

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Zoning Meeting on Monday, August 18, 2025, at 5:03 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Pro Tem Danté Anderson presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Lawana Mayfield, James Mitchell, and Edwin Peacock III.

ABSENT: Mayor Vi Lyles

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Tiawana Brown, Renee Johnson, Marjorie Molina, and Victoria Watlington

* * * * *

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said welcome to our August 18, 2025, Zoning Meeting. We will begin with introductions.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Mitchell gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag led by Boy Scout Troop 8 from St. Matthews Catholic Church was recited by everyone in attendance.

* * * * *

EXPLANATION OF THE ZONING MEETING PROCESS

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

Councilmember Ajmera arrived at 5:07 p.m.

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION OF THE ZONING COMMITTEE

Melissa Gaston, Vice Chairman of the Zoning Committee said good evening. Thank you, Mayor Pro Tem and the City Council. My name is Melissa Gaston, and I'm the Vice Chair for the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission. Allow me to introduce my fellow members. I have here Caroline Millen, Robin Stuart, Erin Shaw, Theresa McDonald, Michael Caprioli. I'm sorry, Erin's not here yet, but she will be here, and Douglas Welton is gallivanting around the world. He is the Chair of the Planning Commission, so he's not here this evening. The Zoning Committee will meet on Wednesday, September 6, 2025, at 5:30 p.m. At that meeting, the Zoning Committee will meet to discuss and make recommendations of the petitions that have public hearings tonight. The public is welcome at the meeting, but please note, it is not a continuation of the public hearing that is being held tonight. Prior to that meeting, you are welcome to contact us to provide input. You can find contact information and information on each petition at the City's website at charlotteplanning.org. Thank you Mayor Pro Tem.

* * * * *

DEFERRALS/WITHDRAWALS

There were no deferrals.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

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

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 3 THROUGH 4 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS PULLED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE PULLED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

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

The following items were approved:

Item No. 3: Ordinance No. 1001-Z, Petition No. 2025-037 by Eastgroup Properties, L.P. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 1.23 acres located north of Shopton Road, east of Pinecrest Drive, and west of Beam Road from I-1(CD) ANDO (Light Industrial, Conditional, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay) and N1-A ANDO (Neighborhood 1-A, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay) to N1-A ANDO (Neighborhood 1-A, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay) and ML-1(CD) ANDO (Manufacturing and Logistics-1, Conditional, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Shaw) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type and 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 petition and an associated land swap would facilitate a more efficient vehicular and truck private driveway connection for a previously approved rezoning and light industrial development. The petition would allow for internal connectivity between two sides of a light industrial operation, reducing vehicular and truck traffic impacts to Shopton Road. The site is located approximately two miles south of Charlotte Douglas International Airport and is within the Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map. The western portion of the site will change from the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type to the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The eastern portion of the site will change from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 746-747.

Item No. 4: Ordinance No. 1002-Z, Petition No. 2025-038 by Longvalley II, LLC amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 7.76 acres located north of Forest Point Circle, east of Forest Point Boulevard, and south of West Arrowood Road from B-D(CD) (Distributive Business, Conditional) to OFC (Office Flex Campus).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Shaw) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type. 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: While the petition is inconsistent with the recommended

2040 Policy Map Place Type of Manufacturing & Logistics, the site and surrounding properties are developed as office uses. The proposed OFC (Office Flex Campus) zoning district is compatible with the existing uses and several of the adjacent properties are currently zoned OFC. The site is located area that lacks Access to Employment Opportunity according to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed OFC zoning district allows for office, research and development, education, medical, and assembly uses that may help fill this Employment Opportunity gap. The OFC zoning district permits a variety of uses that are in line with keeping the character of the area, which is primarily developed with office and hotel uses, and is generally auto-oriented. But the OFC district also provides standards that accommodate other travel modes. The site is located a quarter mile south of West Arrowood Road, designated by the Charlotte Streets Map as a 4+ Lane Boulevard and is considered an arterial street and is intended to serve high volumes of traffic at relatively high speeds. The site is also within a half mile of the Interstate I-77 interchange with West Arrowood Road. The site is located along the route of the CATS number 56 and 57 local buses providing transit access between the Lynx Blue Line Arrowood Station and the Charlotte Premium Outlets mall as well as to the SouthPark Community Transportation Center. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic Opportunity. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Manufacturing & Logistics Place Type to the Campus Place Type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 748-749.

* * * * *

DECISIONS

ITEM NO. 5: ORDINANCE NO. 1003-Z, PETITION NO. 2024-112 BY DREAMKEY PARTNERS AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.4 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF BEATTIES FORD ROAD, SOUTH OF SLATER ROAD, AND NORTH OF CINDY LANE FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N2-A (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Winiker) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The proposed multi-family attached dwellings would provide an additional housing option in an area identified by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as being in a housing gap. The petition commits to providing a workforce housing program for 30% of all units, for a period of 30 years, at 80% area median income (AMI). The site is within a quarter mile of a commercial node at Beatties Ford Road & Cindy Lane that includes retail, service, and institutional uses. The petition commits to completing the fourth leg of the signalized intersection at Beatties Ford Road and Capps Hill Mine Road. The traffic signal enables pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross Beatties Ford Road to access a recreation center, religious institutions, retail, and services on the west side of Beatties Ford Road. Bus stops for CATS Route 7 are located in close proximity to the site. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion, 3: Housing Access for All, 5: Safe & Equitable Mobility. 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.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map recommends the 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 multi-family attached dwellings would provide an additional housing option in an area identified by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as being in a housing gap. The petition commits to providing a workforce housing program for 30% of all units, for a period of 30 years, at 80% area median income (AMI). The site is within a quarter mile of a commercial node at Beatties Ford Road & Cindy Lane that includes retail, service, and institutional uses. The petition commits to completing the fourth leg of the signalized intersection at Beatties Ford Road and Capps Hill Mine Road. The traffic signal enables pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross Beatties Ford Road to access a recreation center, religious institutions, retail, and services on the west side of Beatties Ford Road. Bus stops for CATS Route 7 are located in close proximity to the site. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods, 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion, 3: Housing Access for All, 5: Safe & Equitable Mobility. 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.

Councilmember Mitchell said kudos to Councilman Graham for getting something accomplished that I could not do in 14 years being a District Two Representative. This has been a long time coming. Thank you so much for DreamKey, working with the stakeholders in there. We had a long-running feud, Councilmember, with one of the property owners, Paul, and so finally, I'm glad now we've got a partnership, and look forward to the new development. Thank you, Mayor Pro Tem.

Councilmember Graham said I've been to the site a number of times.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said excellent.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 750-751.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: ORDINANCE NO. , PETITION NO. 2025-005 BY EB PROPERTY GROUP, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.96 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF CLEVE BROWN ROAD, SOUTH OF HAMILTON RUSSELL LANE, AND NORTH OF HACKBERRY CREEK TRAIL FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N1-D CCO (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-D, COTTAGE COURT OVERLAY).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Neeley) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: This petition is appropriate and compatible as the site is within an area designated by the 2040 Policy Map for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The Cottage Court Overlay District allows for a reduction in minimum lot size and reduced setbacks to permit the development of small residential communities that are structured around common open space designed in a cohesive manner that are to be shared by all residents. The development pattern

prescribed by the Neighborhood 1 Place Type and permitted by the Cottage Court Overlay zoning district is consistent with the character of this area. The petition could help facilitate the goal of providing a variety of housing types within an area where single family dwellings are the predominate housing type. The petition could facilitate the following Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 752-753.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: This petition is appropriate and compatible as the site is within an area designated by the 2040 Policy Map for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The Cottage Court Overlay District allows for a reduction in minimum lot size and reduced setbacks to permit the development of small residential communities that are structured around common open space designed in a cohesive manner that are to be shared by all residents. The development pattern prescribed by the Neighborhood 1 Place Type and permitted by the Cottage Court Overlay zoning district is consistent with the character of this area. The petition could help facilitate the goal of providing a variety of housing types within an area where single family dwellings are the predominate housing type. The petition could facilitate the following Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: ORDINANCE NO. 1005-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-013 BY TRUE HOMES AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.43 ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE NORTH AND SOUTH SIDE OF MINTWORTH AVENUE, WEST OF MARGARET WALLACE ROAD, AND EAST OF WYALONG DRIVE FROM NS (NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES) AND N2-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B) TO N2-B (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Sealey) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be 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 Commercial 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 site lies in a transitional area between an established single-family neighborhood, and a commercial center at the intersection of Margaret Wallace Road and Idlewild Road. Although the place type designation is commercial here and may include some auto-oriented uses, Neighborhood 2 could serve as a positive transition between established Neighborhood 1 residential areas and commercial development. Where the rezoning boundaries abut single family homes, the site plan provides substantive buffering with proposed open space areas. Similar building forms to the rezoning proposal can be found directly south of the site where there is an existing townhome community. The site is serviced by CATS express bus route 52X, providing transit options for future residents. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Commercial 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. Resolved outstanding issues regarding amenitizing and accessing open space.
2. Committed to a 15-foot-wide Class C landscape yard along the western boundary of the site where the site abuts NS zoning.

David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development said both changes staff believes are minor and do not warrant additional review by the Zoning Committee. Happy to take any questions.

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

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mitchell, and Peacock

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, 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 Commercial 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 site lies in a transitional area between an established single-family neighborhood, and a commercial center at the intersection of Margaret Wallace Road and Idlewild Road. Although the place type designation is commercial here and may include some auto-oriented uses, Neighborhood 2 could serve as a positive transition between established Neighborhood 1 residential areas and commercial development. Where the rezoning boundaries abut single family homes, the site plan provides substantive buffering with proposed open space areas. Similar building forms to the rezoning proposal can be found directly south of the site where there is an existing townhome community. The site is serviced by CATS express bus route 52X, providing transit options for future residents. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Commercial Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site, as modified.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mitchell, and Peacock

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 754-755.

* * * * *

ITEM 8: ORDINANCE NO. 1006-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-015 BY WILKES ASSET MANAGEMENT AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.74 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MOUNT HOLLY ROAD, WEST OF RHYNE ROAD, AND EAST OF CRESTON CIRCLE FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD

**1-A) AND ML-1 (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-1) TO N2-A (CD)
(NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Shaw, seconded by Stuart) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be 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: While the site is designated as a Neighborhood 1 (N-1) Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map, the property is split zoned N1-A (Neighborhood 1-A) and ML-1 (Manufacturing & Logistics-1) is currently entitled for both residential and nonresidential development. The site is abutting to a commercial development to the southeast zoned ML-1. The site is within one-third mile of a designated Community Activity Center Place Type containing retail and restaurant uses. And within a three-quarter mile of a commercial development containing daily needs such a grocery, retail, restaurant, and personal services. The proposed development would fill a need for housing in an area that has been identified as lacking Access to Housing Opportunity by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The site is directly served by transit, the number 18 CATS local bus, provides service between Callabridge Commons/Riverbend shopping centers and the Rosa Parks Community Transportation Center. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for 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. Increased the number of visitor parking spaces from 10 to 12.
2. Prohibited vinyl as a siding material.
3. Modified the driveway on Mt. Holly Road per NCDOT requirements.

