing and Neighborhood Services partners to come up with that type of strategy. I don't know if it's been explored for the petition we talked about earlier this evening, but we can certainly reach out and see if that's something else that can be offered. I think the difference with some of that is the actual ownership of the units versus here, they're in the hotel staying, where the other petition we heard earlier, like I said, they actually own that asset, and so that's a whole other level of trying to coordinate assistance, with not just relocating people, but also real property. So, that's why there may not be a direct correlation between the two, but we can certainly explore to see if there's anything else that we can learn from it.

Mr. Peacock said yes, and Madam Mayor, I was just going to say, Ms. Johnson, you're tracking with this? I don't know what your reactions are to that, to try to help us before a decision on the previous petition. Are those strategies that might?

**Councilmember Johnson** said like he said, the challenge is that they own their mobile home, so that's just the extra challenge. We've seen these displacement strategies when hotels are redeveloped, and I appreciate the fact that we have this and we're working to be proactive. So, yes, it does help. It absolutely helps, yes. Thank you for asking the question. Thank you.

Mr. Peacock said no more questions.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said alright. The one question I have, and I'm not sure if you're aware of this, but it says it's for up to 125 multi-family stacked residential units. Do you have any knowledge of how many families currently stay at the motel?

Mr. Mangum said I do not. That's a question we can ask of the petitioner.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay. I'm just trying to understand the scope of this anti-displacement effort here, if it's really being leveraged at 80 percent capacity or above, or is it much lower than that, because that will give us some understanding of the impact?

Ms. Johnson said so, I think I'm doing the math correctly. When we talk about affordable or attainable or workforce housing, 80 percent is around \$89,000 for the household. So, I just want us to keep that in mind when we're advocating for affordable housing. Thank you.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Molina, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 19: HEARING ON PETITION 2025-028 BY CANVAS RESIDENTIAL PARTNERS, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.91 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF MT HOLLY-HUNTERSVILLE ROAD, EAST OF OAKDALE ROAD, AND WEST OF FIRESTREAK DRIVE FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said alright, 2025-028 is just under nine acres, as mentioned, off of Mt Holly-Huntersville Road, just east of Oakdale and west of Firestreak Drive. Currently zones N-1A, proposing to rezone to Neighborhood-2A, Conditional. You can see we've got some R-8MF(CD) heading down Mt. Holly-Huntersville back over there to Oakdale, which when we did translation, when the UDO went into effect, the R-8MF Zoning District translated directly to Neighborhood-2A. So, just want to provide a little bit of that context and background for you. The Adopted Place Type on the Policy Map does recommend Neighborhood-1. Again, you can see that orange just to the left that represents Neighborhood-2, which again, is reflective of that R-8MF Zoning that is currently in place for those two projects just to the west. The proposal for 2025-028 would be for up to 65 multi-family attached residential dwelling units, essentially townhomes. Limits the number of units in a building to a maximum of four. Does provide an eight-foot-wide planting strip and 12-foot-wide multi-use path along Mt. Holly-Huntersville, as well as eight-foot-wide planting strip and sidewalk on public road A. There is connectivity with the projects to the west. So, that provides a continual street network from this project through the other two existing projects all the way back down to Oakdale, that would be through Bluedale Road and a street stub, also to the adjacent property to the east, so that road network can continue on should there be future development. Does provide open space that's accessible to residents, that would consist of some different design elements for seating, decorations, interactive elements, things like that. Also provides a 10-foot Class C buffer adjacent to single-family use or zoned property, and then also commits to some design guidelines for the design of the actual structures themselves.

Staff does recommend approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation and site design. Again, it is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for Neighborhood-1. We do have the adjacencies just next door in somewhat of a continuation of the communities that have been built there, again, particularly with that public street network that does provide that access all the way back over to Oakdale without getting back onto Mt. Holly-Huntersville, so that's one element we also want to ensure that we highlight a little bit as part of this continuation of what really is those two developments, again, to the west. So, with that, we'll turn it over to the petitioner, as well as the community, and take questions following their presentations. Thank you.

**Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. Bridget Grant here on behalf of John Floyd. I'm covering for his case tonight, so you might do additional follow-up with him. We're here representing Creighton Call and Canvas Residential on what's essentially a third phase to this rezoning community. Staff mentioned it's an 8.91-acre site, and I'm not going to repeat everything that Dave said. Let me jump ahead to the site. This got developed as Oak Lake Phase One. The initial phase was developed as a transition [INAUDIBLE] was supposed to be potentially commercial where Oak Lake Phase Two is, and so we were transitioning between commercial to townhomes in this location. After this first phase began development, there was interest from the property owners in selling to this developer, and it created the opportunity for us to provide more townhomes in this area, and provide that direct connection out to the road, and sort of relieve some of the traffic that's on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road by providing a parallel path. As we've been working through on Oak Lake Phase One and Phase Two, the property owner that owns Phase Three approached the development team, because they had a change in circumstance and wanted to downsize away from their current home situation, and thought that continuing the same quality development, continuity between the development uses, transitioning between what was happening over to the single-family, and again, continuing that road network that provides you an alternative off of Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, and a good parallel path, would be an appropriate transition in this location. So, when you look at the site plan rendered, as Dave mentioned, we've got 20-foot setbacks from back of curb. We are accommodating future changes for the thoroughfare setback. We've got one access point on Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, but our internal streets will provide stubs that support the existing development to the south as well as any future development that will happen on adjacent property. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions after Mr. Wright has a chance to speak.

**Tom Wright, 6530 Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road** said thank you for your time. My concern is with the amount of traffic. The proposed additional development is going to be up to 65 units, which I'm sure that's probably what they're going to put there, allowing for 1½ spaces per vehicle parking, that's up to an additional 90 vehicles. Now, I understand that they've proposed, or are putting in a road, that will parallel Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, but there's also going to be one entrance that is coming out somewhere, roughly a couple of football fields, is about the best analogy I can give you, down from my property, and my property is directly adjoining to the property that they're going to build on. My property has been in the family, well, I'm 76 years old, so the property's been here 75, 80 years, it's been in the same family. Additionally, I have relatives who live behind and beside of me, who have been there just as long as I have, and they couldn't be here tonight due to poor health, but my concern is the additional growth of traffic. Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road used to be a pretty little two-lane country road. Now, it's a two-lane country speedway. I can stand in my yard and hear the cars leaving the traffic circle a quarter mile down the road, and it sounds like a dragstrip. So, my big concern is the additional traffic. Granted, some of the people are going to use the roadway going out down to Oakdale, but there's some that are going to use the other, and that's my big issue. Thank you.

Ms. Grant said I just want to say we appreciate Mr. Wright's willingness to come out and speak tonight and share his concerns about the proposed development. We do think that there will be some relief by using the internal street network, and it's just not uncommon when you see the amount of transportation improvements that have been made with the roundabouts in that area that some of the development followed with it. One of the things he mentioned, though, that I did want to clarify, is the parking at 1.5 spaces per unit. We have a lot of conversations about parking and townhome developments. That is the ordinance requirement, and so what's noted on the plan is the ordinance requirement. We are likely going to have one and two-car garages with parking in the driveway, as well as guest parking available on street. So, we anticipate it'll be over the 1.5. We're just noting the ordinance requirement. Happy to answer any questions.



**Councilmember Mayfield** said Mr. Pettine, question. It is noted by staff the proposed development will fill a need for housing in the area that's been identified by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as opportunities for access to housing. How often are we looking at that? Because what I'm really trying to understand is, does this rationale of that statement take into consideration the multiple multi-family projects that we have already approved, and the fact that further up Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, a 2022 approval of a new police station, the groundbreaking and clearing has already happened. We have another development that was approved where the clearcutting happened, but for the last two, two and a half months, no work has continued. I don't know if that's because of the financial climate today, where work has stopped, but I'm trying to reconcile utilizing the language of lacking in an area that is not lacking just based off of the approvals of multi-family that this Council has moved forward within the last year and a half.

Mr. Pettine said yes, and that's a good question. I think that's something we'll have to follow up with our folks that manage that EGF (Equity Guide Future) database and see how often it gets updated and what year that's being pulled from, but I'll be happy to look into that and give you a followup on it.

Ms. Mayfield said so, that speaks to a request that Councilmember Johnson has made repeatedly, when we talk about cumulative impact of areas. So, it's challenging to read a comment regarding an area that's been identified, knowing that staff isn't automatically, since the question has been asked multiple times for a number of years now, to look at what we're approving in real time to see the impact of it. Ms. Grant, when we're looking at the possible connections, what were the improvements that have been committed to by the organization you're representing?

Ms. Grant said the commitment is to provide the extension of the existing public street network from Phases One and Two, into Phase Three. So, it's essentially an execution of what we'd refer to as our subdivision requirements, where we're building a street network to provide a parallel road that runs parallel to Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, so it'd be an alternative route.

Ms. Mayfield said and the idea of connecting this multi-family into this residential community versus having a stub road, staff, we're mandating that?

