

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Zoning Meeting on Monday, August 19, 2024, at 5:31 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Pro Tem Danté Anderson presiding. Council members present were Tariq Bokhari, Tiawana Brown, Ed Driggs, Lawana Mayfield, and Marjorie Molina.

**ABSENT:** Mayor Vi Lyles, Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, James Mitchell, and Victoria Watlington.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said I'd like to welcome you to the August 19, 2024, Charlotte City Council meeting. I think we have everyone here. I'd like to begin by welcoming you this evening. Thank you for joining us. We begin our meetings with an invocation as an expression of inspiration, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. The invocation for us as a Council is really meant to underscore our proceedings and set the tone for how we move forward. We celebrate the religious diversity of our entire community, including those who do not have a religious faith.

\* \* \* \* \*

### INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Molina 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, Council woman, and to the rest of Council as well. My name is Andrew Blumenthal and I'm the incoming Chairman of the Zoning Committee of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission. I'll start by introducing my fellow committee members. To your left, we have Clayton Sealey, Robin Stuart, Rick Winiker, Theresa McDonald, Erin Shaw and Shana Neeley. The Zoning Committee will next meet, given Labor Day, on Wednesday, September 4, 2024, in lieu of our usual Tuesday slot. That'll be 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 public hearings from this evening. Prior to that meeting, you are welcome to reach out to us to provide input. You can find our contact information, as well as information on each of these petitions on the City's website at [charlotteplanning.org](http://charlotteplanning.org). Thank you, Council woman.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you and thank you and the committee for your service. At this time, I'd like to pass it over to staff so we can review the deferrals and withdrawals.

\* \* \* \* \*

### DEFERRALS/ WITHDRAWALS

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, and carried unanimously to defer: a decision on Item No. 3, Petition No. 2023-124 by The Paces Foundation to September 16, 2024; a decision on Item No. 12, Petition No. 2022-224 by SRL Central Avenue Properties, LLC to September 16, 2024; a decision on Item No. 13, Petition No. 2024-011 by Eastwood Homes to September 16, 2024; a hearing on Item No. 17, Petition No. 2023-070 by Ahmad Developers, LLC to September 16, 2024; a hearing on Item No. 18, Petition No. 2024-035 by City of Charlotte to September 16, 2024; a hearing on Item No. 19, Petition No. 2024-057 by Savalex Homes, LLC to September 16, 2024; and a hearing on Item No. 20, Petition No. 2024-060 by DreamKey Partners to September 16, 2024.

\*\*\*\*\*

### CONSENT AGENDA

**ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 4 THROUGH 11 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS PULLED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE PULLED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.**

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said we will now move on to our consent agenda. Please note that these petitions meet the following criteria. First, there was no public opposition to these particular petitions at the hearing. Secondly, the Zoning Committee recommended approval and there are no changes after the Zoning Committee's approval, and lastly, staff recommends approval of these particular petitions. Are there any consent items that Council would like to pull for a separate vote or comment?

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Molina, and carried unanimously to approve the consent agenda as presented.

The following items were approved:

**Item No. 4: Ordinance No. 836-Z, Petition No. 2023-152 by Sam's Commercial Properties, LLC amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 1.1 acres located at the southwest intersection of Mallard Creek Road and Carolina Lily Lane, east of Kings Grant Drive from CC (Commercial Center) to CG (General Commercial).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Neeley, seconded by Sealey) 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 final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Commercial 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 CG zoning district is intended to accommodate areas of general commercial development in the City, typically located at key intersections or organized along arterial streets. The approved conditional plan allows retail/business uses on this site. This request will provide better flexibility and properly align with the standards of the UDO. The petition proposes a commercial land use that has the potential to promote access to amenities, goods, and services. The petition proposes a commercial land use that has the potential to promote access to employment opportunity. The parcel has frontage along Mallard Creek Road, a State-maintained major arterial. The site is served by CATS route #54. CATS is requesting a bus stop with the final location to be coordinated with the developer during the Land Development plan review process. The parcel is surrounded by a mix of residential uses, retail, and vacant land. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 309-310.

**Item No. 5: Ordinance No. 837-Z, Petition No. 2023-164 by Eden Acquisitions, LLC amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 23.42 acres located along the east side of South Tryon Street and west side of Steele Creek Road, north of Hamilton Road from N1-A (Neighborhood 1-A) and IC-1 (Institutional Campus-1) to N2-A (CD) (Neighborhood 2-A, Conditional).**

The Zoning Committee voted 4-2 (motion by Russell, seconded by Neeley) 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 final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends Neighborhood 1 and Community Activity Center place types for the site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is partially within a Community Activity Center place type and is within a half mile from the core of the activity center at the intersection of S Tryon Street and Steele Creek Road. The proposed multi-family attached dwellings would provide an appropriate transition from the single-family dwellings in the Neighborhood 1 place type to the south and the more intense non-residential uses in the Community Activity Center place type to the northeast of the site. The petition commits to enhanced screening above ordinance requirements with a 20-foot Type B landscape yard with fence along the southern property boundary where adjacent to single-family dwellings. The petition includes a new public street off S Tryon Street that would provide access to a future Mecklenburg County park adjacent to the site. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion, 4: Trail & Transit Oriented Development, 5: Safe & Equitable Mobility, 6: Healthy, Safe & Active Communities. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map (2022) from Neighborhood 1 and Community Activity Center place types to Neighborhood 2 place type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 311-312.

**Item No. 6: Ordinance No. 838-Z, Petition No. 2024-013 by Above and Beyond Students, Inc. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.24 acres located on the west side of Park Road, south of Seneca Place and north of Cortland Road from OFC (Office Flex Campus) to CAC-1 (Community Activity Center-1).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Sealey, 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 Community Activity Center 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: CAC-1 zones are intended for those areas that are transitioning away from automobile-centric orientation toward a more walkable, well-connected, moderate intensity, mix of retail, restaurant, entertainment, office, and personal service uses, including some residential uses. The area surrounding the subject site includes a mix of office, residential structures, many of which have been converted to office and residential support uses, and multi-dwelling development. The development standards of the CAC-1 district allow for greater flexibility in design and site elements, such as parking amount and location, while accommodating multiple modes of transportation including walking, bicycling, and automobile. CAC-1 zoning district is appropriate as it would align the site's zoning with the site's existing Community Activity Center Place Type which is the predominate Place Type along both sides of Park Road. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion, 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 313-314.

**Item No. 7: Ordinance No. 839-Z, Petition No. 2024-030 by Asana Partners LP amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.39 acres located at the northwest intersection of South Sharon Amity Road and Randolph Road, south of Woodlark Lane from CC (Commercial Center, Conditional) to NC (Neighborhood Center).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Lansdell, seconded by Neeley) 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 final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood Center 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 consistent with the recommended 2040 Policy Map Place Type of Neighborhood Center (NC). The NC zoning district permits a variety of uses that are in keeping with the character of the area which is diversifying from an auto-centric, mid-century suburban development pattern to a more mixed-use area with office, retail, restaurant, and residential development. The site is walkable to nearby neighborhoods as well as directly adjacent to daily needs and could increase the amenities, goods, and services offered at the existing shopping center. The NC zoning district will utilize UDO design standards that are more human scaled and pedestrian oriented than the existing legacy zoning on the site. The site is directly served by the number 28 CATS local bus and is under a quarter-mile walk from stops for the number 15 local bus and the number 62x bus providing service to the Charlotte Transportation Center, SouthPark Community Transportation Center, Eastland Community Transportation Center, and Stonecrest Shopping Center. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 315-316.

**Item No. 8: Ordinance No. 840-Z, Petition No. 2024-032 by Troy Knight amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.17 acres located on the west side of Montgomery Street, north of Frazier Avenue, and east of West Trade Street from NC (Neighborhood Center) to N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Lansdell, seconded by Russell) 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 final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood Center Place Type for this site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: This petition is appropriate and compatible with the surrounding uses and context of the area. Access to housing is high priority need in this area according to the EGF (Equitable Growth Framework) Community Reports. The petition could help address some housing need. The site is within a half mile walkshed to a LYNX Gold Line stop. The site is within a half mile walkshed of the Irwin Creek greenway. The Neighborhood Center Place Type is a preferred adjacency for this site. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood Center Place Type to Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 317-318.

**Item No. 9: Ordinance No. 841-Z, Petition No. 2024-036 by Julio Barriga amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.23 acres located on the west side of Westerly Hills Drive, north of Wilkinson Boulevard and south of Blessing Street from N1-D (Neighborhood 1-D) and CG (General Commercial) to NC (CD) (Neighborhood Center, Conditional).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Russell, seconded by Sealey) 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 final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends Neighborhood 1 place type for the site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The proposed Neighborhood Center zoning district and place type would provide an appropriate transition from the Neighborhood 1 place type to the north and west of the site and the Community Activity Center place type to the south and east. The development standards accompanying the petition limit uses to office and accessory uses. The proposed office use is an appropriate transitional use between more intense commercial uses to the south and east of the site and established residential uses to the north and west. The petition limits building height to 40 feet, which matches the maximum building height of the N1-D zoned parcels to the north and west of the petition site. The site is less than a quarter mile from existing bus stops for CATS routes #5 and #35 and approximately a half mile from the proposed CATS Silver Line station. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods, 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 Neighborhood 1 place type to Neighborhood Center place type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 319-320.

**Item No. 10: Ordinance No. 842-Z, Petition No. 2024-038 by Cambridge Properties, Inc. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 3.02 acres located at the northwest intersection of West W. T. Harris and Davis Lake Parkway, south of David Cox Road from CC (Commercial Center, Conditional) to CG (General Commercial).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Lansdell, seconded by Sealey) 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 final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Commercial 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 consistent with the recommended 2040 Policy Map Place Type of Commercial. The CG zoning district permits a variety of uses that are in keeping with the character of the area, which is generally auto-oriented but also provides standards that are accommodating of other travel modes. The site is walkable to nearby neighborhoods as well as directly adjacent to daily needs. The site could increase the amenities, goods, and services offered at the existing shopping center. The Commercial Place Type calls for standalone nonresidential uses located along high-volume arterial streets. The site is located at the intersection of a road designated by the Charlotte Streets Map as a Collector Street, and a 6+ Lane Parkway which is considered an arterial street and is intended to serve high volumes of traffic at relatively high speeds while limiting direct access to adjacent land uses. The site is adjacent to the future Davis Lake Parkway Urban trail that is proposed to feed into the existing Mallard Creek Greenway. The site is located along the route of the CATS number 21 local bus providing transit access to the Charlotte Transportation Center. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 321-322.