David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development said staff believes the changes are minor, and again, do not warrant additional review by the Zoning Committee. Happy to take any questions.

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

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs, 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: While the site is designated as a Neighborhood 1 (N-1) Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map, the property is split zoned N1-A (Neighborhood 1-A) and ML-1 (Manufacturing & Logistics-1) is currently entitled for both residential and nonresidential development. The site is abutting to a commercial development to the southeast zoned ML-1. The site is within one-third mile of a designated Community Activity Center Place Type containing retail and restaurant uses. And within a three-quarter mile of a commercial development containing daily needs such a grocery, retail, restaurant, and personal services. The proposed development would fill a need for housing in an area that has been identified as lacking Access to Housing Opportunity by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The site is directly served by transit, the number 18

CATS local bus, provides service between Callabridge Commons/Riverbend shopping centers and the Rosa Parks Community Transportation Center. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended Place Type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site, as modified.

Councilmember Graham said let me take this opportunity to thank the development team, as well as those that represent the Mountain Island Lake community, for really coming together and collaborating on, not only this petition that's in front of us, but also a wide variety of issues related to growth and development in the Mountain Island Lake community. They are very engaged, as they should be, and they made a lot of compromise, as they should, to get this to the finish line. There were two points that I wanted to mention. One in particular was, again, we wish we were able to get more homeownership versus rental properties through this petition, but we were not able to and that continues to be a problem for many of the residents in the Mountain Island Lake area in terms of preferring homeownership versus rental. They are saturated with apartments for sure.

Councilmember Molina arrived at 5:16 p.m.

Councilmember Johnson arrived at 5:16 p.m.

Secondly, what continues to be a thorn in everyone's side is the construction, the maintenance, and the upkeep of state-owned roads that really hampers our ability to apply some smart growth practices, based on the inability to have any major discussions with the State of North Carolina, in reference to road construction and improvement that's in the short term, not in the long term. There is a plan, it's about 20 years out, and that serves no one any good. I'm also concerned, Madam Mayor Pro Tem, that as we begin to talk about transit, certainly after September 10, 2025, there'll be a lot of talk about transportation and transit for sure. The state put some restrictions in reference to the City not supplanting our funds now for transportation, that the state will do the same as well, which is to continue to invest and accelerate their funding of state-owned roads, certainly in Mountain Island Lake. I think Steele Creek is another example where they are delaying the renovation or expansion of state-owned roads that's causing bottlenecks. Those are two fast-growing areas of the City. Certainly, we are applying smart growth practices, and approving some of these rezonings, such as this one. Certainly, long-term, I think we really need to have a discussion with our state partners about how can we accelerate state-owned roads that are in need of expanding in the short term and not the long term? We can't wait 20 years or 15 years for the state to come and help us out, nor should we supplant our local dollars to invest in the maintenance of state-owned roads in the short-term or the near-term future. I think this continues and will be a point of concern for me. I spoke with the Assistant City Manager before the meeting and made some suggestions, and we'll talk more about that offline. I think we really need to have a focused strategy about how we communicate and coordinate with the State of North Carolina in reference to their responsibilities in conjunction to what we're trying to do here locally with our own local dollars. So, I move for approval.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, Mr. Graham. I agree. We have quite a few state-owned roads throughout the entire City that need attention, so I absolutely agree.

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

YEAS: Councilmember Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mitchell, Molina, and Peacock

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 756-757.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: ORDINANCE NO. 1007-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-020 BY SAGE INVESTMENT GROUP AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.56 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF TUCKASEEGEE ROAD, EAST OF QUEEN CITY DRIVE, AND WEST OF I-85 FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) AND ML-1 (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-1) TO N2-C (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-C, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Gaston, seconded by Shaw) 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 Manufacturing and 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 proposes to convert an existing extended stay motel into up to 125 studio apartments, supporting UDO goals related to adaptive reuse, sustainability, and infill development. The proposed N2-C zoning district is intended to accommodate a range of moderate-intensity residential housing types, including multi-family stacked dwellings, which aligns with the petition’s proposed use. Although inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for Manufacturing and Logistics, the proposed residential use is compatible with nearby zoning and land use patterns, which include adjacent residential (N1-B), commercial (B-1(CD)), office (OFC), and institutional (INST(CD)) districts. The reuse of the existing building avoids additional impervious surface and preserves site infrastructure, consistent with the UDO’s goals for fiscally and environmentally responsible development. The site's proximity to major roads (Tuckaseegee Road and Queen City Drive), existing transit routes, and pedestrian infrastructure supports access to daily needs and employment opportunities, aligning with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan vision for 10-Minute Neighborhoods. The Neighborhood 2 Place Type encourages housing that can accommodate a variety of household types and incomes. The proposed mix of small, attainable units fills a market gap for individuals and small households often underserved by conventional multi-family products. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the 2040 Policy Map from the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs, to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the Manufacturing and Logistics 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 petition proposes to convert an existing extended stay motel into up to 125 studio apartments, supporting UDO goals related to adaptive reuse, sustainability, and infill development. The proposed N2-C zoning district is intended to accommodate a range of moderate-intensity residential housing types, including multi-family stacked dwellings, which aligns with the petition’s proposed use. Although inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for Manufacturing and Logistics, the proposed residential use is compatible with nearby zoning and land use patterns, which include adjacent residential (N1-B), commercial (B-1(CD)), office (OFC), and institutional (INST(CD)) districts. The reuse of the existing building avoids additional impervious surface and preserves site infrastructure, consistent with the UDO’s goals for fiscally and environmentally responsible development. The site's proximity to major roads (Tuckaseegee Road and Queen City Drive), existing transit routes, and pedestrian infrastructure supports access to daily needs and employment opportunities, aligning with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan vision for 10-Minute Neighborhoods. The Neighborhood 2 Place Type encourages housing that can accommodate a variety of household types and incomes. The proposed mix of small, attainable units fills a market gap for individuals and small

households often underserved by conventional multi-family products. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the 2040 Policy Map from the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

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

YEAS: Councilmember Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mitchell, Molina, and Peacock

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 758-759.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: ORDINANCE NO. 1008-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-028 BY CANVAS RESIDENTIAL PARTNERS, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 8.91 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF MT HOLLY-HUNTERSVILLE ROAD, EAST OF OAKDALE ROAD, AND WEST OF FIRESTREAK DRIVE FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Sealey, seconded by Winiker) 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. 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 petition seeks to address the housing need with an allowance for up to 65 residential units. The site is adjacent to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type area that are developed as multi-family housing along Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road to Oakdale Road. They share a similar development pattern and street connectivity. The proposed plan limits the number of units per building to four which is compatible with building forms allowed in the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. This provides an opportunity for a gentle increase in density. The proposed plan would continue the trend in moderate-intensity residential development along the Mt. Holly-Huntersville Corridor. Additionally, this site, combined with the adjacent Neighborhood-2 Place Types, meets the minimum area requirements for establishing a new Neighborhood-2 Place Type. The petition provides a transition from the Interstate to low density residential neighborhoods on the north side of Mt. Holly-Huntersville Rd. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the 2040 Policy Map (2022) based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The 2040 Policy Map (2022) recommends the 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 petition seeks to address the housing need with an allowance for up to 65 residential units. The site is adjacent to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type area that are developed as multi-family housing along Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road to Oakdale Road. They share a similar

development pattern and street connectivity. The proposed plan limits the number of units per building to four which is compatible with building forms allowed in the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. This provides an opportunity for a gentle increase in density. The proposed plan would continue the trend in moderate-intensity residential development along the Mt. Holly-Huntersville Corridor. Additionally, this site, combined with the adjacent Neighborhood-2 Place Types, meets the minimum area requirements for establishing a new Neighborhood-2 Place Type. The petition provides a transition from the Interstate to low density residential neighborhoods on the north side of Mt. Holly-Huntersville Rd. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type for the site.

Councilmember Johnson said I want to piggyback off what Councilmember Graham talked about in working with the state on the state-owned roads. District Four has an inordinate amount of state-owned roads. This is actually in a ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction), but I want to speak on this petition specifically. This petition is going to actually add to traffic improvements. It's going to extend an internal street network that runs parallel to Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road. So, it's going to provide an alternative connection. This is an improvement over what can be done by-right. The phase three, it's 65 units, I believe, and it's going to be consistent with the phase one and two phases of the Oak Lake development. So, I will be supporting this, because again, this is an improvement to the area. It's an improvement over what could be done by-right, and that traffic improvement just addresses the challenges that we've been talking about on this road.

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

YEAS: Councilmember Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mitchell, Molina, and Peacock

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 760-761.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: ORDINANCE NO. 1009-Z, PETITION NO. 2025-029 BY SUMMIT AVENUE WESLEY HEIGHTS, LLC AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.49 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF FREEDOM DRIVE, EAST OF THRIFT ROAD, AND WEST OF WESLEY VILLAGE ROAD FROM MUDD-O SPA (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT - OPTIONAL, CONDITIONAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Gaston, seconded by Winiker) 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 2 Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is within walking distance of multi-family housing, single family housing, the Stewart Creek Greenway, and nearby goods and services, supporting the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan for 10-Minute Neighborhoods. The existing MUDD-O zoning allows for intensive office and commercial uses; the proposed NC zoning district allows building forms that may be a more appropriate scale given the surrounding context and permits a mix of uses with prohibitions on auto-centric uses. The Neighborhood Center district promotes walkable, compact development and allows for a range of residential and commercial uses that can provide everyday services close to existing housing. The petition reflects a logical transition from light industrial and mixed-use zoning along

Freedom Drive to residential zoning to the north and east, supporting a more connected and complete neighborhood. This site sits at the end of the Thrift Road corridor which is rapidly shifting from industrial uses to adaptive commercial and mixed-use projects. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhood. The approval of this petition will revise the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 2 Place type to the Neighborhood Center Place Type for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, 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 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 2 Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is within walking distance of multi-family housing, single family housing, the Stewart Creek Greenway, and nearby goods and services, supporting the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan for 10-Minute Neighborhoods. The existing MUDD-O zoning allows for intensive office and commercial uses; the proposed NC zoning district allows building forms that may be a more appropriate scale given the surrounding context and permits a mix of uses with prohibitions on auto-centric uses. The Neighborhood Center district promotes walkable, compact development and allows for a range of residential and commercial uses that can provide everyday services close to existing housing. The petition reflects a logical transition from light industrial and mixed-use zoning along Freedom Drive to residential zoning to the north and east, supporting a more connected and complete neighborhood. This site sits at the end of the Thrift Road corridor which is rapidly shifting from industrial uses to adaptive commercial and mixed-use projects. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhood. The approval of this petition will revise the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 2 Place type to the Neighborhood Center Place Type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 68, at Page(s) 762-763.

Councilmember Driggs said could I just say to the leaders of our Scouts, you're very welcome to stay, but you're also free to leave if you choose to. We won't take offense. So, you decide how long you want to be here.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said yes. Thank you all for coming out, that was lovely to have you here this evening.