Mr. Pettine said so, the projects to the west of this, both built public streets that extended from Oakdale, with the intention of building out a network that could be a public road network for folks to get from one side of that area to another without having to get on Mt. Holly-Huntersville. So, they are all public streets that are being connected to, so we're not connecting from a public street the City would maintain to a private street that's maintained by an HOA. They're private alleys, but the public street network is something that was designed with the initial project, and will continue forward to the east, should other projects be approved, but it's essentially, again, trying to build that parallel road network to Mt. Holly-Huntersville to provide some relief for it, but yes, that is a requirement.

Ms. Mayfield said so, in our requirement, and maybe I've missed it, can you point out where we have the language regarding the fact that traffic calming is going to be installed? Because the reality in residential is 25 miles an hour. As was mentioned, and what I know, because I live along the area and I drive different parts of Mt. Holly-Huntersville on a daily basis, is that when individuals are cutting through a neighborhood, they are not adhering to 20, 25 miles an hour. So, where's the language that ensures the protection of this residential community and/or has commitments regarding traffic calming via speed bumps to make sure they're protected?

Mr. Pettine said I'm not aware of any traffic calming that's built into the proposed road network. I don't know if C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) has anything else to share on that, but I'm not aware of any other commitments to traffic calming for the new road network.

Ms. Mayfield said so, that is something that, while we're looking at updated language and we're looking at community impact, that needs to be taken in consideration, because maybe staff has the time, maybe they don't, to actually drive these communities where you are supporting development. Currently, in residential neighborhoods, especially single-family neighborhoods where the speed limit is 20, 25 miles an hour, where we are adding these connectors, that is not how individuals are driving. So, just as it was mentioned tonight that you can hear the vehicles, especially down at the roundabout at the other end. It's a mini speedway. It doesn't get as much attention as other parts of the City, yet the vehicles still utilize these straight ways and these connectors through community. So, if we're going to say we have a priority around aging in place and staying in place, that means that we also need to have a commitment to ensure that whether it is the petitioner that wants to connect in, or if we're going to mandate the connections, that we have the language in place to actually to protect these neighborhoods. Bridget, I don't know if there's an opportunity to speak to your clients, but if we're talking about connecting into residential community, then there has to be some benefits to that community, because unfortunately, traffic patterns today, individuals need a little guidance on how to drive versus what they actually do, and sometimes that means we need to be a little bit more proactive on the front end. So, it will be helpful if you can have a conversation and we can follow up.

Ms. Grant said we'd be happy to have that conversation.

Ms. Mayfield said and just for full transparency and acknowledgment, I did make sure to post this onto Next Door for the community, so that others will also know that this hearing was happening tonight, and how to reach out if they had comments, because there's a lot of moving parts happening all along Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road, but it's really just one really good drag road, in the morning or all the time, but what I can say, just in the last six months alone, it can take me up to eight minutes just to make a left turn out of my community, because of the amount of traffic, and that's not even seeing all of the impacts, that's just a few going down to one lane, because of construction that's happening with all the clearing. Again, there's no notification regarding the police station. I had to go in and look up in the system and found out that that was something approved in the beginning of 2022, which is great having a police station, but you just see clearcutting and trucks blocking the road. If it's taking me up to eight minutes to get out, just to try to make a left turn, this cumulative impact must be a consideration. Thank you.

**Councilmember Johnson** said thank you, Councilmember Mayfield. Yes, cumulative impact. So, we have to look at this from a policy perspective, and I appreciate you being the eyes and the ears for Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road. You talk about it all of the time. From a policy perspective, we almost need to look at the traffic impact study trigger. Maybe it should be lower on two-lane roads, or different areas, or areas with less infrastructure, which is why I champion the infrastructure meeting. We really have to start taking a look at this and doing something with the information that we know. So, I appreciate your coming out, sir. Thank you for advocating for your neighborhood. Thank you for telling us more about the neighborhood. I'll make sure I drive out there before the decision, but we have to look at when we're implanting these multi-family in established single-family residence. There has to be some consideration. This question is for staff. This petition is inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map. Can you explain your rationale for recommendation, please?

Mr. Pettine said yes, sure. So, one of the items that we talked about was the adjacency of the Neighborhood-2 Place Type and the continuation of that community and that public street network, providing that kind of alternative route, like we said on Mt. Holly-Huntersville, that does get you back over to Oakdale. There is also recent entitlements on the other side of that, that would provide some Neighborhood Services. I believe it was upwards of 20,000, I think, square feet of some Neighborhood Services. There's a shopping center at the other corner of that Oakdale and Mt. Holly-Huntersville. So, we did see some services coming to that as well, but those adjacencies and that public

street network were two things we looked at, as well as I know we talked about getting some dates for when that data is pulled from, but the housing information and the housing gap study that we look at did identify this as an area of need for housing, and that was something that we did cite as well. So, those are some of the main reasons that we made our recommendation and had a rationale as we did.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and I'll just say, when I talk about cumulative impact, that's schools and everything, and we as a Council really have to sit back and think about what's our City going to look like in 10 years from these decisions we're making. Can you provide us with a map, you or Ms. Craig, with a map? I've asked for maps for District Four areas of the approved by-right and pending development within a certain radius for the last two years or so. If we could have that for this area also, that would be very helpful, so that Council can see from a grand scale the changes in this area. Also, how can residents keep up with the development in their area and know what's pending, what's by-right, what's approved? Can you give a recommendation?