**Item No. 11: Ordinance No. 843-Z, Petition No. 2024-041 by McAlway Road Ventures, LLC by amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.548 acres located on the east side of McAlway Road, west of Craig Avenue, north of Bobby Lane from N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B) and OFC (Office Flex Campus) to N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Lansdell, seconded by Sealey) 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 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 parcel abuts garden apartments to the east, townhomes to the south, and townhomes under construction to the west on lots zoned N2-B. The N2-B zoning district is intended for the development of multi-family dwellings, including multi-family attached and multi-family stacked units. Lower-intensity residential dwellings, including single-family, duplex, triplex, and quadruplex dwellings are permitted within the zoning district, subject to the standards of the N1-E zoning district, or as components of a multi-dwelling development. The site has split zoning with most of the site zoned OFC and the remainder zoned N2-B. The request proposes to bring the entire acreage under one zoning district. The rezoning site has frontage along McAlway Road, a City-maintained major collector. The petition is located within a quarter mile of a Neighborhood Activity Center. The petition is location within an Access to Housing Gap (EGF). Access to housing is a high priority need in this area according to the EGF Community Reports. The petition for uses allowed in the N2-B zoning district on the site, including multi-family attached dwelling units, seeks to address the housing need. The petition is made up of remnant parcels. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

The ordinance is recorded in full In Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 323-324.

\* \* \* \* \*

## DECISIONS

**ITEM NO. 14: ORDINANCE NO. 844-Z, PETITION NO. 2024-022 BY QTR DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS & SUNSET ROAD PARTNERS, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 12.11 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF SUNSET ROAD, EAST OF OAKDALE ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 5-1 (motion by Whilden, seconded by Sealey) 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 proposed development would fill a need for housing in an area that has been identified by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as lacking opportunities for access to housing. The site is located within a half mile of an area designated as a Neighborhood Center by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed development fronts on Sunset Road, designated by the Charlotte Streets Map as a 2+ Lane Avenue and considered an Arterial Street by the UDO. The proposed site plan limits the number of units per building to no more than five and provides several duplex lots to increase the diversity of housing types. Vehicular access to the site will be via a new public street extension of McCauley Meadows Drive, creating a cross access connection with adjacent development and provides stub streets to large undeveloped tracts of land which begins to form a street grid. Parking for the attached multi-family dwellings will be from a network of private alleys, and the petitioner has committed to enhancing these alleys by placing a minimum of 40 trees at a minimum spacing of 40 feet on center along the alleys. Alleys will also include a network of sidewalks to accommodate pedestrian access to the dwelling units. The petitioner has committed to enhanced design standards for units abutting public and network required streets including providing covered stoops and limiting blank walls. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10-Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the

recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

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

1. Added note stating: "Cross-access shall be provided to the adjacent western parcel as required per the provisions found in Article 31.2 of the Ordinance."
2. Added possible future location of the cross-access to the site plan.

**Teresa Montalvo, Rezoning Program Manager** said staff believes these changes are minor and do not warrant additional review by the Zoning Committee.

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

Motion was made by Councilmember Molina, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, 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 proposed development would fill a need for housing in an area that has been identified by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as lacking opportunities for access to housing. The site is located within a half mile of an area designated as a Neighborhood Center by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed development fronts on Sunset Road, designated by the Charlotte Streets Map as a 2+ Lane Avenue and considered an Arterial Street by the UDO. The proposed site plan limits the number of units per building to no more than five and provides several duplex lots to increase the diversity of housing types. Vehicular access to the site will be via a new public street extension of McCauley Meadows Drive, creating a cross access connection with adjacent development and provides stub streets to large undeveloped tracts of land which begins to form a street grid. Parking for the attached multi-family dwellings will be from a network of private alleys, and the petitioner has committed to enhancing these alleys by placing a minimum of 40 trees at a minimum spacing of 40 feet on center along the alleys. Alleys will also include a network of sidewalks to accommodate pedestrian access to the dwelling units. The petitioner has committed to enhanced design standards for units abutting public and network required streets including providing covered stoops and limiting blank walls. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10-Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site, as modified.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 325-326.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 15: ORDINANCE NO. 845-Z, PETITION NO. 2024-029 BY EMBREY DEVELOPMENT COMPANY AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 19.81 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF ALEXANDRIANA ROAD, EAST SIDE OF STATESVILLE ROAD, AND WEST OF TWIN LAKES PARKWAY, NORTH OF INTERSTATE 485 FROM OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS) TO IMU(CD) (INNOVATION MIXED USE, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 5-1 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Whilden) 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: he 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Manufacturing & Logistics 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 petition provides an opportunity to provide housing in an area that is connected to schools and retail options. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Manufacturing & Logistics to Innovation Mixed Use Place Type for the site.

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

1. Contributes \$200,000 to the City of Charlotte Affordable Housing Trust Fund prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the Site.

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

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, 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 post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: he 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Manufacturing & Logistics 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 petition provides an opportunity to provide housing in an area that is connected to schools and retail options. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Manufacturing & Logistics to Innovation Mixed Use Place Type for the site, as modified.

**Councilmember Driggs** said so, I just want to note quickly, the staff does not recommend this. I don't take the decision to vote for something against the recommendation of staff lightly. I feel their analysis of the applicability of our policy was appropriate, but in my mind this is a situation where the application of policy doesn't really fit the circumstances, so this was offered for the staff's intended use. No transaction was possible. So, again, greatest of respect for the staff, but I feel it's in our interest to go ahead and move this one forward. Thank you.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said so our colleague, Councilmember Johnson, did send us an email in response to this, but I also want to share that I appreciate staff's idea, but this particular area, as was alluded to by my colleague, more than 20 years they were not able to develop what we thought would happen in the area. So, I appreciate the fact that the petitioner listened to the District Representative, to members of the community, made a contribution, has in here some housing affordability for a segment of our community that needs access to it, made additional commitments for sidewalk improvements, not just for their specific property, but even extending beyond as well as contributing to our Housing Trust Fund as we continue to see major growth in the City. So, although, it is not as a slight to our staff, which does an amazing job, for this particular project it seemed like this development would be one that would hit our goals of our 10-minute neighborhoods, as well as create housing diversity in the area where there are jobs. Thank you.

**Councilmember Molina** said just really quickly, I wanted you to elaborate because I asked earlier just to get some clarification, because again, as my colleagues have



stated, I don't want to be redundant here, but really understanding what your policy position was. Can you just give like a high-level view of what that was just for public record so that we can have it out there.

**Teresa Montalvo, Rezoning Program Manager** said certainly. So, the property today is in the Manufacturing and Logistic Place Type, as is most of the property surrounding it. The petitioner is seeking the IMU zone to develop a wholly residential project, multi-family stacked project. From a policy perspective, that is not a type of development that we would support with the adjacencies of the Manufacturing and Logistics occurring around it. Moreover, that's still a viable Manufacturing and Logistic area. We've recently approved several projects for Manufacturing. There's auto repair, auto dealership surrounding that. We've had a couple other petitions come in recently for presubmittal meetings for Manufacturing and Logistics. So, based on those characteristics, we did not feel this was the best location for this multi-family project. Nothing against it. The developer has done great strides to make it a good project, and I don't doubt that. It just really came down to the policy and where that directs us to locate multi-family residential projects, such as this.

Ms. Molina said like my colleagues appreciate the work of staff, and quite often it's something that we lean on because you really lean into this work before we actually have a touch point with it. So, we depend, one, on your work and the acumen that you lend to this process, as well as our commission. So, I just wanted to acknowledge that. I also will be supporting the Council member, due to the fact that this has been a longstanding opportunity for more than a decade now without any interest in development, and I feel like that based on that assessment, it would worth supporting. I think that if there's an appetite to diversify this particular area with that type of project, then I'm willing to support it to see that through. So, thank you again for your work, and that's all I have Mayor Pro Tem.

**Mayor Pro Tem Anderson** said I too will be supporting Councilmember Johnson on this particular petition. I spoke with staff earlier at length about this petition and understand where this petition has been, and this part of the City has been for a while. So, I will be supporting Ms. Johnson as well.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 327-328.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 16: ORDINANCE NO. 846-Z, PETITION NO. 2024-039 BY GETHSEMANE CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL GARDENS AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 10.65 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF WEST SUGAR CREEK ROAD AND NORTH SIDE OF THE ROMAN ROAD, WEST OF MINERAL SPRINGS ROAD FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO IC-1 (INSTITUTIONAL CAMPUS-1).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Whilden) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type for this site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The preferred Neighborhood 1 adjacency is present with this petition. The site is also adjacent to the Campus Place Type and would unify the parcels currently owned by the Gethsemane Cemetery to one place type allowing for a consistent development pattern. The IC-1 institutional campus zoning district is intended to address the needs and impacts of large-scale institutional campuses including religious campuses. The

approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood 1 Place Type to Campus Place Type for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, 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 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 for this site. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The preferred Neighborhood 1 adjacency is present with this petition. The site is also adjacent to the Campus Place Type and would unify the parcels currently owned by the Gethsemane Cemetery to one place type allowing for a consistent development pattern. The IC-1 institutional campus zoning district is intended to address the needs and impacts of large-scale institutional campuses including religious campuses. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood 1 Place Type to Campus Place Type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 329-330.

\* \* \* \* \*

## HEARINGS

**ITEM NO. 21: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-094 BY CITY OF CHARLOTTE PLANNING, DESIGN, AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - TEXT AMENDMENT TO MODIFY THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO ADDRESS MINOR ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS RELATED TO TREE PRESERVATION ACCOUNTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER OVERLAY, AND TO CORRECT SCRIVENER'S ERRORS.**

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

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said alright, great, thank you, Mayor Pro Tem. Yes, so, our first item is a public hearing on Text Amendment 2024-094, probably one of the most straight forward text amendments we'll have. Just to talk through the three changes that are essentially composed in this. Article 14 is our Special Purpose and Overlay District. It's where things like our neighborhood character overlay or residential infill overlay, historic district overlays, all live in the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance). As we were going through the exercise of working with some communities all in the neighborhood character overlays that are currently in process, there was some language that we noticed that was a carryover in there, not existing in any of the other overlay districts that we have, and it essentially clarifies some things about deed restrictions. Again, we didn't see that language anywhere else. The code in the UDO is silent on deed restrictions as it really technically should be. Those are private agreements. The City doesn't get involved in reviewing or enforcing any of those. So, this change for Article 14 would remove just a statement that reads, it cannot modify any standards located within existing declarations of covenants and restrictions. Again, that's just to make it consistent with all of our other overlay districts and really clarifies that, again, staff is not involved in researching or enforcing or implementing any of those deed restrictions. So, that's the first change.