* * * * *

HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 12: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-027 BY MISSION CITY CHURCH AND FREEDOM COMMUNITIES FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.77 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF VALLEYDALE ROAD, NORTH OF SUMMERVILLE ROAD, AND SOUTH OF GOODMAN ROAD FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) AND CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development said alright, petition 2025-027 is located off Valleydale Road. The site's approximately 4.76 acres, and it's currently undeveloped. The site's currently split-zoned, N-1B, Neighborhood-1B, and CG, General Commercial. Proposed zoning is N-2A(CD), Neighborhood-2, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type for this site. The N-2A District is inconsistent with the N-1 Place Type, and approval of this rezoning would

revise the Policy Map to the Neighborhood-2 Place Type. The proposal calls for the development of up to 43 multi-family attached dwelling units or townhomes. The buildings are limited to no more than four units a piece, the number of buildings on site is limited to 12, and all units will be House Charlotte eligible, and deed restricted for a minimum of seven years to ensure affordability. The following streetscape and landscape improvements are proposed. Access to the site is proposed from a public street extension of Goodman Road. The petitioner will convey a 70-foot greenway easement to Mecklenburg County. A 20-foot rear yard setback and a 25-foot Class B landscape yard will be provided along all property boundaries abutting the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. Open space will be amenitized and will exceed the requirements of the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance). A minimum of 20 street trees will be provided along the private alleys. The following architectural requirements are proposed. All buildings are limited to three stories and 48 feet. Certain building materials, such as corrugated metal siding and plain concrete masonry units, are prohibited. Porches and stoops will be provided for each unit. Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation, environment, and site and building design, as the plan limits building forms to quadraplexes, which is compatible with the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. All units will be House Charlotte eligible to ensure a degree of affordability, and the plan dedicates a greenway easement, and the site is served by transit. I'm happy to take any questions following Mr. Moore's presentation.

Eddie Moore, 2100 South Tryon Street, Suite 400 said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem Anderson, Council members, Zoning Committee and staff. My name is Eddie Moore with McAdams. We are representing Pastor Kyle Dillard with Mission City Church, and also Mark Talbot with Freedom Communities on this rezoning. Before we get into the site, we'll have both of them give a little bit of background on their input as part of this rezoning.

Mark Talbot, 3501 Tuckaseegee Road said good evening, folks. My name is Mark Talbot, and I'm with Freedom Communities. I know many of you. I'm excited about this project for two reasons. One is after we had the momentum at Duke's Ridge, which some of you are familiar with, we've had teachers move in, firefighters move in, social workers move in, and this one's going to be just more of the same. Right in the crosshairs of the Faith in Housing initiative that you have started, and you have pushed, we're excited to present this project tonight. I met Kyle several years ago, as we've worked in the Freedom Drive Corridor, and they had this extra land, and so what could we do with this to help the community. Through our partnership with True Homes, we're able to bring this together and come to the marketplace at an 80 percent AMI (Area Median Income) or less, which is pretty exciting to be able to provide that workforce housing for our community. We look forward to it. Kyle's going to tell you, the housing classes, credit classes. Encouragement for the process will be done right there from the church that's on the site, and then we can create community right there within the neighborhood. So, we're excited about it, think it fits right in the target of what I think you guys have wanted and what we've seen the community really needs. So, thank you for your consideration. Kyle Dillard is the Pastor of the Mission City Church who owns the land, and he can tell you a little bit more about what they're planning to do.

Kyle Dillard, 608 Valleydale Road said yes, thank you guys for allowing me to be here and partner with you guys. It's an honor to be here. It's my first one of these, so that's kind of exciting to be here. Our church, Mission City, has had this property that we have been praying over for many years that God would use it in some way to serve the needs of the community around our church. Mission City, over the last 10 years, has been committed to serving our community in that way. We started a food pantry during the pandemic. When we started the food pantry, we had 145 families that we were serving every single week. We continue to do that today. It's entirely led by volunteers in the community, so it's neighbors serving their neighbors. We continue to serve people in need over and over and over. Many times most of the people that come in the community that we've been able to build around our food pantry has been less about the food and more about the encouragement, and being able to come and pray for them for all the needs and things that are going on in their life, the struggles in their life.

So, in the same way, we want to do this with this property and partnership with Freedom Communities and also True Homes to continue the part that we had in providing people with these needs that they have with affordable living. We get weekly calls and emails about the property, but we have not been willing to sell just to the highest bidder, because we don't believe that that would benefit the community. That's not what we're trying to do. We want to continue to serve and build up the community. So, we're excited to see working families in our community who struggle to afford a home to be able to finally afford a place of their own, and we want to take that even further, not just in having them be able to have affordable housing, but also have programs at our church that we connect with Freedom Communities in financial classes, and all these different things like that. We don't see this as just selling a property, we see it in the same way we do in our food pantry. The food is not the priority. Changing lives, encouraging people in their life and their faith, loving their neighbors the way Jesus modeled that in the way he served others, that's what we want.

So, the property in its current form right now has some homeless people living on it. Have come in and out of the neighborhood, throws a lot of trash away on the property. Our church has been broken into eight times in the past 10 years. I was on Channel 3 last year, because someone parked in our parking lot and held up the Family Dollar at gunpoint. So, we would like to see the property used for better things than that, that's what we're hopeful for. We'd like to see it slowly change, and we've seen the neighborhood in the past 10 years as we've been serving them slowly change for the better, that's what we want. Like I said, we don't intend to develop a piece of property. We want to develop a healthy community of people who can learn to serve one another, as we intend to continue to give them the opportunity to do that, to serve one another, whether they choose to or not. Thank you.

Mr. Moore said thank you, gentlemen. As was mentioned earlier, the True Homes Foundation, they will be the builder/developer. We were before you with the Cindy Creek Lane rezoning a few months ago. So, they will be involved in building their product and also developing the property. Here is the site, just a couple of land uses. The Mission City Church, they own a couple pieces of property along Valleydale, the Family Dollar, the Express Mart, a multi-tenant commercial building. There's a CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) bus stop at this intersection and then also another CATS bus stop at this location. The existing zoning is CG and N-1B. So, it has a mixture of zoning on the property. You can kind of see the breakdown of those two Zoning Districts, and we are requesting N-1A(CD) for 43 towns. The adopted 2040 Policy Map is on the right. It recommends Neighborhood-1. The revised 2040 Policy Map recommends commercial for the site. We feel that a Neighborhood-2 would be a good transition between the commercial properties along Valleydale, and then the remaining single-family to the east. This is a rendered plan of the layout. Access will be off of Goodman Road. You can kind of see the extension that runs north and south. From there, at the southern portion, there will be a stub street that will be there for potential redevelopment of properties along Summerville Road. So, should those properties redevelop, they'll be an additional access point out to the property. The site is a little constrained due to the odd configuration, and we also do have a stream buffer that is along the back, and that will be dedicated to Mecklenburg County. You can kind of see how we've clustered the townhomes internal to the development, keeping it away from any of the neighbors. I do want to point out, at the corner of Goodman and Goodman Road, the property that is located there is owned by Beth Lammonds. She will be speaking here after us. We will continue to work with her. Her existing home is very close to the Goodman Road extension. It is approximately 12 feet from the Goodman Road extension right-of-way and about 17 feet away from the actual pavement. We have been in discussions with C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) for curbing along the western side of the Goodman Road extension. There is no curbing that is existing today. So, we're working with them. We've had some very good discussions with C-DOT and the possibility of adding that for her along with some other concessions, such as screening and also a potential new driveway onto Goodman Road.

The one thing that's pretty interesting about the trip generation for this site is that under the existing current zoning with the CG and N-1B, you could have up to 970 daily trips per day for this site, and that is primarily driven by the CG zoning changing that to 43 townhomes and into a CD. That comes out to about 277 trips per day. So, we're looking at about a 70 percent reduction in potential trips from what the property is zoned today and can be developed compared to what we are proposing. Wrapping everything up, we will be conditioned for 43 townhomes. There's not a whole lot of townhomes that are in this area, so this will be a differing housing type. There is an affordable housing initiative, and these will be for sale units. We will continue to work with the neighboring properties for some of the items that I mentioned a couple of minutes ago. From there, be glad to answer any questions you have.

Beth Lammonds, 1122 Goodman Road said good evening, Council members. I want to thank Councilman Graham for coming by the property a few weeks ago to take a look at it. That really meant a lot, and I do appreciate your time. My name is Beth Lammonds, and I reside at 1122 Goodman Road. I purchased this property in 2020, so that my mother and I could live together during her last phases of life. After her passing in 2022, I have remained in the property and in the home, which holds great personal significance for me. My home is directly adjacent to the only proposed entrance for this new development being considered for rezoning. I'm here tonight to express specific concerns about how this rezoning and the associated changes could significantly affect my property and my quality of life. First, my house was built in 1957, and it sits just 12 feet from the side property line. That side of the house includes my bedroom. Under current building codes, if the home were built today, it would require at least a 13½-foot setback. Now, I've been informed by the developer that they intend to use the side of my property to widen the right-of-way, which would further reduce the already narrow side yard, and bring the road even closer to my living space. Second, the increase in traffic, from both construction and future homeowners, would significantly raise noise levels in what has always been a quiet residential space. The existing right-of-way was never intended to support the volume of traffic that a large development would bring. Third, the proposed road widening would directly affect my driveway. I do not believe I should be forced to relocate my driveway as a consequence of this rezoning.

Finally, and most importantly, I've yet to see any documentation confirming that the land in question, whether you call it a right-of-way, a driveway, a stub, or anything else, as a public right-of-way. When I moved in, the elderly residents had mentioned to me they were the ones that actually paved the road way back in the 1950s. I think Joyce knew the neighbors that had told her that. As far as I understand it, it's only been used for myself and the other immediate neighbors. I respectfully ask the Council to consider these impacts carefully before making a decision. I appreciate your time and your thoughtful consideration. Thank you.

Joyce Bunn, 1212 Goodman Road said good afternoon. My name is Joyce Bunn. I've lived on Goodman Road close to 40 years. This rezoning to build 43 townhomes with two-car garages with only one way in and out, the traffic will be very unsafe for the houses on Goodman Road. Three houses will be affected the most, Beth's of course, my sister lives across the street. They will all lose part of their lawns, parking spaces, and their safety when trying to get out to go to work. I can't imagine a city bus coming down that way. Thank you for your time.

Phillip Bunn, 1212 Goodman Road said hello. My name is Phillip Bunn, and I oppose the rezoning of Petition 2025-027. So, I've been a resident here my entire life, the 36 years I've been on this earth, almost 37, I've lived here. This has been my home. The couple of issues that I see with this. Number one is the traffic on our road will increase if this rezoning is approved. This can and will affect, not only the three houses, but everyone else who uses the road. Lanes will also need to be widened to accommodate traffic, so this means three homes will lose their property that they've had for as long, if not longer, than I've been there.

So, one home will also become uncomfortably close to a road with traffic, literally passing by within feet of the foundation as well. Goodman Road is already getting tight

with traffic due to another neighborhood being attached to it as well. Adding another neighborhood and a road will only make things worse, especially with the overgrowth, across the street that's growing over into the road, causing cars to have to ride down the middle of the road, unless you want your car scratched up. We have issues out of that.