Mr. Pettine said yes. We can certainly produce some maps, as requested. I would say the best way for folks to stay plugged in on active projects, development projects, City-related projects, rezonings, the Development Near Me App is really the best way to track that stuff. That's something that is kept up kind of in live time. You can go in and see what type of project's being built, if it's a new water line or a new subdivision or road improvements, street lighting projects, those will all be captured in that. Folks can click on the different items and see what those projects are, know who to talk to, and they can reach out and get information on those individually.

Ms. Johnson said are they able to see an illustration of all of the pending and approved petitions?

Mr. Pettine said yes, you open the map up and there's different colors and other things that kind of indicate different types of projects, dots, stars, for different types of things. So, you can really see those areas that have been heavily developed or have a lot of capital investment projects in. They'll have a lot of different colors and things to click on for folks to learn more about, but yes, as soon as you open it you can really get an idea of the type of activity going on.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. Well, for this petition, I'd like a map for Council to be able to take a look at. Thank you. That's all I have.

Mr. Pettine said certainly.

Motion was made by Councilmember Peacock, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.
--

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 20: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-029 BY SUMMIT AVENUE WESLEY HEIGHTS, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.49 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF FREEDOM DRIVE, EAST OF THRIFT ROAD, AND WEST OF WESLEY VILLAGE ROAD FROM MUDD-O SPA (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT-OPTIONAL, SITE PLAN AMENDMENT) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development** said good evening. Petition 2025-029 is located on the north side of Freedom Drive, east of Thrift Road and west of Wesley Village Road. The site is approximately 1.49 acres currently undeveloped. Current zoning is MUDD-O SPA, Mixed Use Development District, Optional, Site Plan Amendment. The proposed zoning is NC(CD), Neighborhood Center, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-2 Place Type for this site. The NC

District is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation, and approval of the petition would revise the Policy Map to the Neighborhood Center Place Type. A little background on the site. A previous MUDD-O SPA plan proposed the development of a mixed-use building containing 10,000 square feet of retail and 66,000 square feet of office. This proposed plan allows all uses permitted in the NC Zoning District, with the exception of some automotive oriented uses, such as gas stations, vehicle repair facilities, car washes, car dealerships, etc.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of requested technical revisions. The site is in a rapidly changing mixed-use area containing a variety of housing types and supporting goods and services. The current MUDD-O Zoning allows intensive office and commercial uses, while the proposed NC Zoning District allows for building forms that may be more compatible with the scale of the surrounding area. It permits a wide variety of uses while prohibiting autocentric uses, so that the site may promote walkability and compact development. Happy to take any questions following the petitioner's presentation.

**Sarah Stewart, 1209 Oak Crest Trail, Belmont** said good evening. Thank you, Mayor Pro Tem, council members, and Zoning Committee members. I don't really have anything to add to staff's presentation, but I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 21: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-036 BY RANGEWORKS FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.55 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF BRYANT STREET, WEST OF SOUTH SUMMIT AVENUE, AND EAST OF FREEDOM DRIVE FROM NC (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER) TO CG(CD) (GENERAL COMMERCIAL, CONDITIONAL).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development** said this petition is located at the corner of Bryant Street and Summit Street. It's approximately 1.55 acres and is developed as a surface parking lot. The current zoning is NC, Neighborhood Center, and the proposed zoning is CG(CD), General Commercial, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Community Activity Center Place Type for this site, and the proposed zoning would be consistent with that Place Type. Proposed plan calls for the development of a driving range and a private outdoor recreation facility with a maximum of 36 driving bays. The structure would be a maximum of 11,000 square feet and will be open air. The existing surface parking lot is proposed to remain underneath this driving facility. The site permits only the land uses of driving range, private outdoor recreation facility, and parking lot as a principle use.

Staff recommends the approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues and requested technical revisions related to transportation, as the Comprehensive Plan calls for the Community Activity Center Place Type, to provide entertainment and open space and mixed-use walkable settings, and the proposed driving range and outdoor recreation facility could advance the goals of providing recreation facilities in the area. I'm happy to take any questions following Mr. Brown's presentation.