The second change, as mentioned, also has to do with our tree preservation section of the Ordinance. We all understand we have a fund that we collect funds when people do payment in lieu for tree save, and there's a certain pot that that money goes into, which we can then use for other tree initiatives. Really just needed to clarify and change the word of fund to something different. I think it changes to account now, and that is so that those funds can be disbursed. There's just challenges with the word funds when it comes to disbursement of those funds through Strategy and Budget. So, working with

them, we identified that that was an issue. So, we've changed that word to essentially just read how it needs to, so those heritage tree mitigation payments and other payments in lieu can be disbursed out through that fund and used as they were intended to, and that's essentially the same for the enforcement section. So, anywhere that we had that word fund, when it came to tree preservation, that had to then be changed to account so that also can clarify where that collected fine revenue gets deposited and disbursed out of. So, just three really basic cleanup changes, nothing overarching that has any real policy implications, just some cleanups that we've identified through staff implementation, and then again, working with Strategy and Budget on those mitigation funds. So, be happy to answer any questions that you have.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said Mr. Pettine, so help me understand the clarification. We're changing the language to remove it from fund. Currently, those funds can only be used to be disbursed for tree related. So, by changing the language from fund to account, what does that do?

Mr. Pettine said it doesn't change what they can be used for. It just changes the ability to then disburse them through Strategy and Budget.

Ms. Mayfield said so, again, just for clarification, if it doesn't change where it's going, what was the challenge in Strategy and Budget for them to allocate funds?

Mr. Pettine said we've got some folks here that maybe can clarify the technicality of it, but it doesn't change what it can be used for. So, it doesn't open it up to using those funds for other City initiatives. It has to be used for the same thing. It's just essentially, again, changing that word, but I'll let Tim explain a little bit more.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, fund to account, why?

**Tim Porter, Urban Forester** said thanks Dave. Good evening, Council. Tim Porter, Urban Forester. It's really just a preference from Strategy and Budget to be more comfortable. There was some understanding of fund being a very specific type of account, that as we move into the new accounting system workday in the future, there was some uneasiness with that account or its equivalence. If you dig into the redline, it says accounts or its equivalence. It's just a comfort level long-term that just better aligns with the preferences of Strategy and Budget and our future accounting system workday.

Ms. Mayfield said so, it truly is just an even name change. It's not changing any of the accountability of it?

Mr. Porter said yes, that's correct.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

**Councilmember Molina** said Article 14, David, can you give me some understanding. Especially with East Charlotte, I get a lot of interest in the overlay district. Tell me what exactly we're updating, so that me and the community can understand that.

Mr. Pettine said so, we're updating the language that's in there. There's a sentence that refers to, again, those declarations of covenants and restrictions, just commonly referred to as deed restrictions, and it creates some confusion as to, is staff responsible for reviewing and enforcing those, or not moving forward things that meet City standards because there may be a conflict with those deed restrictions. Again, all of our other overlay districts and the UDO in its entirety is silent on deed restrictions, as it should be. We don't have any ability to get involved in those. Those are private party agreements. So, it's essentially just removing that sentence, so it's just clear that, as all the other overlay districts, that's not a staff responsibility. It doesn't mean that private property owners can't still take action and enforce those deed restrictions through their own mechanisms, and it doesn't mean that they don't have any mechanism to enforce those. It just means it clarifies that the City isn't the responsible party.

Ms. Molina said and again, that's something that's outside of our ability to even touch the scope of what that might mean, right, just for clarification?

Mr. Pettine said yes, exactly.

Ms. Molina said is there some kind of published document that we're going to give as a result of this?

Mr. Pettine said the published document would just be the UDO with that sentence removed, and that's the redline version that's online now. It just shows that sentence being struck and then just a renumbering of that section to just back to, now the B2 is gone, B3 becomes B2, etc. So, that's the one thing that will change. We can always put out some messaging through our own Planning Department channels to say this was an update. Again, it doesn't provide any real effectiveness on anyone's ability to, again, enforce those, or say, "Hey, our community has these deed restrictions. What do we do to move those forward?" That's just all a private party matter.

Ms. Molina said okay, that's all I have. Thank you, Mayor Pro Tem.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 22: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2023-156 BY PLANT 4 PARTNERS, INC. FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 16.08 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF EAST W. T. HARRIS BOULEVARD, NORTH OF ROCKY RIVER ROAD, AND WEST OF JOHN RUSSELL ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS).**

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

**Teresa Montalvo, Rezoning Program Manager** said the site is approximately a 16-acre undeveloped parcel, located on the east side of W.T. Harris Boulevard, north of Rocky River Road. For context, there is an established residential area to the east of the site, and Duke Energy is located across W.T. Harris to the west. The W.T. Harris corridor in this area includes a mix of residential support and office uses. The request is to rezone the site from N1-A to Office Flex Campus. The aforementioned residential development to the east is zoned N1-A; however, several properties to the north and south, fronting on W.T. Harris, are zoned O-1, which is a Legacy District, which translates to the OFC zone. The 2040 Policy Map calls for a variety of Place Types along this segment of W.T. Harris, including Manufacturing and Logistics, Neighborhood Center and Neighborhood-1. The subject site has a Place Type of Neighborhood-2. Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the requested OFC zone is consistent with the existing mix of zoning and development along W.T. Harris Boulevard. Access to goods and services has been identified as a high-priority need in the area, and the petition could facilitate goal eight, related to diverse and resilient economy. Approval of this petition will change the Place Type from Neighborhood-2 to Campus. I'm here if you have any questions.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. I would also just underscore that this is a Conventional Rezoning Petition with no associated site plan.

**Steve Farnie, 9110 Hood Road** said good evening. My name is Steve Farnie and I'm the developer on this site. I'm not going to take that much time because the owner right now is the Seventh-Day Adventist, this is their district headquarters there, and this is land they've owned for over 35 years, and up until now the only pursuers they've had wanted to build either apartment complexes or a school. What I developed, and I've done 12 of these in the Charlotte area, is one-story professional parks, very low density. We had a neighborhood meeting, and a group showed up and they were excited about

it because they didn't want to see an apartment complex in front of them or a school. So, that's really all I have to say. I'll be happy to answer any questions to the person that's opposed to it.

**Kevin Hull, 8229 Getalong Road** said good evening, Council. My primary concern, and maybe it sounds like the site concept was not a part of the zoning and staff review, but I think overall I've seen the concept and spoken with some of the members, but my primary concern was with the tree conservation area proposed in the site concept between the residential plots of land and then the office development. There's not a large buffer, so that people are going to look out of the backyards, and instead of seeing trees and woods, now they would see a parking lot and offices. So, I think the overall concept sits well with me, but as a member of the neighborhood, I would like to request a larger buffer between that, more commercial office space and the neighborhoods that are there now.

Mr. Farnie said I'm not the engineer. I wish my civil engineer was here, but he's out of town. We're using the standard buffer between residential and commercial, and I don't really know what that is, but it's whatever is on the books for that zoning. There's a lot of tree conservation, and those houses will not be looking on a parking lot. The buildings are going to be on the perimeters and the parking will be in the center. So, the neighborhood will only see the back of the buildings, but you'll have to look through, I think, 75 feet of buffer area. If you look at the map, that area just above the area in question, is that I've got two buildings that is exactly what we're going to build, and we have that exact situation, and we've been there for 22 years and there hasn't been any problem. It's very quiet. Operation is all professional centers and that'll be what the new one is. So, we do have a large tree conservation. Out of the roughly 12 acres that we'll be developing, about five of it is going to be maintained in trees. There's a large triangle area in the center of the park that will be maintained as trees with passthrough there with picnic tables and things. So, we're very aware of that as an ambience and a benefit to the park in general.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said don't go too far away, stay close by, but this question might be for staff. We note in here that Charlotte Water currently does not have the water system accessible for the rezoning boundary under review. So, help me understand how we're here with a recommendation from staff and committee if we already know we're having challenges with access to water?

Ms. Montalvo said this is a conventional zone, so there are items that will be addressed at the time of permitting depending on what's proposed.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, that doesn't really help me. So, I'm going to try to ask the question a different way so that I can play catch up. We just had a major incident within Uptown Charlotte regarding Charlotte Water, three and a half, four weeks ago. If we know clearly that Charlotte Water is stating that the closest water distribution main is approximately 350 feet north of the rezoning boundary, and again, Charlotte Water currently does not have water system accessibility, why will we even move something forward if there's a greater chance that this is a project that can be delayed?

Ms. Montalvo said I think from a staff perspective, we are looking at the appropriateness of the zone for this site. If this were a conditional plan and there was specific development proposed, then we would probably take a deeper dive in the availability of utilities, but at this time, whether they're going to just market it in the future for an office development, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Pettine, but that's my approach.

**David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development** said yes, so just real quick on that stuff for water and sewer. When we see that kind of comment, it doesn't mean the site can't be served. It doesn't mean they don't have capacity to serve the site. It just means they don't have a line in the area of the site. So, if it's going to be extended to provide service for water and sewer, it'll have to be at the developer's dime and their own expense. The City doesn't pay for that extension. So, it doesn't mean that there's not capacity. It just means that they have to extend that out, and when they do, they come

in for permitting, they have to then put in the lines on their own cost, rather than the City having it already there. So, it doesn't mean they can't develop the project. It just means there's an additional expense per the developer.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you. Mr. Farnie is there a possibility for the consideration of a tree buffer versus a good bit of it being in the middle of the development for their amenity that we maintain undisturbed buffer between that residential, because we know fall tends to happen, even though we're losing seasons, when all those leaves fall you want to make sure that what you're looking at. Because also there's potential environmental impacts with the vehicles, the gas, the talking, radio, whatever it is. Is there a possibility that you can work with your engineer to identify more undisturbed buffer space between the residential and your property versus more of the tree save going in the middle of the property?