The second issue I have is going to be litter in our area. We pick up more people and traffic if this rezoning is approved, more people, more traffic, more litter that we the residents do often have to pick up behind everybody, and it's not even ours. My third issue is going to be the noise. If this rezoning is also approved, not only will we deal with more traffic and litter, but some noise as well. Some of us have to wake up super early. So, we have to go to bed early in the afternoon, so we can get rest, and if we can't get rest that's going to affect our quality of life. I'm up at 2:45 a.m., that's when my alarm goes off. I'm on the clock by 3:45 a.m. in the morning, and if there's a ton of traffic coming and going, it's going to be hard to get rest and hard to get sleep. I want to thank you for the time. That's all I've got.

Brigette Harvey, 804 Oak Street said hi. My name is Brigette Harvey. I live at 804 Oak Street. I've been there for almost 30 years. My husband was born and raised there. His parents were born and raised there. I have watched this whole community develop in the last 20-plus years with four brand new communities in there with over a thousand homes. We're probably talking 1,500 homes. There's been no changes to infrastructure. There's not been any changes to being able to moderate the traffic through there, because if 16 gets backed up, trying to come to Charlotte, they come down Valleydale. So, now you're going to add in even more. You make this one change, now there's going to be more changes, more changes, more changes, but there's no infrastructure being even talked about, mentioned or discussed. On top of that, these changes will cause significant, significant dynamic changes to our community. From the beginning of Valleydale to the end of Valleydale, there are no townhomes, there are no apartment homes. It's all single-family homes. So, now if you introduce this to our community, it changes everything, everything, our whole mindset, the way things are, the way people interact. It causes safety concerns, because when you start having apartments in there, even townhomes. I'm sorry, but people who live in townhomes, I've been in them. They care about their stuff, but at the same time, they don't take as much pride as somebody who owns a single-family home. That's all I'm going to say on that part. This also will put a bigger strain on the local school systems, which are already almost at capacity at this point, which are not doing the greatest test levels at this point in time. So, when you add even more to that, you're putting more strain on a system that's already strained and going to cause more students to fall further and further and further behind, and I thank you for your consideration on this.

Dewayne Jordan, 6501 Mint Street said I'll make it quick. Dewayne Jordan. I live at 6501 Mint Street. I think I'm the largest property owner in that area with over 15 acres. I have 12 homes in there that I rent out. My family established that neighborhood over 100 years ago. If you look in that area, there are no apartments. Everything has been single-family dwellings forever. When the City came in and annexed it, they didn't change it. Nothing has changed until now. This petition is before you, and it may meet the Planning staff's recommendations and it may meet their intentions, but my Grandma used to say, "It may be right, but is it the right thing to do?" We have invested our money and our time in building our property, in building our quality of life in this neighborhood for all these years, and I don't see the need for any change now. If the church wants to be a steward of the neighborhood, donate the property and put single-family homes in there, that way it ties in and matches everything that's already there. I would implore the Council to please deny this petition. This is not necessary, and it affects our quality of life. Thank you for your time.

Councilmember Brown arrived at 5:46 p.m.

Mr. Moore said we definitely appreciate everyone coming out tonight to discuss the rezoning. Just some of the technical issues. There was a question that the right-of-way will increase in size. We will not be increasing the Goodman Road extension right-of-

way. We do not control that piece of property at all. It'll just be an extension of an existing street. As mentioned earlier, the changing of the rezoning compared to the CG, that's where a lot of the trips will happen, because it's partly zoned commercial, the trips will decrease about 70 percent. So, we have that as well, and possibly another item. We did explore knowing that access was going to be a significant concern of the site. There are two parcels that are along Valleydale Road that are contiguous to the site. Those folks were approached, and they were not interested in the rezoning or being a part of the rezoning, but we did want to make sure that the Goodman Road extension, we would have the right-of-way to the property line should the other properties to the south redevelop. So, there's potential for an access along Summerville Road, and I'll let these gentlemen finish it up.

Mr. Talbot said thank you, folks. Change is tough. It always is hard, and I really respect these folks and the change that comes to their community. I think we'll all recognize that change in our city is happening fast, and one of those changes has been the affordability of housing and how expensive it is, and to the greater good of being able to keep residents and make homes available for them to purchase and be able to build their personal wealth, I hope you'll consider this. Thank you for your time tonight. We really appreciate it.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, thank you. Stay close for questions, because we're going to open it up for questions, and sir, you can't speak again unless someone asks you a question, but hang on, because we're going to open it up for questions for the Council members.

Councilmember Graham said first, let me thank everyone for coming out this evening on this very important topic. Certainly, the affordability of housing is really important in our community, and certainly I think everyone around this dais supports affordable housing, whether it's this district or District One, Three, Four, no matter where it's at, but it has to be in the right location too, that's really important.

Councilmember Watlington arrived at 5:49 p.m.

I did take the opportunity, I guess, about three weeks, four weeks ago, to tour the site, walk the site. I saw the proximity between Beth's home and the only entrance to the site, and I left feeling that it was problematic. If I lived there, I would be upset too, not because it's affordable housing that's coming behind me, but because of the close proximity and the only entry point to that subdivision is literally a stone throw away, and I think you have to take that into consideration as well. I believe that no matter if you're living in an apartment or a townhouse, people care about their quality of life and the living conditions of the community, and so I don't think that's the issue at hand either. It's really about, is this the appropriate site? Is there an appropriate entry point to the site that would accommodate, not only the traffic that it would generate based on those who live there, but emergency vehicles, a fire truck, police cars, getting to the people on that site.

So, I'm a little bit undecided at this point, very much aware that there are a number of concerns relating to this. I'm willing to grant you the same courtesy of walking the site with you, as well, and see if there is a way that we can broker a compromise. You can't move her house, that's a permanent fixture, and that road is really, really narrow. So, I don't think I'm exaggerating at all, and it goes right by her house. I mean it's literally problematic. So, I'm opening myself up to all the parties to come out again to see if there is a way to compromise. Is there another entry point other than that entry point? I'm very skeptical, not based on housing affordability, based on proximity and entry, and I think those are some issues that we need to talk about before it comes back for a decision. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said first, let me just acknowledge the partnership with the City, especially for home affordability. A lot of products we see are for rent. So, for you all to bring opportunity for our residents to have a shot at homeownership speaks volumes, and we appreciate that. I know Councilwoman Mayfield has been leading that

effort for Faith in Housing partnership. So, we want to see more of that, but I also want to keep in mind what Councilmember Graham said about the entry point. So, if one of you could come forward, and if you can show us the site map again, and see if there are any changes that could be made to the entry point to address some of the concerns that were raised by a few public speakers.

Mr. Moore said sure. Ms. Lammonds' property is right here. It's a little hard to see here, but her house is very close to that. She was kind enough to share her boundary survey or property survey with me, and she's right, the house is close, it's about 12 feet from the right-of-way and about 17 feet from the pavement itself. What we have discussed is putting curbing, because there is no curbing currently along that section of the street, to have 2½-foot curb and gutter down to a point where it goes to valley curb for her driveway, for her house, and then continue that along Goodman Road into the site. As I explained a little bit earlier, we do have a stub street here. So, should these properties redevelop, we have a connection there. These two properties, they did not want to be part of the rezoning petition. So, that would've been probably our best entry point off of Valleydale Road, and we even explored another possibility of another entrance into the back of the church property, but unfortunately this property owner, we would've needed to do grading for that driveway, and it probably would've been on his property as well. So, he would've had to also agree to all of those terms. So, we've looked at it. We do fully understand that access is a significant concern as part of this rezoning, but we will continue to work with Ms. Lammonds with some of the items that were mentioned earlier.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I think that would address their concerns, and I think those are valid, as Councilmember Graham mentioned, and I hope that we can have a resolution on that in coming weeks. I think one of the speakers also mentioned about infrastructure, and we hear that pretty much every zoning meeting, traffic, congestion throughout the City. So, this question is for C-DOT. If you could give us any update on infrastructure that's coming near them. If you don't have that list, it could be part of our followup report.

Jacob Carpenter, C-DOT said Jake Carpenter with C-DOT. So, there's no capital projects identified in the direct vicinity of this site, but I will note that, specifically Valleydale Road, it's full build-out as a two-lane road, a two-plus. So, there's some turn lane improvements that could happen down the road on Valleydale, but it's not planned for any road expansion to more than two travel lanes, but we can look for additional projects in the area and see if we can find anything to provide in the followup report.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I think if you could provide us an update on that. Any infrastructure items as part of our strategic investment areas?

Mr. Carpenter said not in the direct vicinity of this rezoning.

Ms. Ajmera said of this site.

Mr. Carpenter said yes, correct.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. I also want to know, in staff's recommendation, I see the rationale here is that there is a commitment to setbacks and open space that are greater than our ordinance requirement. Could you tell us what is our ordinance requirement and what is the commitment that's been provided by the petitioner, specifically in terms of the setback and open space?

Mr. Carpenter said yes. So, adjacent to the Neighborhood-1 Place Type, they would be required to provide a 10-foot Class C landscape yard. They voluntarily included a 25-foot Class B landscape yard where applicable, and for the rear setbacks abutting the northwestern side of the property along here, they've committed to a minimum of 20 feet from that property line. Depending on the orientation of buildings, it could vary between five and 20 feet, but they've committed to a minimum of 20.

Ms. Ajmera said well, that's all I have. I look forward to having some sort of resolution on the entry point, but I really appreciate the commitment that you made to affordable housing, setbacks, open space, and even Parks and Rec easement. That speaks volumes, and I hope that we can address the concerns of our long-time residents that they raised. That's all I have, thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said I just want to give you an idea of what we as Council members have to consider. Some of the things you mentioned, your subdivision is changing. We hear that so often, and we understand. The City is changing. So, we recognize that. I think you brought up some great points when it comes to infrastructure, so that those will be considerations. Councilmember Ajmera asked questions about pending developments. I know we don't ask about the price point too much, that's kind of frowned upon, but when you talk about 80 percent AMI, in my mind I'm thinking around \$288,000 or \$300,000 for the homes, if we're looking at \$120,000 AMI in the City. So, we need that level of housing in our City. You think about it, \$300,000 with the home dollars, the home downpayment I think is up to maybe \$100,000, you know that's under \$200,000 mortgage for individuals. We need that level of housing in our City. So, this will be something that, me as a Council member, I would really advocate for and want to see. However, as a former realtor, and someone who was opposed to the UDO for specific reasons, location does matter. So, if it's going to impact, and I think I heard 12 feet from a driveway. I mean, we have to really, really consider that. Is that fair to the existing homeowner? So, that's the approach we want to take. So, I would hope, for certain, that you all could work this out, because it's important, this is important housing, but our current residents are important as well. So, I look forward to the additional progress. Thank you, that's all I have.

Councilmember Mayfield said question for the petitioner. It is noted in here open space will be amenitized and have a minimum dimension of 50 feet in all directions. What exactly does that mean?

Mr. Moore said that's the minimum open space dimension we have identified on this plan here, the area that is in green. We do have it called out as open space for the site. That excludes the stream buffer.

Ms. Mayfield said okay. So, I wanted to make sure for, whether or not residents pull this up, when we say that open space will be amenitized and have that minimum dimension, what exactly are we saying? That we just have green space, but open space could mean anything. Is it a trail? Is it accessible? What are we talking about?

Mr. Moore said as part of the conditions, there are amenities that we're able to choose from. So, that is all built into the conditional notes.