**Collin Brown, 1420 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100** said thank you. Mayor Pro Tem, Council members, Zoning Committee members, Collin Brown on behalf of Rangeworks. This is a cool petition. So, if you know this area, it is an area that is rapidly changing. My client, Rangeworks, is working in partnership with the property owner, which is a group named Asana. So, here Asana owns the Grinnell Water Works, which is kind of a historic

building, lower level, one to two-story buildings, and as you all know, you're seeing every surface parking lot like this one out there is being replaced by new multi-family housing or something like that. So, what Asana's trying to figure out, they need the parking to serve these kinds of historic buildings, but how do you monetize this so this is pretty cool. So Rangeworks is a new concept of kind of an urban driving range, more like what you would see in Asia. Literally, you see these in Korea where things are very constricted, and so the idea is the surface parking lot stays there, and the structure gets built on top of this. George Mattingly with Rangeworks, if he was here, when I first met him, I said, "Oh, yeah, I did the work for Topgolf when they first came to town," and the first he says is, "Look, we are not Topgolf," and I remember Councilmember Mayfield, we went to Austin to look at Topgolf before they came, and Topgolf is a party. It's lights, it's music, they make their money off food and beverage. That is not what this is. This is for golfers that want a place to play in the City. So, it is very much more targeted on that, as someone that would come from their office downtown and come out. So, here would be a look at this. What you're seeing, this range is actually up, so the surface parking lot stays down there, Grinnell Water Works has its same parking, and then essentially a steel structure is built on top of that, and then there's just netting. The only building here is elevated, so there's just hitting bays where people come. You can see the surface parking lot still there on the bottom, building very small, netting. The netting is used, unlike Topgolf, you can see those nets are a long way away. This actually has a roof on the top net, so the poles do not have to be as high. They're going to use the netting product same as at major league baseball. So, if you go see a game, you don't even know the net is there. That's the concept. So, it works pretty well to serve Asana. So, they can kind of keep Grinnell Water Works, which I think are some of the coolest buildings we have in the area, there and functional, monetize this, but bring in a new use that would serve the community. This is the map I used. I know Councilmember Graham is not here tonight.

We had good attendance at the official community meeting. The Wesley Heights Community Association invited George and myself out to their meeting last week. You will hear from them. I think it's fair to say they were excited about a concept that's kind of neighborhood-serving. This map I was showing you that kind of goes down hill, so it's lower, so they were not concerned about what they'll see from the neighborhood. We're really right up against the ramp here, got a great view of downtown. So, golfers, that's going to be what they see. The neighborhood will not see much. The neighborhood was excited about this use, and frankly about having something new and bright and secure. Happy to answer questions if you them.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, Mr. Brown. How many of these Rangeworks currently exist?

Mr. Brown said this is a new company. There are several in the works. Charlotte would be the first delivery. If you're in marketing, this is a magic location to be able to bring people there and see that skyline. So, very excited this is the top priority. I will say, we do have some modifications to make to the plan. Our UDO is a lot of things, flexibility it is not, a little bit of a square peg, round hole. So, we're going to be working on some modifications. We also have seeks and variances, so it's great that we're not coming to you next month, so we'll back to you August 2025 at the earliest, after we've also seen the ZBA (Zoning Board of Approval).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said it's good to hear that the community is excited as well.

Mr. Brown said they're excited, yes.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said okay, Mr. Brown, we went down this road similarly many years ago with Topgolf, but you say this is not Topgolf. One of the selling points that made Topgolf great is the fact that it was way out on a lot of land without anything near. So, even though it has the netting, the chances of a fly ball hitting anything of significance were slim to none. This, in direct opposition, in town in a much closer space, so walk me through again how this is a good location for something like this.

Mr. Brown said yes. Well, here, I mean, the location's what they're after. They're looking at an urban location. Someone who works downtown can come for an hour. If you're coming downtown for another event, kind of part of an entertainment area, folks from the neighborhood can come down, and it's enclosed, and I'm happy to set up a virtual meeting with you and Mr. Maddingly, who's the expert, to talk about it. You can barely see it on here, but there's a top on it as well. So, Topgolf has their pole so high in case someone can hit them over. This will be almost fully enclosed. Musco is the producer of the netting, who does the major league netting. If you've been to a major league baseball game, I don't even know there's a net there, but it'll be here and on top as well. So, this very much the draw, that the idea is this is urban. It is downtown. It's walkable for folks in the neighborhood. You know there's a lot of residents coming here. There's a lot of entertainment. Part of that, I mean, you could walk to Panthers Stadium from here. So, the sell here is very much the location, and I went out there today, and it's an incredible view, and if you could imagine two hitting bays looking at the skyline. So, that is the sell.