Mr. Farnie said well, we're going to do the middle of the property anyway. It's not going to affect the number of square feet that we can get, and I don't know if you had asked me about the buffer on the street?

Ms. Mayfield said between the residential. So, the question that Mr. Hull had, regarding the residential and your property, is there a possibility that you and your engineers can have a discussion of maintaining a little more of the natural undisturbed tree area versus clearcutting and then planting?

Ms. Farnie said so, are you saying can we do more than what the zoning requires right now? Is that the question?

Ms. Mayfield said well, you can always do that, but what I'm asking is, if ya'll can have a conversation in order to try to meet with Mr. Hull and some of the other residents to meet a little further to the middle to create a buffer that will enhance the neighborhood as well as your property?

Mr. Farnie said sure, we can have that discussion. We've got plenty of room in the middle. I mean, we're only putting 85,000 square feet in 12 acres. So, you can see the density is very, very low.

**Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney** said I need to interrupt Councilmember Mayfield. We have to be very careful because we don't have a site plan and it's conventional, so any use is allowed in Office Flex, so he can't, since it's not conditional, he can't [inaudible].

Ms. Mayfield said thank you, Ms. Hagler-Gray, for that reminder. I appreciate that, but yet, since Mr. Hull has some design that he has seen, whatever that design is that we don't have, I'm just asking if you can have a consideration to continue communication with the neighbors?

Mr. Hull said absolutely. We want to be good neighbors. We have been for 22 years down the street and we're not going to violate that. We're going to work with the neighborhood.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you so much.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 23: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2023-165 BY CENTRAL AVENUE MULTIFAMILY, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.839 ACRES BOUND BY THE SOUTH SIDE OF CENTRAL AVENUE, WEST SIDE OF PIEDMONT STREET, NORTH SIDE OF SUNNYSIDE AVENUE, AND EAST SIDE OF**

**THE INDEPENDENCE/I-277 RAMP FROM N1-D (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-D), NC (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER), O-6(CD) (OFFICE, CONDITIONAL) TO CAC-1(EX) (COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER-1, EXCEPTION).**

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

**Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development** said this site is just under three acres along Central Avenue, Piedmont Street, and Sunnyside Avenue. Located on the Sunnyside portion of the Elizabeth neighborhood. There are a mix of uses along this section of the Central Avenue corridor, which service the surrounding residential areas. The site is currently zoned Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood-1D, and Office, conditional. That Neighborhood Center zoning is as a result of the pedestrian overlay that used to be on the site, automatically translating that portion to NC. The petitioner is proposing Community Activity Center-1, Exception, which is a conditional rezoning request, and this petition is consistent with the Community Activity Center Place Type that's recommended for a majority of the site and is inconsistent with the Neighborhood-1 designation on the two southeastern parcels on the site. The proposal itself is for up to 315 multi-family units, as well as up to 5,000 square feet of commercial or retail space that'd be unrelated to the multi-family development. So, it kind of services like a leasing office, for example. EX petitions allow for modifications to certain UDO standards in exchange for public benefits, and the benefits provided by the petitioner in this rezoning includes the development of a 16-foot publically accessible shared use path, the relocation of the existing sewer line, and 9,000 square feet of amenitized public plaza space along the shared use path and at the intersection of Piedmont and Sunnyside.

The plan requests modifying the height plane restrictions for portions of a building within 200 feet of the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. There are two areas identified in this site plan where the site plan modifications will occur. One area will be along this western boundary and one area is along the northeastern boundary, as shown on that site plan. This exception request modifies the maximum building height from 65 feet to 85 feet, and that's only limited to the areas that are specified on that plan. The height plane restrictions for portions of a building within 100 feet of Neighborhood-1 will be maintained so that the building is no more than 50 feet tall in that 100-foot radius. The petitioner is also requesting to reduce the minimum ground floor height from 14 to 10 feet where nonresidential space may occur, and the final EX request is to reduce the ground floor transparency levels, except where nonresidential space may occur. The petitioner commits to fund a traffic signal at Central Avenue and Piedmont Street, and up to three speed humps or other equivalent traffic calming measures within a year of securing the final Certificate of Occupancy.

A comprehensive transportation review was completed as part of this rezoning process and mitigation measures were identified and committed to in the conditional notes. The petitioner will relocate the existing curblin along Central Avenue to allow for the construction of a buffered bike lane per the Charlotte Streets Map, and they will reserve right-of-way along the sites western edge for future acquisition by CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) for the Silver Line. Several architectural standards are specified that are mindful of the site's transition to the surrounding single-family uses, and staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of the requested technical revision. The requested EX provisions for transparency, ground floor height and architectural standards are in response to the specific elevation characteristics of the site as well as its locational and future transit infrastructure. The other EX provision being requested is for flexibility in the height plane standards required for sites near Neighborhood-1 Place Type, and although this petition would modify that maximum building height from 65 to 85 feet in those two portions, these portions of the structure would not be immediately adjacent to any single-family uses, and the sites maximum height would be concentrated along Central Avenue and the western edge, which will be about the transit line.

The public benefits procured in this petition would support pedestrian transit infrastructure. The 16-foot shared use path would serve as a vital pedestrian connection for the community utilizing transit to access the nearby amenities along Central Avenue,

and this path will be properly amenitized in a way that is consistent with our existing pedestrian paths along transit lines. As part of this redevelopment of the site in anticipation of future transit infrastructure, the petitioner also commits to relocating the existing sewer line, and that's just what is typically a pretty big financial burden away from the City and to the petitioner. Separately from the EX benefits outlined in this plan, the petitioner will still utilize bonus mini provision options from Article 16 in the UDO to achieve any height above 80 feet. Recognizing that this site is adjacent to single-family uses, they created several architectural standards that will allow for a more compatible building design along Sunnyside and Piedmont, and again, they are maintaining that 50-foot height cap, where within 100 feet of Neighborhood-1, which further transitions to the single-family uses. There's also 65-foot height stepdown that's interior to the site in between the 85-foot and the 50-foot height zones.

Although this petition is located at the edge of a single-family residential area, the majority of the site and Central Avenue is recommended for Community Activity Center, and that Place Type envisions mixed-use, mid-size developments along transit corridors. So, densification should be encouraged in areas like these, which front major arterials, which Central Avenue is, and will also be along future transit routes. This petition sufficiently balances the goals of that CAC Place Type and provides adequate public benefits to justify the EX request, and I'll take any questions following the community and petitioner's comments.

**Keith MacVean, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. Keith MacVean with Moore & Van Allen. Jeff Brown of our firm and I are assisting Republic Metropolitan, the petitioner, on this request. With me tonight, representing the petitioner, is Adam McMichael and Dennis Walls. They're available to answer questions. I want to thank Holly and the staff for helping us with this request. Holly's done a great job outlining what the request is about and where we are. As she mentioned, a site located on Central Avenue adjacent to the Sunnyside neighborhood, which is a residential neighborhood right behind us. That neighborhood is also part of the Elizabeth neighborhood. Before we filed this petition, early on, we started meetings on the site with the residents of Sunnyside to get input on the petition. We've made a lot of changes to the petition request that you see before you tonight as a result of input from those meetings. Unfortunately, we haven't been able to address all their concerns. I think there is a number of speakers here tonight to address you regarding their concerns.

So, as Holly mentioned, a variety of zoning districts for this site, NC, Old Legacy, conditional, as well as N1-D. As Holly mentioned, a majority of the site is supported by the 2040 Place Type Map. A small portion, or a third, or a quarter of the site is inconsistent. The rezoning would make the site totally consistent with the Plan by using CAC. We have limited building height. We have limited density. As Holly mentions and the Planning Department mentions in their staff analysis, this is a transitional location, and one of the things that we've worked hard to do here is to try to propose a conditional plan that does make a transition from Central Avenue, a four-lane heavily trafficked corridor, adjacent to future transit location, as well as in close proximity to the existing Lynx Gold Line, a stop on Hawthorne, also has existing bus service on the site. So, we wanted to make a transition from those public infrastructure improvements. The site also has access to the future Cross-Charlotte Trail, which is directly across Central Avenue from the site. So, in trying to transition between that more intense corridor and the single-family neighborhood to the rear, we spent a lot of time on design, how the building lowers in building height from 85 feet along Central, to a maximum height of 50 feet at Sunnyside and Piedmont, added additional amenities in terms of open space and large setbacks.

We heard a lot of concerns from the residents about traffic and parking in the neighborhood. So, we worked to design the access to be on Piedmont closer to Central Avenue where it would have access hopefully to a potential future signal, which the petitioner has agreed to fund. Subject to C-DOTs (Charlotte Department of Transportation) approval of the future signal. I also will mention that, in regard to the



Cross-Charlotte Trail, C-DOT has actually funded and will be adding a pedestrian-activated signal on Central, that will provide the residents of this community, as well as the residents of Sunnyside, a neighborhood access to the Cross-Charlotte Trail at a signalized or pedestrian crossing. That trail connection and also lines up as one of the amenities that Holly mentioned, a 16-foot multi-use path that will be built by the petitioner along Independence that links the future transit station to the Sunnyside neighborhood and to the Cross-Charlotte Trail. We also added a provision that said we will provide 20 percent more parking, that is the minimum that is required by the ordinance, again, to address concerns from the neighbors about parking. We also worked with the City to not relocate the curb on Sunnyside and Piedmont, so that on-street parking along those streets, along our frontage, would not be possible, and residents would be encouraged to park in the parking structure within the facility.

This just shows you what the future impact of the Silver Line will be on the site. That area has been reserved and set aside for the construction of the Silver Line. There are improvements in terms of sewer line relocation that are being done as part of the development of the site. This access, as I mentioned, was originally when we first started this, we had an access point on Sunnyside Avenue. We heard a lot of comments about the potential impact of that. It actually would work well for this development to have access on Sunnyside, but we eliminated that and moved the vehicular access to Piedmont at, hopefully, what will be a future signal funded by the developer. We are working with C-DOT to get that accomplished as part of the development of the site, have agreed to do a traffic [inaudible] analysis as part of that, and as I mentioned earlier, this is the future pedestrian signal at the intersection of the Cross-Charlotte Trail and the proposed 16-foot multi-use path that's part of this development. Two height exceptions that Holly mentioned, quickly, to increase building height above what's allowed along Central, 85 feet here and 85 feet here, again, along Independence Boulevard and adjacent to the future Silver Line Station. We are in compliance with the UDO in regard to building height as it adheres to the residential neighborhood. This exception is really based on the small remanent piece of Independence Park that's called N-1 Place Type, so the code actually restricts height based on that, even though it cannot be developed with residential uses.