Ms. Mayfield said so, you'll be able to choose from different amenities. So, one of the challenges that I'm having, based off of what you shared so far, this is difficult. Yes, we are working specifically with our religious institutions to identify opportunities both for housing, but also the reimagining of building space. Yet, what we have said in this City for many years is that aging in place, staying in place is a priority. So, when we have a community that has grown, yes, we're going to see growth and we're going to see changes, that accessibility into this space is a major challenge. When you share, and when I hear, that a number of the potential partners chose not to be a part of this rezoning with their land choice, it almost feels like, well, we're going to do it, because this is the land that we can do it on.

We have to take into consideration the impact when you're looking at 12 feet or less. I use Valleydale Road probably three to four times a week. So, coming off of Mt. Holly-Hunstersville, turning onto Bellhaven, if I want to get to Freedom, Mt. Holly Road is a nightmare, because it is literally two lanes. It is extremely difficult, which is why my earlier was no. I cut up Valleydale. Valleydale is starting to see a number of the same traffic concerns, and yes, we have a bus, the bus is sitting in the same traffic. So, that's not really a win for me to say, well, we have access to public transportation there,

without being able to widen it. Really, it's challenging to even want to widen that road, because of the businesses that are along it.

I would love to continue the conversations. I will gladly come out and visit with the residents, as well as walk with you all to see your vision. Reorientation may or may not help, but when we're talking about the setbacks, but the setbacks aren't going to directly positively impact the residents who are going to be seeing the largest negative impact, that's going to be a challenge. Yes, we want to make sure that we have a city that's accessible and that is diverse in price point housing, as well as product. I would hope that we can figure out how to do that without causing, not only future challenges, since we say homeownership is how we build wealth, future challenges for generations to come, but also the impacts that will be felt, because the other thing that we're not talking about is the construction piece. We can talk about it in more detail, but the plan for where are the employees going to go, where are they going to be parked when the actual construction starts? Is the site big enough where all of that can be contained on the site or is it going to have to be in community, like we're seeing in South End and other areas, where the workers unfortunately are parking in front of people's driveways, parking in their yards? That will be helpful to know, but I definitely look forward to us continuing the conversation. These are just some of the things that I'm trying to take into consideration as well. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I actually don't have a question. I wanted to speak for a moment to the residents. Really appreciate that you came tonight. Your passion and concerns have come across. We heard you. I think it's important to try to level set a little bit. So, when I heard you say, please deny this, or why can't we have single-family homes? We aren't really in a position to impose single-family home construction. We don't have the authority to do that. So, we have to look at this through the lens of the pressure that we're under, because of a housing shortage and the desire to create housing, the growth of the City, and we are often in a difficult position here, because people like you come in and they're unhappy about the impact of this growth. We cannot entirely prevent that. Our job is to minimize that, to keep it to a minimum, and you are fortunate to have a veteran Council member in your corner to kind of steer that process. I would just encourage you as the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee. I'm the District Seven Rep, so it's not my geography, but think in terms of obtaining the best possible outcome of this and think about the issues that matter the most to you. I can tell you, for example on traffic, it says the proposal creates 270 trips, and the entitlement is 970 trips. You should be happy. We've seen that before. I was actually the one that introduced the requirement that we also disclose what the current traffic is. So, the fact is, you've got no traffic being generated at that site now, and you have the prospect of 277 trips. So, traffic is often what we get challenged about. The one thing I will say about that is, we are trying to do something about that. So, we are working right now and offering to the public in November 2025, a referendum for a one cent sales tax increase that would give the City a multiple of our current funding capacity for infrastructure projects. So, even though there's nothing scheduled right now, as that process moves forward and if we get that passed, we will have more capacity to address some of these issues.

I also just wanted to mention, by way of level set, a lot of people do come in and they say the schools can't handle it, and just want you to know about that, that in my dealings with CMS (Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools), they have basically said, "Don't you control your growth for us, we will. You let it grow, and you do what you think is right, and we will create the school capacity around that." Now, again, my kids were in trailers for years. So, I know that that's not always very satisfactory, but it's not up to us to make decisions based on the schools. There's a school board for that. They have their own budget. So, what I'm trying to do is just point you in the direction of the most effective advocacy for your interests, and I hope you appreciate that. Again, you're fortunate Mr. Graham is going to give you all of the benefit that he can. Thank you.

Councilmember Molina said I think a lot of great points have already been stated, so I don't want to repeat any of those points. I'll start by saying to the residents, thank you for coming today. I think it is very important that we hear from you directly. It really helps

us to understand, especially for those of us that don't deal with you on a regular basis as far as representation is concerned. It helps us to know what your direct concerns are for when this decision comes in front. I will say this, I'm working on and talking to staff, and I'm sure my colleagues will be a part of this, because we're all interested in making sure that the residents that we represent have some understanding of how this process goes. So, Mr. Driggs is telling you a lot about what we can and can't do from a municipal government standpoint. So, this is what we call the hearing. This is where you come, you tell us what's going on from your perspective, we hear from the petitioner, and then within a month, based on most timelines, we have a decision in like a month's time in most cases generally. That's not something that's widely known. A lot of our residents don't realize that the timeframe is that short. So, I want to level set. It could be longer, but that's generally how it goes on a decision-making basis, and with that being said, I'd like to know what can you do by-right, petitioner, with this property as is? So, based on what you own, how many units could you build in this property by-right, by-right meaning they own it, the land use right now says they can do X without any decision from Council, that's what that means?

Mr. Moore said the existing CG Zoning, that does allow for townhomes. It also allows for multi-family stacked, so it could be a vertical. I don't think that staff would recommend a tall height in this area. Plus, with adding more of a condo situation, there would be some issues with financing, so that's why we are going strictly with the single-family attached. Now, the balance of the site, it could be duplexes and triplexes, we have committed to buildings that only have four units as a max, and we have kept those very clustered and inside, and so that was very intentional on the design itself. Could we have greater density? Someone could come in and build a multi-family apartment building.

Ms. Molina said in its current state.

Mr. Moore said in its current state up to, I believe, 48 feet in height. We have capped the height as part of the conditions to, I believe, 35 feet for a two-story product. So, the height could be greater than what we are committing to, and the CG is about 1.4 acres approximately. So, an apartment building or two smaller apartment buildings could possibly be built there and easily meet the 43 units and then would still have the same access.

Ms. Molina said and what's the current ask for units right now?

Mr. Moore said 43 total.

Ms. Molina said so, you're asking for 43, and 43 could potentially be built by-right?

Mr. Moore said I think by-right, yes, with the two apartments buildings and then duplexes and triplexes on the balance of the N-1B zoning.

Ms. Molina said do you agree with that staff? Is there somebody who can answer.

Mr. Oliver said yes. I just want to make a small correction. So, apartments and multi-family attached are permitted in the CG District under certain circumstances. That's when they are located in a Neighborhood Center. In this location, apartments and townhomes would not be permitted by-right in CG.

Ms. Molina said so, give me some idea of what would be allowed by-right at this moment?

Mr. Oliver said to fully know how many units could be built and how large of a commercial building could be built, the site would have to be designed following standards of the ordinance. So, we don't have a good idea specifically, but the C-DOT memo as far as those 970 trips that's been stated on. It's taking into account 13 dwelling units and about 14,000 square feet of retail.

Ms. Molina said okay. So, just for public consumption, conditional. I see that there's a conditional. So, conditional means what?

Mr. Oliver said conditional means exactly what this is. It has to come before the board for decision.

Ms. Molina said right, but that means you've got to tell me what you're going to put there, or you don't have to tell me what you're going to put there?

Mr. Oliver said as far as conditional goes, you do have to come with a plan, and that's what they're doing through this process, but to develop by-right, they do have CG on the property and they do have N-1B on the property. So, there are certain uses that could be built without coming before the City Council.

Ms. Molina said so, I'm trying to ask these questions so that you get some of what we have to deal with when it comes to making these types of decisions. We have some values-based information that we can actually say like, look, this makes no sense, but then the protection, or not thereof, comes in where like there are already land uses that can be done without us even saying yes or no. It sounds like that could be a possible challenge based on what I can see right now. So, I agree with Mr. Driggs in that you do have a senior statesman who represents you, who is extremely adept at this process, who will be able to guide you to some type of equilibrium, and I trust that with 100 percent certainty. Something that makes sense for you as an existing resident, who has spent decimal years in this area, and something based on what the current land uses would allow for in the event that, let's say, this wasn't to happen, and someone else purchased it, hypothetically, to make sure that you understood, because this is complex. I mean, the ones of us that do it all the time, we have to depend on staff to ask for specificity, and making sure that we can try to disseminate that to you and make sure that you understand what's going on is important as much as we can.

So, I'm going to look to Councilmember Graham, because like I said, I know he's going to do a fantastic job of giving you great guidance on what's in front of you, where you are, working with the petitioner, and I'm sure he'll get back to us to let us know what that means, but thank you for coming, and you guys too. I mean, Councilwoman Johnson said something that's very important. Housing affordability is something that we're always attempting to try to create the right opportunity for where it makes sense for both residents, the resident that would live there and existing residents as well. So, I'm really hoping that in this case, based on what the current use is, what your ask use is, that you would consider if this was your neighborhood, and you had something that you knew you could do across the street from someone's house, but you also know that someone lives there. I like those kind of humans. I like the humans that are just like, you know what, I'm going to consider these other humans, because if it were me, I would want someone to consider me too. So, that makes it easy for us to be in favor of something where there needs to be a balance, just from my process of thought. That's all I have, thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you, Ms. Molina. Mr. Moore, I just have a couple questions for you. I noticed that you had 15 members attend the community meeting. Were there other concerns outside of what these five residents brought up tonight?

Mr. Moore said it was the same message that we received that they provided you, the Council. Yes, those were the major issues that we did hear.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, and then as you went through your presentation, did you mention that three homes would potentially lose some parts of their land with this? Someone mentioned that, and I want to just verify that that was true.

Mr. Moore said no, that was mentioned a little bit earlier. We will not be widening the right-of-way, the Goodman Road extension, because the church does not control the property along either side of Goodman Road. So, there will not be any property that will

be acquired unless the property owner is willing to do so, but we have not asked them for any property, so there will not be any taking of property.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, so no one's property will be impacted. However, the proximity to the Madam's house is very much an issue?

Mr. Moore said yes.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, got you. So, the other statement I just wanted to make, because there was a question around schools and performance, and Mr. Driggs did bring up some really valid points. We do see the utilization of the schools in this area, and in particular, West Meck High School and Coulwood Middle School, are very much underutilized. So, that's good news that there won't be a great saturation of the high school and the middle school there, so that was good news. As my colleagues have mentioned, I won't repeat it, but this is a difficult balance, and I'm going to pass it over to Mr. Graham so he can close us out, but I'm sure we'll have fruitful discussions in community around this on a go forward basis.

Ms. Johnson said just really quick, there's a note from Charlotte Water, and this is for City staff. It says Charlotte Water currently does not have water system accessible for the rezoning boundary under review. The closest water distribution main is approximately 375 feet southwest. A developer donated project will be required in cases there is not direct service. Can you explain that? So, the developer will have to do what, and what impact will that have on the current water pressure and system?