Ms. Mayfield said so, the hitting bays, just for clarification, they will or will not be providing food and drink?

Mr. Brown said they will have very limited. This is probably one or two employees. There may be a refrigerator, George says.

Ms. Mayfield said so, it's not going to be expensive, like ABC licensing a full bar.

Mr. Brown said no, no, no. You may get a power drink or power bar, and he says this is for real golfers that go have fun. They may be there an hour now.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, thank you.

Mr. Brown said thank you.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 22: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-037 BY EASTGROUP PROPERTIES, L.P. FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.23 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF SHOPTON ROAD, EAST OF PINECREST DRIVE, AND WEST OF BEAM ROAD FROM I-1(CD) ANDO (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL, CONDITIONAL, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY) AND N1-A ANDO (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY) TO N1-A ANDO (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY) AND ML-1(CD) ANDO (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-1, CONDITIONAL, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development** said Petition 2025-037 is approximately 1.23 acres located on the north side of Shopton Road, west of Beam Road and east of Pinecrest Drive. It is surrounded by a previously approved petition on over 100 acres for light industrial development. Current zoning, two separate pieces to this rezoning. The western triangular portion is zoned I-1(CD) ANDO. The more rectangular portion to the east is zoned N-1A ANDO. Proposed zoning would effectively swap the zoning with the N-1A going to ML-1(CD), the I-1(CD) going to N-1A(CD). The Policy Map recommends the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type reflecting the current zoning for the I-1(CD) portion, and Neighborhood-1 for the N-1A portion. So, it's a Tier 1 rezoning. All uses permitted in the N-1A Zoning District would be allowed on the

western portion. Only a vehicular and truck private driveway connection will be permitted on the eastern portion of the site.

Staff recommends approval of petition. It is inconsistent, but would facilitate a more efficient vehicular and truck driveway connection for a previously approved rezoning in light industrial development. Petition would allow for internal connectivity between two sides of a light industrial operation, reducing vehicular and truck traffic impacts to Shopton Road. The site is just south of Charlotte Douglas Airport, as well as in the Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay. I'll take any questions following comments from the petitioner.

**John Carmichael, 600 South Tryon Street, Suite 2300** said thank you, Madam Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. I'm John Carmichael on behalf of EastGroup Properties, and with me tonight is Ms. Felicia Reddick with EastGroup Properties. Joe did a really good job going through many of the details, so I'll try not to be too repetitive. The site is just northeast of Shopton Road, and it's just east of the intersection of Pinecrest and Shopton Road, and then further to the west is Shopton Road and Sandy Porter Road. This is an aerial photograph, the site is here, and then you can see EastGroup is developing these two properties here. As Joe said, there is an existing zoning of I-1(CD) ANDO that encircles the site. Ya'll may or may not recall that that site was rezoned by the airport some years ago, and then EastGroup purchased that property. EastGroup is developing a light industrial business park on the northern portion here and then the southern portion here. So, this parcel here to the west is currently zoned I-1(CD), and then this parcel is zoned N-1A. So, what's happening here is the petitioner is requesting that the western portion be rezoned from I-1(CD) to N-1A, and this eastern portion be rezoned from N-1A to ML-1(CD). What would happen is, this parcel would be incorporated into the existing N-1A site, the western parcel. The eastern parcel would be incorporated into light industrial development. So, the property owner here has agreed to that, and EastGroup has agreed to that, and the property owner we're doing the land swap with would get a little more land. So, as Joe alluded to, the purpose of this request is to facilitate a land swap between the owners of two adjacent parcels of land, one of whom is the petitioner, as I mentioned the light industrial business park is being developed by the petitioner to the north and to the south, and this land swap would allow for more efficient and effective private vehicular connection between the northern portion of the industrial park and the southern portion of the industrial park. The only uses that would be allowed on the portion that's being rezoned from N-1A to ML-1(CD), would be the driveway connection and then pedestrian improvements, open space, tree save, landscaping, and buffers. So, no vertical improvements, just horizontal. So, it's a land swap between two property owners, but they need to rezone each parcel to effectuate the land swap. I've probably done a poor job of explaining that, but here again the key is, you've got industrial park being developed all around here, and then we're doing that land swap. Happy to answer questions if that's clear as mud.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. I know you shared that with me in one of our meetings as well. So, I know it's a little bit of a mouthful there.

**Councilmember Molina** said so, I'm actually peeking at the former district ReRep over there, to ask for some context. So, I'll start with my questions. It did sound a bit confusing, so I can't even imagine what a resident listening might be thinking.