Then, there's a number of other exceptions regarding mixed-use buildings, and because of adjacency to the future transit line, which is elevated above the site, we wanted some relief on the mixed-use provisions design standards. The site will meet the residential design standards, and as Holly mentioned, we'll meet the commercial design standards where the 5,000 square feet of commercial area would be located along Central Avenue. There's a minimum commitment to no less than 1,500 square feet. So, again, in terms of amenities, public open space at the corner here, public open space here to help with the transition, limited height, agreement to fund the traffic signal to help with traffic within the neighborhood and from the future development that occurs here, larger setbacks along Piedmont and Sunnyside to move the building back and create a better transition, commitments to specific architectural treatments regarding balconies and porches that would project out from the main building to create more of a scale down, there are three-story balconies and porches, direct access to Sunnyside from these units, and then the units along Piedmont would also orient toward them, but because of grade, would not potentially have access to Piedmont itself. Then, lastly, just again, these commitments to architectural treatment along Sunnyside, streetscape improvements, stoops and porches with direct access, trying to create the residential use transition, where the residents of this community feel part of the Sunnyside neighborhood and vice versa. So, a lot of work to try to make that integration as seamless as possible. We're happy to answer questions.

**Craig Miller, 612 Louise Avenue** said good evening. My name is Craig Miller and I'm an 18-year resident of the Sunnyside neighborhood which is adjacent to the proposed development in this hearing, and I had some exhibits. Did those get passed out?

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said we're passing them around now.

Mr. Miller said got it, alright. I'm joined here by neighbors who stand together in our opposition to this rezoning, and I will be followed by Bethany, as you know. Sunnyside is a small and tight-knit community that, while a part of the Historic Elizabeth neighborhood, was largely cut off after the widening of Independence. If you look at Exhibit One, you'll see that it's also bounded by the busy streets of Central and Hawthorne. This isolation, I believe, has played a large part in why our neighborhood is so tight knit, but our location has become somewhat more of a curse lately, as it is increasingly a target for large-scale development. If you would please turn to Exhibit Two, you'll see there I included all the fairly recent and upcoming or potential developments that surround our neighborhood. I won't go through all of them. I have them listed, but you could take a moment maybe later to get a sense of how our neighborhood is undergoing lots of pressure from development.

Now, we recognize that properties along Central and Hawthorne are zoned for higher density uses and understand the importance of that in a quickly growing city and urban core area. This particular rezoning, however, is very different because it includes those two properties zoned Neighborhood-1, N1-D, that were recently purchased by Skyla Credit Union and are included in the development and would be included in the sales transaction if it happens. These two properties front Sunnyside Avenue within the interior of our neighborhood and had single-family detached homes on them. Exhibit Three, page three, shows the one still standing, which is an example of the beautiful, historic homes in our neighborhood, and I'd like to point out that Elizabeth is a Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places, and there's currently an effort underway to establish local Historic District for Elizabeth. Rezoning these two N-1 parcels, to me, is a dangerous precedent setting threshold. If you look at Exhibit Four, that helps to maybe understand why. If the rezoning of these two N-1 parcels is allowed, it invites developers to do the same thing with similar properties within the interior of the neighborhood. From there, it would only be a matter of time before they would chip away at the rest of the neighborhood, and this is kind of thing that ruins neighborhoods.

Additionally, this is an exception, conditional rezoning. As such, the developer is requesting modifications to zoning standards in exchange for including features deemed as public benefits. One request is to increase the height to 85 feet, which Keith mentioned, which will allow more apartments to be built, thus, more money for the developer. The others include significant reductions in ground floor height and transparency, also shared earlier, both of which will detract from the architectural appeal. None of these supposed public benefits, offered in exchange for the exceptions, come anywhere close to making up for the negative consequences of the requested exceptions and are hardly much, if any, benefit for the Sunnyside community. One is the multi-use pathway that was described, combined with the linear open space plaza, which were asked for by CATS because of the potential light rail stop next to the development. Another public benefit was the relocation of the sewer line. As you're aware, light rail's no longer the plan for the eastern section of the Silver Line. So, these benefits are no longer relevant since they'd be built for something that won't be happening. It isn't funded. The desire for higher density residential next to a Light Rail Station also becomes less relevant. In exchange for these and other lackluster offers couched as benefits, Republic Metropolitan stands to earn substantially more money by building higher and reducing ground floor architectural value. The bar for granting exceptions should be set much higher. There's very little public benefit, and the development will have significant negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood in terms of cut-through traffic and resulting safety issues, more on-street parking in a neighborhood where many properties don't have driveways, more people allowing their dogs to use our lawns as their bathroom, and so on.

One other major issue concerns traffic. If you look at the last Exhibit, one entrance/exit is being allowed on the side street for all 315 units. Now, Keith pointed out that, originally, they had an entrance on Sunnyside, which we didn't want. What he didn't show is the original plan also had an entrance on Central, which was canned by C-DOT, I understand. So, that left the one, which is not really what we wanted because it funnels all the traffic through our neighborhood because there's no light at Central

Avenue, that makes it harder to get out on Central Avenue and make your turns. We already see this with another apartment complex that was built in our neighborhood.

In my opinion, this development is another prime example of corporate greed where development companies ask for rule and policy changes and walk away with millions in their pockets, while the existing residents and community, not only don't get benefits in return, but suffer with long-term, nuance-ridden consequences of mundane, inconsistent development. Thank you.

**Bethany Gooch, 708 Sunnyside Avenue** said good evening, Madam Mayor Pro Tem and City Council members. Many of us here do believe that increasing housing density in neighborhoods like ours can improve affordability, optimize infrastructure, and reduce our carbon footprint by minimizing sprawl and protecting our natural resources. However, we believe there is a path to responsible development that can achieve these goals while also preserving the unique character of the existing neighborhood. Charlotte's 2040 Comprehensive Plan is a meticulously crafted document that balances specificity and flexibility, providing a vision for responsible growth with goals meant to reflect the voice of our community. Significant time, effort, and resources were invested in the development of this document. The requested zoning changed by Republic Metropolitan serves as a crucial test of our commitment to integrating new developments responsibly into existing neighborhoods.

When considering the proposed zoning change, our request for City Council is to uphold the intent of the 2040 vision and set a valuable precedent for future development proposals. Specifically, please consider the following. First, does this proposal fit with the vision of a Community Activity Center Place Type as defined by the 2040 Plan? Per the 2040 Plan, this Place Type is for mid-sized, mixed-use areas typically along transit corridors or major roadways that provide access to goods, services, dining, entertainment, and residential, for nearby and regional residents. Typical land use is mostly nonresidential. These buildings have tall ground floors and a high degree of transparency, using clear glass windows and doors designed for active ground floor uses to support a vibrant pedestrian environment. Public open spaces, such as small parks and greenways and tree preservation areas, are also an important feature. It also calls out transitions for building heights to be lower along edges abutting neighborhoods. Republic Metropolitan's plans do not align with the Community Activity Center designation because it includes less than one percent of total square footage dedicated to nonresidential uses with no detailed plan for the space, only 25 percent ground floor transparency and only 10-foot ground floor height. The plan lacks the vibrant pedestrian environment and active ground floor uses that we seek, and there is insufficient commitment to public amenities and open spaces. In addition, the exceptions to maximum building heights are contradictory to the transition of scale, a Community Activity Center should have, as defined by the 2040 Plan.

Our ask for City Council is to require the developer to create plans that properly qualify this building for a Community Activity Center Place Type in line with the 2040 vision. Please do not set the precedent that a Community Activity Center Place Type can be a multi-family apartment building with taller height limits and almost no mixed-use. This is not the intent of the 2040 vision and may actively work against establishing more 10-Minute Neighborhoods. Second, how can we challenge the developers to creatively incorporate N-1 zoning into their plans? Rezoning the two N-1 lots is a significant decision that will impact the surrounding neighborhood and set a precedent for future development. The 2040 Plan aims to, "Enhance the character of structures and communities that constitute the distinct places within the City." This area, our neighborhood, is a prime example of a distinct place where we can test this concept. The 2040 Plan envisioned these N-1 lots for a reason. They were serving as a transitional buffer and graduation of scale between the dense development on Central Avenue and the residential neighborhood of Sunnyside. In addition, goal number nine of the 2040 Plan is to retain our identity and charm. We should maintain a diversity of housing on this block. Not every part of the block needs to be densely developed merely because the developer requested it. In addition, the 2040 Plan aims to increase the rate of restoration and adaptive reuse of existing structures. In summary, we're asking that

you please do not set the precedent that Community Activity Center Place Type can be multi-family apartment buildings with taller height limits and almost no mixed-use. Please challenge Republic Metropolitan architects to flex their creative muscles to build their development while sustainably incorporating the two N-1 parcels into their design. We hope you will not support this rezoning request. Thank you.

Mr. MacVean said in regard to the comments from the residents, we've worked hard to create that transition. We understood from the beginning there were concerns about including the two parcels, Piedmont and Sunnyside, and that's why we worked diligently with the architect to look at context sensitive design. The porches, the design of the porches, and the stoops are based on the architect looking at surrounding residential properties. Some of these neighborhoods do contain duplexes, triplexes, and quadruplexes, and it tries to mimic that. The actual design of those units, at that corner, we added an open space also at that corner to create that transition, something that's not required, and there is also 11,000 square feet of total open space as a benefit of public open space, again, something that is not required. In addition, in terms of the benefits. We felt, A, the open space was a benefit, the reservation of right-of-way for the future transit, sewer line relocation, and expense at the cost of the developer instead of the City, not an insignificant expense, but also, the exceptions regarding design are because it is a mixed-use building. There will be commercial space here, something the developer agreed to do, not required to do, and there's up to 5,000 square feet of nonresidential to create that mixed-use. The area is not a great location at this point in time for commercial spaces, but the developer is willing to take that risk. So, in terms of the design standards, as for exceptions, we are meeting the residential CA-1 standards. It's when you bring in mixed-used standards that we want a slight deviation, again, because some of these residential units front on a future transit line that is elevated, and therefore, the units end. There's no real market for commercial space along a 16-foot multi-use path, so that's where the deviations are there in that regard. Be happy to answer additional questions.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I'm going to start with opening up the comments here. This petition has been in motion for quite some time. I've met with the petitioner, I've met with several community members, and I know that there's been a lot of community engagement, and I want to thank the community for coming out tonight to participate in the process. There were over 60 community members at the meeting, which is fantastic, and so I know that there's been a lot of give and take here on this particular petition. A couple questions for you. I've heard from many of the residents that they would actually embrace the introduction of goods and services in their community, and can you talk about the goods and services that are planned for this particular petition?