Mr. Oliver said often sites will have direct access to water mains, sewer lines. In this case, the closest is 375 feet away from the site. So, the developer will be responsible for extending that water main into the site, and they will have to donate that infrastructure to Charlotte Water for maintenance.

Ms. Johnson said and will that have a negative impact on the current water system?

Mr. Oliver said I can't speak to Charlotte Water policies, but it should not have any adverse impact on the water system. They'll have to build it to the specifications required by Charlotte Water.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. That's all, thank you.

Mr. Graham said yes, we've beat this up enough tonight for sure. I just hope that my members will follow Councilmember Mayfield's lead and maybe visit the site, because I think you'll get a different appreciation based on what you're seeing on the map. So, I know everyone is busy, but I think that might give you a little bit more understanding in terms of what are some of the considerations. Thank you.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-032 BY QUEEN CITY LAND FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 15.80 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PLAZA ROAD EXT AND HOOD ROAD, AND EAST OF WINDRIFT ROAD FROM B-1(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL) AND N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just under 16 acres along the Plaza Road Extension Corridor, at the intersection with Hood Road in an area characterized by a single-family residential development as well as Greenfields. The site is currently zoned Neighborhood Business, Conditional, from a 1993 plan for a shopping center, and the petitioner is proposing both the Neighborhood Center, Conditional, as well as a Neighborhood-2A, Conditional zoning district at this site. This request is inconsistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. The plan proposes Neighborhood Center zoning for the portion of the site at the Hood Road intersection, and that would allow for 20,000 square feet of athletic club uses, as well as 4,500 square feet of retail uses. Also specifically prohibits some of those autocentric, neighborhood center uses, as well as a handful of others. The N-2A portion of the site is for up to 94 townhome-style units with no more than five units per building. They would have a 10-foot Class C landscape yard located along the southern boundary against the existing Neighborhood-1 Residential Place Type. Also, commits to preferred architectural standards for those multi-family attached units. It would provide a public street and sidewalk connectivity into the existing Peckham Place and Balham Court. Provides a 12-foot multi-use path as well as eight-foot planting strip along Plaza Road Extension, and an eight-foot sidewalk along any internal public streets and eight-foot planting strip and six-foot sidewalk along the Hood Road frontage. The plan commits to the portion of the site that's along Hood Road to remain undeveloped, and that would protect existing wetlands and the sensitive environmental areas, and the petitioner would provide mulched walking trails and benches throughout common open space areas.

Staff does not recommend approval of this petition in its current form. Our recommendation stems from the items we would look for when assessing a Place Type change for a Neighborhood-1 to Neighborhood-2. In regard to the NC portion of the plan, staff is supportive of the proposal, and generally desires to see those non-residential uses that may service the neighbors in the area. The context of this area is near uniformly Neighborhood-1, and generally a Neighborhood-2 request should be considerate of its surroundings and transition appropriately to those single-family neighborhoods at its edges. Staff would prefer to see building forms throughout the Neighborhood-2 portion of the plan that are in alignment with what is allowed in the Neighborhood-1 district, such as duplexes, triplexes, and some quadraplexes. The areas of the plans that abut the single-family neighborhood should have the least intense building form, such as duplexes and triplexes, with more intense building forms transitioning across the site and being oriented more towards the NC portion designation of the site. A larger landscape yard should also be committed to along the single-family boundary to be more mindful of that N-1 to N-2 transition. There are a couple of other outstanding issues related to transportation that we will look to see addressed in subsequent revised plan, as well as some other more minor items. I'll take any questions following comments by the petitioner and public speakers.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street, Suite 100 said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, Council members, members of the Zoning Committee. Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner, Queen City Land. Thanks to the overview by Holly. This is an interesting site. There's a lot going on here. We've actually spent a good amount of time. Councilmember Molina was involved early, and smartly let me know that County Commissioner, Mark Jerrell, lives around the corner. So, we've engaged with Commissioner Jerrell to talk about this site, and kind of get everyone's feedback. So, as Holly mentioned, the site is here at the corner of Plaza Road Extension and Hood. What is interesting about the site is it is currently zoned to be a shopping center. So, the only thing that can be built on the site today is a large shopping center. Now, this plan was approved 20-plus years ago. A shopping center has not been built. For some reason, there's not demand there, but just keep in mind, zoning only allows a shopping center. So, that's what is allowed by-right. Now, what does the City plan say? The City's plan says it should be our lowest density residential. So, we have a site that is zoned for kind of heavy commercial, the plan calls for very low density residential, and as we talked to the community, feedback is kind of in different places. As we've talked to Commissioner Jarrell, we had some good turnout at our community meeting, and folks said, "You know what? We've got a lot of residential out here. We wouldn't mind having some

commercial, a place to go have a sandwich or have a coffee or have a breakfast, so we might like to see that.” Also, we have one of the largest parks in Mecklenburg County around the corner, and a lot is being done with open space and trail connections. So, there’s a lot of things that can bring you in and out of that site. So, poor Queen City Land, they’re sitting here, and frankly, they’re just a residential developer. Their plan was to take this site and probably build the type of housing that staff mentioned, kind of lower density than what you see on the screen, but in balancing all these, we’ve come up with a plan you see on the screen, which incorporates a commercial portion, because that’s generally what we heard from the neighborhood is, “We got a lot of housing. We don’t want to see just another all residential. Can you provide a commercial component?” So, the development team has done that. We are using split zoning to have the NC zoning there, so we’ve got a place where people can come. We’ve got different ideas on what that could be. We don’t necessarily know right now, but we do think it’s a good idea.

Then, keep in mind, all of the work that’s going on with that giant park I showed you, which would be just around the corner here, and folks saying, “Hey, we’re just seeing houses everywhere.” So, we’ve got almost 25 percent of the site over here on the edge, which is kind of our frontage. If you were building commercial, this is where you’d want the view corridor, but we’re leaving all of this undeveloped. So, over 25 percent of the site is undeveloped. These are the walking trails that we’re talking about, they would connect to some adjacent communities to the commercial area. So, there’s a lot going on. When you start doing all those, you kind of get squeezed, and so we do have now a smaller area, more concentrated residential, which has more attached housing than staff would like, but this is our goal of trying to respond to what we’ve heard from the community. So, our proposal does have 94 townhomes, up to 20,000 square feet of athletic clubs, fitness facilities, racket clubs, up to 4,500 square feet of retail, and then the commitment to a very large portion of the site being open space.

So, that’s what we’re working through. We have Cole Hunt with the development team that is here. He has been out to the site. He has met with neighbors on-site, kind of walked it with them. That’s the reason for some of the trail connections. I know we’ve got a speaker in opposition here tonight, happy to hear from them. I expect we’ll continue conversations with the speakers, especially, it looks like staff’s comments as I’m understanding them, we’ve got to have fairly dense housing, because we’ve given up parts of our site to commercial and open space. So, we’ve got to have fairly dense housing, but if the concern is along the southern property line, the good news is we don’t even abut the single-family homes, there’s intervening property there, and we’re happy to continue working with neighbors in that area and staff, and hopefully get everyone in a supportive position on that. So, we’ve got a long agenda tonight. I’m not going to take all my time, but happy to answer questions if you have any.

Akeria Wray-Timothy, 5005 Painswick Place said good evening, Council members. I am here with myself and other residents of the community that this development will directly affect, and I also have 17 other signatures from members of our community. So, I want to start off by saying that we did meet with Cole, myself, because I’m an end unit, and the other people met with them as well, and we were told that you weren’t going to build behind our house. So, that map does not represent what we were told at all. My first point is that there are other communities with townhomes and also single-family homes within a 5 to 10-mile radius of our community. Our community is still new in itself, and the issues that we have with our builder, which was Empire I think, could’ve been avoided if there were more oversight into how they were building our houses, especially at the price point that we had to pay. Also, Empire lied to us, because we pay premiums for our end units. They told us nobody would build behind us. That’s the reason for our corner lots, and that’s the reason that we bought where we bought. We thought we would have the end unit for our children to play, and to have freedom to do what we needed to do, and that’s why bought on the end unit.

Also, we think that this community, the new community, it will not be a sufficient buffer between us and them. The other community that’s on the other side of us, we can see how there’s lack of a buffer between us and them. I also want to mention that we do

have deer that come to our site, and we understand, Reedy Creek Park is there, there's a bunch of trees and everything there, those deer also have to cross into our community, because we've been imposing on them. So, where are these deer going to go if there's another community just popping up from where we are right now?

Also, to mention, increased traffic. Trying to get out of our community off of Hood Road now is a sport. I have walked that community. I walk our community and I walk the next one. I've seen people go around buses with stop signs out that they're supposed to stop. Hood Road is long, and it goes to Rocky River Road to Robinson Church Road with no extra streetlights, no stop signs, no nothing. There was a major accident that resulted in a death, Plaza Road and Hood Road, last year of 2024. Also, Plaza Road Extension, there's no stop signs. There's no additional lights to, I think it's E.W.T. Harris. There is a school along the way. There's another community development. There's like three community developments down that way. So, I don't think we're accounting for the additional traffic that this is going to bring, especially with putting a commercial site right there. People are going to be able to cut through our community to be able to get to Hood Road without having to wait at that light at Plaza Road and Hood Road. There's also a lack of stop signs within our community, lighting, that we've tried to bring up, but we weren't able to get anything done.

Affordable homes. I think right now with our economy and with everything going on, the pricing for affordable homes is kind of a myth at this point. I don't think affordable homes will be affordable at this point. I know how our community started off and the price point that it's ending at, and no public transportation anywhere near our communities at all. How is there going to be affordability when you have to have a car to get around, have to. Also, the decreasing of trees and foliage, and all that stuff will increase the chances of flooding throughout all these communities as well, as they're being built up.

I want to mention property taxes. We've been there only two years, and our property taxes have jumped already. The noise will also be an inconvenience. They still haven't finished our roads. They parked the equipment on the outside of our street, my house, right outside my house, to do the next community's road. So, where are these machines going to be held at? Where are they going to be done? I work from home, so this is going to be a big issue for me, and a lot of other people in our community work from home. I will say Peck, Bennett, and Bauman are the two main roads that'll be affected by this. I think that's it.

Mr. Brown said thank you. If we could go to my slide deck. I think what Mr. Hunt meant, when he looked at it, and I was just looking at, what I'll point out is that our property does not abut the existing community. So, we don't share a property line with any of the owners. I think that's what Mr. Hunt meant about not developing in the backyard. As I mentioned, I think we're certainly happy. The good news is there is separation land that we do not own. I can find out. I believe their HOA (Homeowner Association) owns these pieces. I'm not sure about this, but I can find out, and certainly we can talk about the transition between the two.

On traffic, I do understand this is their main access to Hood, it is hard to get out. What we'll be required to do is we have to connect to their existing roads. I know people don't love that, but that will give them access to Plaza Road Extension and to the new traffic signal at this location. So, we talked about connectivity, those will be coming through our site. I hear the concern about construction. I think we'll be happy to talk about a condition that those not be connected until construction's finished, so that our construction stays on their site, does not negatively impact their site, but again, we're balancing a lot of interest here, and what we tried to come together is something that responsive to having a commercial component, preserving a good amount of open space, and allowing us to build units. The speaker's right about affordability, trying to deliver homes that people can afford. This is the housing type that that looks like. I have not met with the residents. I'm happy to do that and talk, because staff has expressed the same concern about the southern border about how we can soften that, mitigate that, so the concerns of the noise, the visual impact to those areas. So, we'll continue discussions.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. Mr. Brown, it's kind of difficult to see on this map, but how many ingresses and egresses are there into this community?