Mr. Carmichael said well, let me show this. Yes, it's hard to describe. So, can you see this Council member? So, the site is here, that square and that kind of box or rectangle, I don't what the geometric shape is named officially, but we rezoned this for EastGroup some years ago and they're developing that. All this was rezoned by the airport. You see these buildings here?

Ms. Molina said so, just to be clear, I heard you say that there was a residential ask in here?

Mr. Carmichael said right. See, this is zoned N-1A. This is currently zoned residential, and there's an industrial park, once again, being developed around these two parcels. This parcel here is part of the airport rezoning, it's currently zoned I-1(CD). This parcel is zoned N-1A, it's part of this residential lot. So, what's happened is EastGroup and this property owner have agreed to swap these portions of their parcels, but to do that, the parcel that's currently zoned Industrial needs to be rezoned to N-1A, so it could be incorporated into this gentleman's residential lot, and then the residentially zoned property owned by the neighbor, needs to be rezoned to ML-1(CD), and then incorporated into the industrial site.

Ms. Molina said so, in other words, you're talking about two transactions. One is a land swap, that's totally separate and apart from this process, right?

Mr. Carmichael said well, we need to rezone it to effectuate the land swap, because the residential owner wants to use it for residential purposes, and EastGroup wants to use it for what they would get for industrial purposes.

Ms. Molina said so, there's a contingency on the approval of the petition in order for there to be a proper land swap?

Mr. Carmichael said exactly.

Ms. Molina said so, what my question then becomes is, are these conditional?

Mr. Carmichael said yes. So, the ML-1(CD) would only be limited to horizontal improvements, the driveway connection, landscaping, buffers, pedestrian improvements, open space. So, that area here could only be horizontal improvements, landscaping, buffers, the drive connection. The part that's going to be rezoned to residential could be used for any use allowed in the N-1A. So, we didn't condition the uses in the Single-Family District.

Ms. Molina said okay, but they are conditioned?

Mr. Carmichael said yes, ma'am, yes. So, we can't do any vertical improvements here, and that was to protect this property owner too.

Ms. Molina said right, okay. I wish there was a way, I guess, for anybody who would be watching, especially if you live in the district, because the district rep is not here. I see that you had some participation. I know you're really good at that.

Mr. Carmichael said we had three people at the neighborhood meeting. We had Mr. Kent [INAUDIBLE] who ya'll may remember worked for the City's Planning Department. He lives in Eagle Lake. Eagle Lake is over here. So, Kent came and then two other area residents came who have property across Shopton Road, but really, if you'll look at the surrounding owners, other than the person that EastGroup's contracting with, I think the other adjoining property owners are the airport property that EastGroup has purchased, because it's really kind of buried in here.

Ms. Molina said okay.

Mr. Carmichael said but it wouldn't increase the density, obviously, the industrial, it wouldn't have any effect in terms of density or extra building space or anything like that.

Ms. Molina said okay. Well, that's really all I had, just to make sure.

Mr. Carmichael said yes. Like I said, it's not as readily apparent if you just say it verbally.

Ms. Molina said okay, thank you. That's all I have, Mayor Pro Tem.



**Councilmember Mayfield** said staff, question. Based on the conversation that we just heard, if we move forward, the land swap happens and it goes back to residential, some form. Based on everything that is approved around it, because of the way the airport has purchased and created Manufacturing and Logistics, according to our 2040 Plan, would you all recommend residential that is literally sandwiched with manufacturing all around it?

Mr. Mangum said typically no, but in this case, it's almost like a one-for-one trade. So, we're not really introducing additional N-1 Zoning into a Manufacturing and Logistics area.

Ms. Mayfield said Debbie, go ahead, you're making your way, okay, but do you understand my question? Based on what was just shared, and the map that we looked at, where manufacturing is all around and we've left this little parcel, where if the swap happens, which is one part of the conversation, and that new residential. We almost had it.

Mr. Mangum said I didn't touch it.