**Adam McMichael, 3900 West Alameda Avenue, Suite 1200, Burbank, California** said thank you all. Thank you for your time. Adam McMichael with Republic Metropolitan. I look forward to all your comments and questions. We've looked at this site, this development in particular, over the last year with high aspirations for it being a high-functioning retail location. Regularly, we continue to receive feedback, and against our better expertise, that it's not an exceptional location for retail. There are also some grade issues with regard to the site that don't necessarily allow for what might be optimal heights on some of these retail/commercial areas. So, until we continue to do further planning on that, it's hard for us to commit to an amount of commercial services above what we've put forth in our application. So, we've stated that we would do 1,500 square feet of retail and commercial, and we're willing to go up to 5,000 square feet should the market demand it. We don't want vacant retail. I don't think that helps anybody. Then, also, should the further planning of the site, architecturally, allow for more retail space. We've heard loud and clear from the community, or at least the neighbors, that they would like to see more goods and services. It's my opinion, coming from larger cities here, I would love to see something, such as a bodega of some sort, a stop-in, grab coffee, grab a sandwich, grab a soda-type location here. I think there's some collateral issues to that that all things need to be considered, which sometimes that leads to more traffic, sometimes that leads to more parking issues. Those are two things in our petition that we've gone to great lengths to get away from.

I'll just finish by saying, we've met with the Plaza Midwood Merchants Association, and at this time we have their support in our proposal, and I think they understand, more than most that we've spoken with in the community, that the limitations of it being a fantastic commercial site versus what our proposal is. So, this is where we've landed at the moment and we think that we could bring a good community use to the location, which, optimally in mind, would be a bodega of some sort, a grab and go type situation, and I think that would benefit the community, or at least coming from the conversations that we've had.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said well, the community is very much involved, and I know that there have been conversations, but I think that is a perspective that the community can have a point a view and collaborate with you on what they would like to see in their area. I have a couple more questions on this one. One of the residents that I spoke with earlier talked about this being a Community Activity Center and how does this particular corner, these particular parcels, fit into the concept of Community Activity Center. Can you share some insight on that?

Ms. Cramer said sure. So, if we're talking about the Community Activity Center Place Type, and Ms. Gooch, you did a good job representing what the intention is for a Community Activity Center Place Type. So, we're talking about mid-sized, mixed-use developments, and the Community Activity Center is recommended along really the majority of the Central Avenue corridor. So, this is one piece of a larger Community Activity Center strand that is contiguous here. What the proposal is including with their permitted uses, as well as the design of the site, is consistent with that Community Activity Center Place Type. There is a mix of uses proposed. I recognize that maybe it's not as much commercial use as the community may prefer, but I'll also note that Community Activity Center-1, the zoning district, would allow for an entirely multi-family residential building. It doesn't have to have that inclusion of the nonresidential space there, but they have added that in recognizing what the Place Type really calls for. So, when we talk about Place Types, we want to recognize what's also in the surrounding area, and how this site will fit into that puzzle piece, really. So, yes, it's mostly multi-family residential, but there are really a wealth of goods and services along Central Avenue, and a lot of the pedestrian improvements proposed in this petition are going to help create access to those existing goods and services, and it will add folks that live near those goods and services, as well as a small amount of commercial space on the site itself.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay. I also have another question, if someone from C-DOT can approach the podium. Again, listening to the residents not wanting to have the parking outage directly on Sunnyside, and I know the petitioner listened to that, and so there is entry and exit on Piedmont, but what is the issue with also having entry/exit on Central as well, given that all of the traffic will be flowing into the neighborhood if it's only on Piedmont? Can you speak to why there can't be an additional entry/exit on Central Avenue?

**Jacob Carpenter, C-DOT** said yes, thank you. Jake Carpenter with C-DOT. So, the greater principles have to do with access management, and so along a major arterial, such as Central Avenue, that carries significant traffic volumes as well as significant multimodal volumes with pedestrians and bicycles, the goals of an access management policy is to consolidate access across those points, so minimize crossings across sidewalks, across bike lanes, consolidate turning movements at smaller numbers of locations. So, what that does is enhance safety by reducing those conflict points, and having driver expectations, multimodal expectations, concentrated in smaller areas. Policies like that have been shown to increase safety, support our goals that are in Vision Zero, and factors like that. So, we have our access management policy documented within our Streets Manual, which basically has an order of operations of where developments should get access based on the type of development and where it's located. So, along an arterial, such as this, access should be from the side street to promote all of those access management policies and benefits that I outlined.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. I know that we've had some progress on this petition, but I feel like significant work needs to continue. Along Central Ave, you also have the Gibson Apartment building, which is 250 apartments right there on the corner, and adding an additional 300 plus apartments will definitely add stress to what is already a highly congested, highly traveled corridor along Central, and I think we need to continue to be at the table with the community to work towards what a better ideal solution would be for them in this particular area. So, I look forward to having those continued conversations.

**Councilmember Driggs** said so, this is a 2.8-acre site that currently has single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial institutional office, and mixed-use developments. That seems like an awful lot on 3 acres, and when I look at the traffic analysis, the indication is that this petition would cause the total traffic count to go down by 70. That's just not intuitive to me. So, what exactly is there now that generates 2,000 trips?

Mr. Carpenter said Skyla Credit Union Headquarters was on the site. There's also a small lawyer's office, but it was their main branch of the Credit Union that generated that traffic.

Mr. Driggs said so, that's not current?

Mr. Carpenter said they have moved their operations, so they're not currently in the building any longer.

Ms. Cramer said and the C-DOT memo reflects the entitlements under the current zoning because it has that Neighborhood Center zoning as well on the site. It's hard to determine the exact number of trips that the current entitlements allow.

Mr. McMichael said and Councilmember Driggs, if I can, I will say, in an effort to engage the community further, we've gone above and beyond in this particular instance as well, whether it's intuitive to you, but gone ahead and completed a traffic management plan, looked at this seriously. We've obviously looked at the signal in and of itself at that Study Crash Data, developed a scope for a signal warrant for that to be pursued after this plan. So, those are things that might not necessarily be required, but we are doing already in advance of where we are today.

Mr. Driggs said understood. I'll just need to look at this in greater detail, but it just looks like a lot at that location. Anyway, thank you, Mayor Pro Tem.

**Councilmember Molina** said I want to elaborate on that point that the Mayor Pro Tem made and my colleague, Mr. Driggs. First of all, this is an area that I'm very familiar with. My kid has been a Piedmont Pirate for a few years now, and I've traveled these roads twice a day every day for a little bit, and I absolutely agree with the Mayor Pro Tem in that there is still work to do. I feel like, considering the area, density is already a reality for the neighbors. I think that there's always an equilibrium that when we're listening carefully and there's a good willingness that we can reach in these types of negotiations. So, my hope is that with intent, there is an opportunity to do so. I do understand the Merchants Association, they are great partners. I think each one of us sitting here have those challenges, in that we have the voices that are regularly at the table, and then we have the voices that we don't always hear, and maybe the community members that have driven in their vehicles today, they may be the voices that we don't always hear, but we have to invite those voices as well.

I want to also commend the community members that put this together. When I see a community member take the time, with comprehension, deliver something from your perspective, where it is demonstrative that you've actually taken a look at the scope of what we do and how we make our decisions, it's heartening to me because this process is not easy for an individual to understand, unless they take that additional time. So, kudos to you for taking the time to do this. I think that just looking at how you designed it, and even was able to walk us through that, I really appreciate your work there. So,

just doubling back, going backwards, I'm glad we're in this stage. I trust the Mayor Pro Tem, she is extremely knowledgeable, and I do feel like that she can guide, both the community that trusts her and you guys, to an equilibrium, something that works for both you and the community if that's a possibility. That's all I have, Mayor Pro Tem.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said thank you. I have a question for staff, just trying to understand. Back in June of 2024, all of Council received an email from the Plaza Midwood Business Association, calling for lane reductions. It was soon after, there was another road rage incident that happened in the area. The request was to reduce Central Avenue to two lanes of automatic traffic, as well as extending the existing protected bike lanes that terminated on East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and East 12<sup>th</sup> Street, to extend along East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and Central Avenue. Were any of these conversations, since this was sent to all of Council and I believe shared with Planning staff, taken into consideration when we're looking at projects around this area?

Ms. Cramer said I don't know if C-DOT has more information about conversations, but I have not received that information. As was previously mentioned, though, a lot of the commitments made through this plan are considerate of pedestrian safety and we believe could actually increase pedestrian safety with potential new signalization, traffic calming measures, the buffered bike lanes, and the new pedestrian shared use path.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, so I also want to get an understanding because we're still having a lot of conversations regarding the language in our 2040 Policy Map and the UDO. I have shared at different times the concerns that I have that our language is completely transitioning neighborhoods. This gives me concern because it appears to be in contradiction to our staying in place, aging in place, neighborhood continuity, neighborhood transition when we look at the development that's happening. Also, as a Council, from years ago and current, we've had a number of conversations regarding what has developed along public transportation, i.e., Light Rail, and what has not, regarding who has access to this transportation, when we have language and commitments around workforce development, economic development, 10-minute neighborhoods and all these other things. So, I'm trying to understand really the totality of staff's support and recommendation to approve this petition upon resolution of just basically technical revisions, when there are so many other opportunities that were not addressed in this. So, help me get to where you are?