Mr. Brown said so, to our development, there will be one access to Hood Road up here at the top. Now, their existing subdivision, and this is shown. If I were to show you the old plan for the shopping center, the old zoning requires these connections as well. So, whoever develops this site will have to connect to the stubs in their community. Now, I hear her point too. The good news is here, if coming out, we've kind of routed this, this is a pretty direct route. I think a lot of residents of those communities will probably use our new road to go up to Plaza Road Extension and get the light, but we're only showing one. It is true that residents of this, if they were maybe going south, might go through that existing community to Hood to probably take a right.

Councilmember Driggs said I'm just interested in the site plan. You say you've got 25 percent that's undeveloped. Is that because of topography or why is nothing happening there?

Mr. Brown said it's a lot. There's some topography, there's some environmental issues, I mean, there's more that we could capture, but we've kind of separated that off. This goes pretty hand in hand. So, essentially, separating that off, and I don't have an exact number. I think our zoning depends on whether you define it as open space or tree save, and we're still working through that, but about 25 percent of the site is undeveloped.

Mr. Driggs said is there anything that precludes future development in that area?

Mr. Brown said on our site, certainly the zoning plan would. So, if this plan is approved, this area could not be developed.

Mr. Driggs said I mean, you could apply.

Mr. Brown said we'd be happy to put a zoning condition on it.

Mr. Driggs said alright. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Brown said I'm also [INAUDIBLE] there's something over there. So, there's probably some environmental areas, the reason they're not maxing that out, and there's not a connection to it.

Councilmember Ajmera said thank you. So, I live just a few blocks down that way, north. So, I hear the concerns that my neighbors raised, specifically around infrastructure, and I agree with staff's recommendations here. Staff does not recommend it in its current form, and I see challenge with this one in its current form. I will not support it in its current form. Infrastructure is an issue. This is a two-lane road. In terms of the strategic investment areas, C-DOT can correct me, but there is nothing planned for this area. If you could come to the podium, confirm or correct me if I'm wrong here?

Jacob Carpenter, C-DOT said that's correct. There's no planned improvements at these locations as of yet.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. So, really, I appreciate some of the neighbors that spoke in opposition. I think staff has clearly laid out some of their challenges with this and why they don't support it, but I hope that you will continue to work with the District Council member. I would love to continue to work on this, along with Councilmember Molina, with neighbors to see if we can come to a resolution on this one, but their concerns are valid. That's all I have, thank you.

Councilmember Brown said the young lady that spoke, your name is Ms. Wray. I heard you say something that you met, and they told you that they were not going to build behind your home. Can you come?

Ms. Wray-Timothy said yes, Mr. Cole met with my wife. We're that corner unit right there, and then he also met with this house, and this house, and he walked them through what was going to be here. So, right now it's blocked off here. We were told this is going to be a U. Nothing is going to be here. It was going to open up and go to the left. So, all of this right here is a surprise to us, because this is our yard. So, we were under the impression that nothing was going to be built behind us, whether it's a buffer or not, besides the point that we were told that nobody was ever going to build here, so yes.

Ms. Brown said for clarity and for the record, when you met with Mr. Cole Hunt, you were clearly told that there was not going to be anything built in the area?

Unknown said I met with Mr. Cole, myself and my other neighbor, and he told me that there will be nothing built behind me.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I'm sorry, ma'am, I'm sorry.

Unknown said we live in the same household, that's my wife.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said, no I know, but hang on, hang on. We just have a process that we go by. So, you can't speak from the chair, and you're also not signed up to speak. So, I'm sorry.

Unknown speak for her, yes. We were told that no houses were going to be built behind our home.

Ms. Brown said okay, alright. So, thank you for speaking through your wife. I really appreciate it. So, Mr. Collin Brown, do you know, have you communicated?

Mr. Brown said Cole signed up to speak. It's Cole, if you want to speak for yourself. I was not [INAUDIBLE]. So, come up. Again, I think, my guess is Mr. Hunt saw that we don't own the property behind, but Cole, I'll let you speak.

Cole Hunt, 11535 Carmel Commons Boulevard said yes, thank you for your time. Exactly that, the Empire HOA owns the property behind their property line. So, when I indicated we will not be building on that property, I still stand by that statement, including the buffer, which is part of the property that we're acquiring, that was not included on what the HOA, which is the land that abuts her backyard. So, I wanted to make it clear to Alyson that we would not be building on that HOA land.

Mr. Brown said yes, I see how that was confusing. This is rare that you see a situation where they have their lots, we have our land, and then there's land in between. So, I think Mr. Hunt was saying, "Hey, I'm not developing on this." The neighbors assumed, okay, nothing's happening behind us. It is probably when they see this map, it's closer than they expected. So, this is the conversation we will have. It, again, reflects staff's comments are the same about the southern property line. So, I think this is the area that we're talking about, and that's the area we'll continue talking about.

Ms. Brown said well, speaking of importance of community engagement and community, I just want it to be clear that the conversation that you told them, unless it's something beyond your control, that we kind of stick with that for sake of transparency for our residents, and to communicate and work together. So, thank you so much, Mr. Hunt, for coming up.

Mr. Hunt said thank you.

Mr. Driggs said so, I just wanted to note, we need to look at what's in front of us, and we can't get in a position of trying to resolve what somebody said. If there was a breach of promise, it's a civil matter. So, just want to be clear about that. We need to talk about what the plan is as it's being offered. I did have a question for staff, though. It looks like

some of your objections are pretty basic. How far away are you from being able to reach an agreement with the petitioner?

Ms. Cramer said right, so it depends on how amenable they are to changing building forms, and is looking at options for the area along the southern boundary, and it doesn't have to be just one straightforward answer. You could look at something like enhanced plantings beyond what's currently prescribed, which is a Class C landscape yard, which is the lowest tier, the least amount of screening if you will, of the landscape yards. So, in terms of the amount of items, no, I wouldn't say we are that far away. It's just how open are they to looking at those less dense building forms across the site, but particularly where you're close to the N-1, and looking at your options for the landscape yard along the southern boundary. It's not that we don't think it could work. We just want to see something that's more palatable, given the N-1 context, because generally the site is missing some of the items that we would like to see when considering an N-2 Place Type change, so we're looking to make it more appropriate and consistent with N-1 development patterns with items such as less intense building forms or more buffering and screening along its edges.

Mr. Driggs said so, my concern is just, this is the hearing tonight, and it could change possibly quite a bit. So, I'll look forward to Ms. Molina's leadership on this one, and to hearing about how it comes out, but it feels to me as if this is a little early in the process for us to be having a hearing, quite frankly. Thank you.

Councilmember Molina said first of all, to the neighbors, thank you for coming out. It's great to hear from you. A lot of our residents and even my colleagues hear me talk about the far east. We talk about the far east all the time, and we all know when we live here what that means. They're a great example of what I'm talking about when I'm saying, how do we serve our residents that live in these areas, these previously unannexed areas of Charlotte that are recently annexed into the area. How do we now provide them the same level of service that we provide to the rest of our residents that have been a part of the City of Charlotte for a long time? If you even look at this map, you see where they are is like surrounded by ETJ. This is literally and wholistically the area of Charlotte where we have a ton of upwardly mobile working-class humans that don't have lights on their roads, that don't have sidewalks, that still have two-lane streets. So, when we think about right now we have a Strategic Investment Area. We're coming for you, I promise, as much as we can afford. Harrisburg Road, this Council is spending \$20 million to put lighting and sidewalks along five miles of Harrisburg Road. This Council is spending \$73 million right now to widen and add infrastructure to Robinson Church Road. So, we're coming as fast as we can afford, but there's so much still to do out in that area, that to the extent that we have funds, this Council is definitely looking at that area and areas across the City, to make those strategic investments, so that we can serve our residents to the degree that we can afford to do so. So, I want you to understand that, that we have an equal commitment to you and understanding the constraints.

Now, before I saw a site plan, I want you to know that my counterpart in this work is County Commissioner, Mark Jerrell. He's actually your neighbor. So, when I saw the plan, I called Mark, and I'm like, "Hey, Mark, I've seen this project that's close to your house." I was like, "I'm going to have Collin call you up," because, of course, what we do it works together, but to call him in. We've actually done more than one meeting together with staff. We brought in, I'm looking at, how you doing? He was on the call. So, I had County staff and City staff on the call. I've had Planning on the call, so that we can make sure that our resources are working together for you guys too. So, the County's got some great plans out there. I wish he was signed up to speak, because I would love for him to be able to tell you all of the exciting things that are coming to you from a county perspective that's literally, and I mean literally, fitting together with what we're doing from a City perspective out in the far east. Since he lives there, I was like, "Hey Mark," because he's always telling me like, "We don't have enough like businesses out there. It's all residential. There's nowhere to go get a cup of coffee." He's always telling me stuff like that. So, that's what we talked about, and that's why this was attractive to me immediately when I heard it, because there was this component of

business in it. So, I'm like, I put it in front of Mark. We had meetings. We've talked about it. Even today, just to let you know, definitely we're going to set up another meeting. I want to see where we can meet in the middle, because I would love for us to be able to provide, if we can get to what staff needs, and make sure that you're protected. I'd love to be able to give you what I hear so many of you are asking for with regards to there being something simple to do. Somewhere simple to go and enjoy with your families out there, instead of it just being all residential, is what I continue to hear. I even got an email today that was actually sent to the whole of staff. Have you ever heard of an organization called Charlotte East? It's more inland. It's further inland. It's closer to Eastland. The executive director of that organization is one of your neighbors too, and he reached out to the Council today when he saw this petition on the agenda, and even he's interested in, for he is growing family, having more amenities that are close to you guys, so that you can have those resources finally.

So, I look forward to having additional conversations with you to see where we can meet in the middle. I'm not promising you streetlights, because we can't afford it yet, but with the right resources, our plan is to provide you that basic responsibility as a Charlotte resident that you deserve, with the right financial resources. So, thank you for coming here today. Since I've been on the Council, Collin has been a really honest broker, good partner. When I first told him about County Commissioner Jarrell, he got us all on a call. He got City staff, County staff on a call, and we've done that now more than once. So, I look forward to talking to you and seeing what we can do. Thank you.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: HEARING ON PETITION 2025-042 BY BRYAN ELSEY FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.42 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF TOM HUNTER ROAD, EAST OF VENTURA WAY DRIVE, AND WEST OF HIDDEN STREAM COURT FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said good evening. Petition 2025-042 is approximately 6.42 acres located on the north side of Tom Hunter Road, west of Hunter Oaks Lane, and East of Hidden Stream Court. The property is largely wooded and is occupied by three single-family dwellings. Current zoning is N-1B. Proposed zoning is N-2B, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. The proposal is for a community of 168 multi-family stacked dwellings. Would restrict all units to workforce housing at an average of 60 percent of the Area Median Income. Would limit building height to 48 feet. Commits to building modulations of at least 10 feet in length every 60 feet in building length for buildings fronting Tom Hunter Road. Porches and stoops will be predominant architectural features and would be at least six feet in depth. Would implement an eight-foot planting strip and eight-foot sidewalk along the site's frontage of Tom Hunter Road. Relocates the Tom Hunter Road curb and gutter to 24 feet from centerline to enhance the bicycle lane in accordance with Charlotte Streets Map. Provides a 10-foot Class C landscape yard with six-foot-tall fence along the site's eastern, northern, and western property boundaries, and also identifies a centrally located open space and amenity area of greater than 25,000 square feet.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to site and building design. It is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for Neighborhood-1 Place Type, located in an area with a mix of multi-family and single-family residential development. This petition proposes a moderately intense multi-family development that is mindful of existing land use patterns, as well as the necessity for

attainable housing. The site is less than a quarter mile from bus stops for CATS route 211, and less than one mile from the Tom Hunter Blue Line Station. The site is also across Tom Hunter Road from Tom Hunter Park, and the petition commits to providing workforce housing at an average of 60 percent of Area Median Income. I will turn it over to the petitioner and members of the community.