Ms. Mayfield said I know you didn't, but that seems like. That's not the one. The other one was a better one that you were sharing John. When you look at what the airport has rezoned all around it, I'm trying to understand the logic of why would we even have a conversation about potentially identifying more of N-1A, when none of that should be developed for housing based on its current location, our SEAP (Strategic Energy Action Plan), environmental impacts, and being surrounded by Manufacturing and Logistics.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said yes, so it's this one here. So, as Joe had mentioned, it's really just a one-for-one swap. His N-1 property extends all the way back to here right now. So, this is zoned for residential, this back piece. This piece is what's zoned for Industrial. So, in order to actually get this residential piece a little bit further away from the Industrial, they've agreed to this land swap, but in order for it to work, we've got to go through this exercise of rezoning. So, as Joe had mentioned, we're not really introducing any additional residential space, and I don't think the folks that are here have any real intention of doing anything other than getting themselves a little bit further removed, and a little bit more space away from any industrial development by just effectuating this land swap. So, it's not introducing anything necessarily new. It's really kind of helping facilitate this agreement between the two property owners that are saying, hey, let's work together here, because the space that we want is better for us, and the space that we want to give you is probably better for you, to protect you from some of that industrial encroachment. So, they've agreed to that swap to kind of both insulate themselves a little bit better than they currently are.

Ms. Mayfield said okay. So, I'm going to ask you a different question. Let's say, fast forward, swap has been done. This swath that now is zoned N-1A for housing, you're saying that in our 2040 Plan, that would be consistent having housing be developed right there, when it is surrounded by Manufacturing and Logistics, knowing that we have a SEAP Plan, environmental controls, and other potential environmental challenges, we would approve housing there?

Mr. Pettine said so, if we can go back to our presentation and pull the Comp Plan exhibit. So, the Comp Plan, I think, already identifies the property owner's parcel as Neighborhood-1. So, essentially, why we've got it as inconsistent this evening is because this is recognizing the existing Neighborhood-1 Zoning for these parcels that are still residential. This is the manufacturing piece that is looking to be swapped. So, they're inconsistent because they're both representing the current zoning. So, essentially that inconsistency then really makes this yellow and this purple, and is kind of that one-for-one swap, but right now, you can build a house all the way back to here, and if this rezoning were to go through, you could still do that, it would just be potentially on this piece. So, when we looked at it again, we didn't really look at it as introducing more, we're just kind of flipping the two areas where it's mapped.

Ms. Mayfield said so, this goes back to the comment I made earlier regarding impact. Looking at this one map, it shares one version, but we're not having an accurate conversation, because what we know is that the airport has purchased and rezoned the land all around this one little piece, and if we're talking about that eventually, whether it's six months from now, eight weeks from now, four years from now, that potentially residential can go in this area based on what we may do tonight to just swap these two pieces, that would be a complete disservice to know that someone would then be able to come in and put in a proposal for some type of residential in that area, knowing that we potentially have environmental impacts over there. That is what I'm trying to get to. Look at long-term and stop looking at piecemeal, because just this one piece looks like, okay, that will make sense to give them the chance to switch it out, but the bigger concern for me is the N-1A piece of it, because we've already approved multiple things that are immediately surrounding it. So, why would we then open the door for a potential [INAUDIBLE]. That's just like saying that it's in an airport noise overlay, but we're going to approve housing, when we told everybody else you need to sell, because it's in airport noise overlay.

Mr. Pettine said and again, I think our main view of it was, that could happen on this piece today and not this piece. If the rezoning went through, it could happen on this piece tomorrow and not that piece. So, again, we looked at it straight as a swap between two property owners that were agreeing to it. They would be in control in ownership of the property, and whether or not a future house was built in this location or this location, they're both going to be still in this area of Industrial Zoning around it, there's Office Zoning here, but we didn't really look at it as more or less impactful. It was almost kind of one negates the other.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 23: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-038 BY LONGVALLEY II, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 7.76 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF FOREST POINT CIRCLE, EAST OF FOREST POINT BOULEVARD, AND SOUTH OF WEST ARROWOOD ROAD FROM B-D(CD) (DISTRIBUTIVE BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL) TO OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS).**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** declared the hearing open.

**Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development** said Petition 2025-038 is located on Forest Point Circle, just kind of southeast of the intersection of West Arrowood and I-77. The property is zoned B-D(CD), Distributive Business, Conditional. The proposed zoning is OFC, Office Flex Campus, which is a Conventional Zoning District. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. The OFC District is inconsistent, and this rezoning would revise the Policy Map to the Campus Place Type. This is a Conventional Rezoning Petition, there's not an associated site plan, and would permit any use allowed in the OFC Zoning District. Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the site is surrounded by properties developed as office uses, and the proposed OFC Zoning District is compatible with the existing uses, and there are several adjacent properties zoned OFC. Happy to take any questions following Mr. Groce's presentation.

**Nolan Groce, 1213 West Morehead Street, Suite 450** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of City Council, and the Zoning Committee. Nolan Groce with Urban Design Partners representing the petitioner Longvalley II, LLC. Maxx was very thorough in his presentation. As he mentioned, this is a conventional request, so I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

  
Billie Tyres, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 19 Minutes  
Minutes completed: August 6, 2025