Ms. Cramer said yes, so, I think you summarized. Staff recommendations are complex and it's hard in this rezoning process to access which variables, but there is clear guidelines in terms of our policy considerations when we make a staff recommendation. So, the primary policy we're working off of is that 2040 Comp Plan and the Place Types that are in effect, and the Place Type designation here of Community Activity Center is supported by the proposal itself, and we believe that the public benefits offered as part of this proposal warrant justification for the rezoning request itself. If it were something like, let's say entirely active single-family uses on this site, I think that'd be a little bit different, but considering the existing entitlements and the planned transit around this site, we want to make sure that we're activating spaces along these major transit corridors to be appropriately dense, but also be mindful of the adjacent neighborhood-1 areas, and I think it's a tricky balance in areas like these, but this petition gets close at balancing that.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

**Councilmember Bokhari** said just a quick note for staff. It might be a good idea for us to revisit our planning around things like the Silver Line and things that we know aren't necessarily going to occur. We've kind of been ignoring that and wishing and willing it into existence for decades now, and we have a better line of sight as to what's going to happen, yet we leave our planning and policy documents in a kind of unreal world that's just still following that. So, that's a complex statement, but we can't keep ignoring it.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I will say I appreciate the Plaza Midwood Merchants giving you sort of a letter of approval on this, but I also would like to say, I've been in

conservations with the ECA (Elizabeth Community Association) and they're not in that position for that approval, and this particular petition sits in the Elizabeth neighborhood. So, we really want to be cognizant of the neighbors and what they would like to see as they envision the future of the community. So, lots of work to continue to be done on this one. I will also say, Ms. Mayfield, that there is a longer conversation around Central Avenue and the design of traffic flow, parking, etc., so much longer conversations with multiple neighborhoods along that corridor. So, there is a lot of conversation going on, and some strong desires to have a redesign there.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**ITEM NO. 24: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-061 BY CHARLOTTE PEC, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.90 ACRES BOUND BY THE NORTH SIDE OF EAST TRADE STREET, WEST SIDE OF NORTH DAVIDSON STREET, SOUTH SIDE OF EAST 5TH STREET, AND EAST SIDE OF NORTH CALDWELL STREET FROM UC (URBAN CENTER) TO UC(EX) (URBAN CENTER, EXCEPTION).**

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

**Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development** said This site is just under two acres along North Caldwell, East 5<sup>th</sup>, and North Davidson Street. This is just a short walk from where we are tonight, so if want to do a site visit, it would certainly be easy to do so. The property is current zoned Uptown Core, and they are proposing Uptown Core exception, so this is another EX request like the last petition, and this is in the Regional Activity Center Place Type and this proposal is consistent with that Regional Activity Center Place Type. The proposal itself would allow for the development of practice facilities and associated uses as permitted in the Uptown Core District. The petitioner requests EX provisions, and specifies that the required public benefits will include green building standards and a public art feature, which they will collaborate with Urban Design Center on that public art feature. Requests EX provisions to the site and building design standards, such as reducing the setback line to accommodate cantilevered space, reducing the minimum ground floor height for the parking structure portion of the building, and reducing minimum ground floor transparency. Again, that's because of the nature of these practice facilities and just kind of the unique use that we see here.

They are requesting an EX provision to utilize the parking structure design option C in the UDO where there's a reduction from the active ground floor uses from 90 percent to 10 percent. They are requesting an EX provision to the tree planting standards and they are still working on resolving some outstanding comments with Urban Forestry, but we expect that in a revised plan this week. Assuming we're still on track for Zoning Committee in a couple of weeks, we expect those Urban Forestry comments to be resolved under collaboration with Urban Forestry. They are also requesting an EX provision to allow the exiting curb to remain along North Caldwell and a portion of North Davidson, and an EX provision to allow signage on the site to display on-premise advertising or advertising associated with the adjacent arena parcel hosting the Hornets. They also may seek administrative approval of a master signage package. The site's primary access is along East 5<sup>th</sup>, as indicated with those arrows, and there is a limited access drive that would be available through Caldwell or North Davidson. That limited access driveway labeled right there on the site plan would be for things such as service vehicles.

The building facade along the southern site boundary will be treated with murals and/or other elements to create a visually interesting building facade until it is covered with adjacent development on the rest of the parking area. Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of the outstanding issues. Sporting facility uses create



unique zoning scenarios that challenge typical ordinance requirements, prompting the need for innovative solutions, such as an EX conditional request, and these EX conditional requests allow us to receive public benefits in exchange for those flexibilities and ordinance standards. Sporting facilities and the accessory uses that would be allowed in this petition have a typical site and building design, so we believe that the EX request is here is justified. The site is currently underutilized as service parking in the densest core of our City, so transitioning it to active uses is a much-preferred utilization of this site that is in alignment with the Regional Activity Center Place Type. It would be easily accessed by various transportation options. I mean, it is a tenth of a mile from the Charlotte Transit Center, so you could have access to the Blue and Gold Lines, as well as various bus routes, and redevelopment at this site would help to actively support our transit infrastructure. I'll take any questions following the petitioner's presentation.

**Keith MacVein, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, member of Council, members of Zoning Committee. Keith MacVean with Moore & Van Allen, assisting Charlotte Hornets with their rezoning for the Performance Enhancement Center. With me tonight, representing the petitioner are Travis Ferguson, James Jordan and Shannon Gilligan, as well as Nate Doolittle, and Bob [INAUDIBLE] also assisting the Hornets on their rezoning for the site. As Holly mentioned, really a rezoning regarding technical issues of the Urban Center Zoning District that don't transition or don't relate well to a facility like this where the Hornets are trying to build a performing or [inaudible] facility or practice courts for their athletes and their organization. So, a number of provisions to slightly modify some quantifiable standards of the Urban Core District, as Holly mentioned, consistent with the area plan. We are working with C-DOT, and we have come to an agreement on how to address their concerns regarding the curblin relocation along Davidson Street. There will be a commitment. There is a current commitment that there will be public parking on the site with some hours of use restriction, as some of the spaces are here for the tenants of the building and the use of the building, but after hours, there will be parking available to the public. There's also a commitment actually for parking for the visitors and tenants of this building to park at this facility as part of the agreement with the Hornets Organization.

In terms of Urban Forestry, we've come up with a solution and we can remove that EX provision from the petition, as a solution as to how to meet the tree ordinance on this site has been arrived at, and then there is an EX provision regarding signage to allow one additional wall sign along North Caldwell that could be an electronic or static sign, and again, trying to pick up on some of the some signage theme from the current arena and bring it across the street. There will be active spaces along Caldwell Street, ground floor active spaces, as well as the main entries to the facility itself. This is an image of that corner, this is Caldwell, and this is 5<sup>th</sup> Street going out of town, and that's where we are. Again, we plan to address all the comments, and we're happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, Mr. MacVean. Of course, you know I've had conversations with the developers and I'm very grateful that you're being thoughtful about the site and how it can integrate overall with the Spectrum Center and so that it's a welcome addition to the community. So, I appreciate the thought behind that and the intentionality behind that.

**Councilmember Driggs** said I just wanted to say briefly, appreciate the team, your investment in Charlotte. This is a big project, and I think a plus for the City. So, I expect we'll be able to navigate the rezoning, but thank you very much.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said absolutely.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 25: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-015 BY BV BELK PROPERTIES FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.38 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF MILHAVEN LANE, SOUTH OF SUNSET ROAD, AND WEST OF STATESVILLE ROAD FROM I-1(CD) (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL, CONDITIONAL) TO CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL).**

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

**Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem and Council. Petition 2024-015 is located on the east side of Milhaven Lane, south of Sunset Road, and west of Statesville Road. The site's approximately 0.38 acres and is currently undeveloped. The site is a portion of a property zoned I-1(CD), Light Industrial, Conditional, which was approved under Petition 2020-025. The proposed zoning is CG, General Commercial, a conventional district. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. CG District is inconsistent with the M&L Place Type. Approval of this petition would revise the 2040 Policy Map recommendation to the Commercial Place Type. This is a conventional rezoning petition, there is not an associated site plan, and would permit any uses in the CG District. Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the site is bound by properties designated as Commercial Place Type on three sides. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for service and retail development to support workers in areas designated as Manufacturing and Logistics. The uses allowed in the CG Zoning District would be more supportive of this goal, and the 2040 Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as an access to amenities gap, and the proposed CG District was better suited to fill that gap than the current I-1(CD) Zoning District. I'm happy to take any questions following Mrs. Grant's presentation.

**Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. My name is Bridget Grant. I'm a Land Use Consultant with Moore & Van Allen. Pleased to be here tonight with Randy Smith on behalf of BVB Properties. This is a pretty simple rezoning. It's actually even smaller than the 0.3 acres. We revised it at 0.243 acres. We're just attempting to add a little bit more onto the back of an existing CG site to have a better fit for our future redevelopment of the site. We're happy to answer any questions.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 26: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-052 BY PROVIDENCE GROUP CAPITAL FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.58 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF WEST WOODLAWN ROAD AND WEST SIDE OF WALLINGFORD STREET, EAST OF INTERSTATE 77 FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) TO CAC-1 (COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER-1).**

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

**Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development** said Petition 2024-052 is approximately 1.58 acres located on the west side of Wallingford Street, north of Woodlawn Road and south of Yeoman Road. It's currently developed with a parking lot and a small warehouse, under the current zoning of CG. Proposed zoning is CAC-1, conventional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends Commercial Place Type. So, while it is inconsistent with the Commercial Place Type recommendation, staff recommends approval. It is adjacent to Community Activity Center Place Type to the north and east. It's approximately a half-mile walking distance from the Woodlawn Blue Line Station. The CAC-1 Zoning District is intended to accommodate areas that are transitioning from an automobile-centric orientation toward a more walkable, moderate anticity mix of

uses. The petition could facilitate the Comprehensive Plan goal of 10-Minute Neighborhoods, and I will take any questions following the petitioner's presentation.

**Keith MacVean, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of Zoning Committee. Keith MacVean with Moore & Van Allen. Again, thank you for your time this evening. With me tonight representing the petitioner is JQ Freeman with Providence Group Capital. As Joe mentioned, a fairly simple request to rezone just under two acres to CAC-1 to allow a different variety or a different mix of uses on this site. This is an area that's transitioning quickly, just south of the LoSo area, which is just north of us, and actually we have connectivity to that area through Wallingford. Then just to the east is the Blue Line Station, just over a half mile away, and Community Activity Center is actually recommended around it. So, this zoning provides the petitioner and the owners of the property ability to add some additional uses to this area to help with the transition of this portion of the City. We're happy to answer questions.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 27: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-053 BY JCB URBAN COMPANY FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.698 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF SOFLEY ROAD, WEST OF WEST SUGAR CREEK ROAD, AND EAST OF HILLCREST STREET FROM INST(CD) (INSTITUTIONAL, CONDITIONAL) AND N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N1-C (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-C).**

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

**Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development** said this site is a little over an acre and a half along the north side of Sofley Road, west of West Sugar Creek and east of Hillcrest Street. This area is largely single-family residential, but there's some multi-family residential to the south and east, and commercial uses along Sugar Creek Road. The existing zoning is Institutional CD for one parcel and Neighborhood-1B for that western parcel. This is two noncontiguous parcels in this rezoning. The proposal is for Neighborhood-1C, which is only one step above that classification of Neighborhood-1B that is around the surrounding parcels. This is a conventional petition. The proposed zoning district here for N1-C is consistent with the Neighborhood-1 designation on this site, and because it's a conventional petition we have no associated site plan, but staff recommends approval of this petition. It is just a real modest increase in that Neighborhood-1B designation that's in the surrounding neighborhood. The Institutional conditional plan that is on the eastern parcel was for a daycare expansion that never happened. So, bringing it under N1-C would allow it to be utilized for something and redeveloped accordingly. I'll take any questions following the petitioner's comments.

**David Murray, P.O. Box 11685** said thank you, Mayor Pro Tem, Council, Zoning Committee. David Murray. I'm an attorney here in Charlotte, and I have the pleasure of representing my friends at JCB Urban on this rezoning. The purpose is to allow the potential for these two lots to be subdivided and this is a home builder, so they're going to add houses to these properties. Happy to answer any questions.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said clarification. The purpose of this is to do what because I didn't quite hear the end.

Mr. Murray said these lots are really deep, but they're 100 feet at their frontage, and so we could have four 50-foot-wide lots under N1-C, and so we're not certain that both of the lots are going to be subdivided, but this is going to give some flexibility to the development of those sites since they're so deep.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 28: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-056 BY VIVO INVESTMENTS LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 5.2 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF YORKMONT ROAD, SOUTH OF BILLY GRAHAM PARKWAY, AND WEST OF SOUTH TRYON STREET FROM O-15(CD) (OFFICE DISTRICT, CONDITIONAL) TO N2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).**

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

**Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development** said this site is approximately 5.2 acres located on the north side of Yorkmont Road, west of South Tryon Street and south of Billy Graham Parkway. It is currently developed with a hotel. Current zoning is O-15(CD). Proposed zoning is N2-B(CD). The 2040 Policy Map recommends Commercial Place Type. There's not a site plan associated with this petition, but conditional notes that include commitments to utilize the existing buildings and associated parking, to convert the 138 existing hotel rooms to 138 multi-family residential units. Requires that all units must function entirely as a hotel or as multi-family units. There's no overlap of hotel and multi-family use allowed. Commits to reserving a minimum of 10 percent of the multi-family units for households earning less than or equal to 80 percent Area Median Income for a 20-year period. States intention to maintain the existing Yorkmont Road streetscape and requires at least 30-days' notice of intent to hotel occupants of initiation of conversion to multi-family units. States the petitioner's intent to work with City Housing and Neighborhood Services regarding the transition of residents. It is inconsistent with the Place Type recommendation; however, staff does recommend approval upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation and land use. The petition would provide an additional housing option in an area identified by the Comprehensive Plan as having insufficient housing. Proposed Neighborhood-2 Zoning and Place Type will provide an appropriate transition from the Commercial Place Type to the east along South Tryon Street and the Neighborhood-1 Place Type to the south and west along Yorkmont Road. I will take any questions following the petitioner's presentation.

**Brittany Lins, 1420 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100** said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, members of Zoning Committee. I see some new and some familiar faces, so welcome to the new guard. I look forward to working with you. My name's Brittany Lins. I am a lawyer with the law firm of Alexander Ricks, and I'm here tonight representing Vivo Investments/Vivo Living. Joe did a good job orienting to this site. I'm going to be very brief with your time. I know we're second to last on the agenda. The one interesting thing that I'd point out, when I was looking at Google maps, I don't think I realized how saturated hotel uses were in this area. Just at this intersection, you see six hotel uses. This was also, as Joe mentioned, a hotel use, an Extended Stay America. It's outdated. It's kind of been a security issue. What Vivo is looking to do is a one-to-one conversion from a hotel to residential units. There are existing kitchens and bathrooms that would be upfitted, modernized. As you heard, there is the affordable housing commitment. There is the anti-displacement provision, working with Housing and Neighborhood Services. So, we are excited about this project. As staff said, they're supportive because of the need for housing in this area. Vivo's a reputable company that's done this multiple times, both in Charlotte and across the U.S., enhancing the security, the safety, and the housing stock in the area. So, at that, I'm happy to take any question you may have.

**Councilmember Brown** said thank you so much Brittany for presenting today. I've been in contact with Yorkmont neighborhood. They're very particular about that area, and I appreciate the affordable housing unit piece. What bothers me is the zero commitment from the community.

Ms. Lins said yes. So, Vivo has actually been engaged with the community. They're willing to do open houses, all of those items. There hasn't been much community engagement, but they've been reaching out and are happy to continue to do so.

Ms. Brown said yes, with me, include me. Definitely, we've got to get that done. So, it sounds good. I look and I go to the commitment for the affordable housing piece, and I know exactly where you're talking about, some of that behavior over there and the traffic, the pedestrian traffic, and some things have happened there with safety concerns. So, I do agree with you on that, but that was a minimum of 10 percent. Could it be increased?

Ms. Lins said so, since it is kind of a sustainable practice of using the existing buildings, there are three buildings there, they're using the existing buildings as a one-to-one conversion, that's naturally going to create that attainable housing market. There is that commitment to a minimum of 10 percent being at 80 AMI (Area Median Income) right now. Happy to discuss that with you further, but overall, these are going to be attainable housing units compared to a lot of this new build where you see the demolition and new construction buildings around Charlotte.

Ms. Brown said okay, alright. So, one last thing. I know Councilmember Mayfield might have some questions for you. I like to see what you're doing in the area, but just recently, even though we're supposed to be on recess, we were not, the community reached out to me and I'm just curious, some of the community leaders had just a few questions, and if we could get them involved and engage the community, I'll be happy to advocate and be in the vicinity, but thank you so much. I have no more questions at this time.

Ms. Lins said of course. Thank you, Councilmember Brown.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said you are so correct, Councilmember Brown, that Yorkmont, Ms. Kanupp, and others are extremely active and have been for a very long time, so it is interesting. So, if I'm reading this correctly, if this petition were to move forward, this commitment is from the petitioner without asking for any Trust Fund or City dollars in this particular development?

Ms. Lins said that's correct. It's a product of being able to reuse the building and have the existing parking and infrastructure that gives them the ability to produce that attainable housing price point.

Ms. Mayfield said I look forward to following up with Councilmember Brown and hearing from the community. Thank you.

Ms. Brown said when I went into the transportation considerations, I went over to the outstanding issues prior to public hearing and transportation. It did say that the trips are going to go down, is that correct?

Ms. Lins said that is right. So, it's currently entitled for a hotel. It's being used as a hotel. You can see the transportation slide that I have up now. The total daily trips is decreased when you're talking a multi-family unit compared to a hotel unit.

Ms. Brown said alright. So, I do want to make note of that, and we'll be in contact, but thank you so much for presenting. I don't have any other questions.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 29: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2024-058 BY WILKES ASSET MANAGEMENT FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.85 ACRES**

**LOCATED SOUTH OF RIDGE ROAD, EAST OF BENFIELD ROAD, AND NORTH OF CRAVEN THOMAS ROAD FROM CC (COMMERCIAL CENTER) TO CAC-1(EX) (COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER-1, EXCEPTION).**

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

**Teresa Montalvo, Rezoning Program Manager** said the subject site, as you mentioned, is a 2.8-acre parcel located south of Ridge Road and east of Benfield Road. Brice Knoll Lane and Highland Shoppes Drive currently terminate at the site. The area surrounding the site includes a rich mix of commercial and multi-family development to the north and west, and single-family neighborhoods are found westerly of Benfield Road. The petitioner is seeking to rezone the site to a Community Activity Center-1, exception. The site and much of the surrounding area is currently zoned Commercial Center with some Neighborhood Service zoning to the north and west. The 2040 Policy Map identifies the subject site, as well as the surrounding properties, as a Community Activity Center. The proposed development is a 120,000 square foot climate-controlled storage facility with a maximum building height of 50 feet. The development will include extending Brice Knoll Lane and Highland Shoppes Drive through the site.

The petitioner is seeking flexibility from two UDO standards. One, to allow two new street extensions to be constructed in accordance with the office/commercial narrow cross-section standards in lieu of the office/commercial wide cross-section, and to limit ground floor activation requirements to the Highland Shoppes Drive frontage in lieu of both frontages. Public benefits they're offering in relation to these exceptions, include the provisions of public open space and the construction of off-site sidewalk improvements to fill a gap in the pedestrian network along Highland Shoppes Drive. Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the requested zone is consistent with the Community Activity Center Place Type. The Place Type calls for a mix of retail, personal services, multi-family and office uses. The proposed self-storage facility is supported with existing and future mix of residential uses in the area.

**Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700** said good evening again, 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 Josh Wilkes. Unfortunately, he couldn't be here. Teresa did a great job providing the overview, so I'm just going to highlight that this rezoning, while seeking exceptions, is still providing the required road network and extensions along Highland Shoppes Parkway, as well as Brice Knoll. The reason we're seeking that reduction in the streetscape standard is because it's the terminus of two streets and we're directly across the street from a cemetery and church, which also changes our needs for ground floor activation. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

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

**Councilmember Mayfield** said I just want to take a moment to thank our City and/or County staff during the time that we have been off, you may have noticed. So, for our residents and community members that may have had a challenge, if you are not able to get to the highest speaking stand, there are now spaces for you to be down here on this level with us that is not carpeted, as well as a much lower podium for you to easily have access to, to try to make your building, the people's building, more ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant. So, that was done over the six weeks that we were out. So, just wanted to give a shoutout and thank the staff, who went in, got this done and did it so seamless that you probably didn't even notice that there was something a little different, except when the first gentleman came up. So, we now have podiums as well as parking spaces, not carpeted, for our members that may be in a wheelchair, motorized or by hand. So, thank you for allowing me to acknowledge them.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, Ms. Mayfield. Staff's always being thoughtful and thinking about how we can connect better with the community.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

  
Billie Tyne, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 0 Minutes  
Minutes completed: January 7, 2025