Bryan Elsey, 2021 Vanesta Place, Suite A, Manhattan, Kansas said yes, thank you. So, my name is Bryan Elsey. I'm the owner of The Prime Company. I'm here with my twin brother, Chris Elsey. We're from Manhattan, Kansas, but I'm thankful to be here, and we'll share a little bit about our project. Yes, I guess before I get started, I really want to thank you guys for allowing the Boy Scouts to come. I'm a Boy Scout, actually an Eagle Scout, and I can remember, I grew up in Denver, Colorado, coming to an event like this. So, it's just great to do a community event like that, and have people in the community, especially young men, and here I am today sitting in front of you for something like that. So, I appreciate you guys being so welcoming to the Scouts and doing that.

Let me talk a little bit about us and our project. Yes, so this is there on Tom Hunter Boulevard, and as Joe said, we think this is a great infill location. So, we've got apartment complexes to the north and to the west of us, and it will be workforce or affordable housing at a 60 percent AML. So, I think a lot of us when we hear that, it doesn't really register what that means. So, I wanted to break this down. So, when we say affordable housing, these are restricted rental rates. So, for a one-bedroom apartment the rent differential per month, it's going to average about \$158 a month. Okay, a two-bedroom apartment that's \$319 a month, and on a three-bedroom it's \$497 a month. So, that's a discount to market rent, and so that's substantial. So, I read a lot of the Council members, your bios. We always do that. Obviously, living in Kansas, I'm not local, so I'm trying to learn about you guys and your community, and I saw a lot about affordable housing. I think Mayor Pro Tem, you had actually grown up in some affordable housing. So, I know it's a really important thing to this community, and I think it's a great tool to use, and I think this is a great location to do that. So, when I do say workforce housing, so again, these are your first responders, these are teachers, construction workers. They are folks that are earning about 60 percent of the Average Median Income. So, to put that in perspective, it's about \$100,000 here in Mecklenburg County. So, that's somebody that makes between \$40,000 and \$60,000 a year.

Here's our location. I think Joe already touched on this. Here's our kind of preliminary site plan again. So, in this map north is, well, to my left. As I said there, to the west and to the north we do have multi-family housing, to the east is a single-family home housing development, and then to the south is Tom Hunter Park, and I actually walked that park this afternoon right after we flew in. It's a beautiful park. It's a great asset to the community, and so I'm really excited about our residents hopefully being able to use that facility. We did do a neighborhood meeting with the Hidden Valley Neighborhood Association when I had reached out to you, Mayor Pro Tem. Prior to having our neighborhood meeting, we had a zoom call, and I think, I don't know if Marjorie's, she's probably here.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said she's right behind you.

Mr. Elsey said alright, Marjorie, sorry, Marjorie. So, yes, we had a good conversation. I mean, some of their concerns, and we hear this a lot when we're in communities is, of course, traffic along Tom Hunter Boulevard, and I think we'll have somebody here, a traffic engineer from the City. So, they did say that they had looked at it with our trip calculations, and they had not recommended a TIA, which is a Traffic Impact Analysis. So, typically when we're doing developments, if there is a significant traffic issue or they don't think that the street will be able to hold that capacity, they'll order us to do a Traffic Impact Analysis, and the staff's not recommending that currently. So, when I hear that, that to me means that there should be adequate capacity off of Tom Hunter Boulevard. The second question that the Hidden Valley folks had asked us about was they wanted us to explore potentially finding another exit off of our parcel to the north there, and that's an adjacent apartment complex. I have reached out to those guys three or four

times, and have unfortunately not been able to get any response out of them. So, that's not really surprising to me. If I owned the neighboring apartment complex, and another guy was planning to build a new apartment complex that would be a direct competitor, I really wouldn't be that helpful either, because that would kind of hurt my business. So, not super surprising that they're not very responsive.

That's really it. I want to share, I guess, just a couple of projects that we've done in the past. So, being in Manhattan, Kansas, we've got to build all over the country. So, this is a project we built in Los Angeles, just finished up, this is 85 units. We're a little bit unique as far as a development firm goes, in that we're vertically integrated. So, I have my own in-house architecture team. We've got about 15 architects that work for us. We act as a general contractor, so we handle all the construction process, and then we also do all the property management when we're done. So, we haven't sold any of our properties to date. We like to hold onto them. So, you saw there, we want to love our neighbors. So, we want to try to be the best neighbor we can to the folks, and we hold onto these assets and want to take good care of them.

This is another site in Lawrence, Kansas, just down the road from us in Manhattan. It's 250 units. We're just starting construction on that. Then, this site is in Oceanside, California, it's 179 units. I'd mentioned kind of how we're vertically integrated. So, when you're dealing with us, it's really just one company. So, there's nobody to point a different finger at if something doesn't go right, it's all coming back on us, and that's really it. So, I would really love to get your guys' feedback, and we look forward to hearing any comments that folks have and would love to get your support for our project. Thank you.

Marjorie Parker, 5131 Springview Road said good evening, Mayor Pro Tem, Council, Zoning Committee, and City staff. I am Marjorie Parker, President of the Hidden Valley Community Association. We are here tonight to strongly oppose Rezoning Petition 2025-042, which seeks to change the zoning for 908 Tom Hunter Road from an N-1B to an N-2B, to allow for 168 additional apartments. We thank our residents for attending. We also have 260-plus petitions against this rezoning. Residents know firsthand that adding more apartments without meaningful infrastructure investment will exacerbate traffic dangers, reduce mobility, and further limit our quality of life. We met via Zoom with Mr. Elsey on two different occasions to outline the changes needed before additional apartments could be considered by the community. One of our top changes was, since they're almost directly across from the park, that we needed a lighted pedestrian crosswalk with pushbuttons for the children to cross the street, and we do have a lot of children that come from the apartments and cross the street. We also asked for a comprehensive cumulative traffic study incorporating all development in that area. We asked for two entrances and two exits to reduce the congestion that would come out to Tom Hunter Road, and we asked for a long-term infrastructure plan that supports mobility, safety and community cohesion. Unfortunately, his response did not address our concerns. While we welcome thoughtful community-serving development, we cannot support dense apartment construction at this location without critical safety and infrastructure improvements. Our neighborhood needs businesses, like coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores that are easily accessible to residents, not another influx of high-density housing without proper planning.

Hidden Valley has long borne the brunt of systemic neglect. We're getting some attention now and I'm happy for that. Many residents were not aware that Tom Hunter was zoned an N-1B, largely because we already had three apartment complexes on that road built without sufficient community input or infrastructure investment. Hidden Valley is boxed in on two sides by major state roads, North Tryon and Sugar Creek. Just try getting out at 9:00 a.m. in the morning, or at 3:00 p.m. in the afternoon. The lack of infrastructure investment has left our neighborhood vulnerable to traffic hazards and safety risks. Church signs have been destroyed by vehicles. Multiple residents have been injured in collisions caused by reckless driving between North Tryon, Sugar Creek, and Reagan Drive, and Tom Hunter has become a cut-through street. I, myself, was at a red light in Hidden Valley, but was hit from a car knocked off of North Tryon backward into me while I'm waiting at a red light in Hidden Valley. Our Vice President, George

Johnson, his brick wall from cut-through traffic has been knocked down three times due to speeding drivers cutting through our neighborhood. Yes, we've worked with C-DOT and we've worked with CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department). These are not isolated incidents. They are reality for our residents. If apartments are built on Tom Hunter, we're going to have to worry about the safety of those children, and they do come over to the park without their parents, unfortunately. We're going to have to worry about seniors trying to get out of Hidden Valley, because that will be our third state road that will completely block us in. We urge you to reject Petition 2025-042, and work with us toward development that serves, not harms, our community. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Elsey said yes. So, there is a really acute need for affordable housing here. So, I went and toured two other affordable housing projects that are adjacent, less than a two-minute drive from this location, and they have a waiting list for their units. So, I empathize with the Council. I think you're in a really tough spot. You typically have single-family homeowners that don't want to see any change or any development that comes in on a parcel next to them. It's always, "Well, we like affordable housing, but not this location. This isn't the right spot." I think you're in a tough spot. I realize that, as City Council members, but I do think this is the right spot.

The questions about the pedestrian walk, I did mention that, hey, we'd be more than willing if we set up a benefit district. We're not causing all of the residents that are going to be coming across it. I'd be more than willing to be a part of a benefit district that helps pay for that traffic, for that light, but I wasn't unilaterally going to say, yes, we'll just pay for that. I heard already that those traffic signals are expensive [INAUDIBLE]. So, we'd be more than happy to participate if there was to create a benefit district, and everyone that signed that petition, where we would all share in the cost of that, more than willing to do that. As far as the safety concerns with the road. I mean, we have a traffic analysis that says that there is adequate traffic with a road there, that it can handle the additional capacity. So, I think when we look at it, we've got apartment complexes already there, that this is the right location, but I do empathize with you. I do think it's a tough spot. I mean, you've got a lot of single-family homeowners there to the south, but not everybody can afford, as was mentioned earlier, a couple hundred thousand dollars down to own a single-family home.

Councilmember Watlington said my questions really center around this idea of traffic and safety, because I understand, certainly, that it's incremental. We've had plenty of conversations about the overall impacts of development on traffic concerns. That said, once this is in the ground, the concerns that they brought up from a safety standpoint really cannot wait until we have the money to pay for infrastructure improvements. So, two questions. The first one is, when we look at our TIA, what are we considering in terms of safety, and how do we consider historical risk versus just the trips per day? Then, the second part of that question is, if there was to be some kind of voluntary benefit contribution by the developer, do we have the opportunity to close the rest of the funding gap to get something on the ground in time with the development?

Jacob Carpenter, C-DOT said good evening. So, to your first question about the traffic safety. When we perform analysis of petitions, if there are safety issues that are concerns along where there'd be a new driveway access, then we would take a look at some mitigation measures. In this case, the Tom Hunter Road area where the site is specifically, doesn't have any historical high-injury network classification. As a greater analysis, when we do the larger traffic studies, which is not done with a petition like this, we would consider improvements to intersections when we review crash history and things like that. So, in this case, there is no traffic study. It's a smaller petition from a traffic perspective, but we do review the frontage for access concerns.

To your second question. Sometimes we do have the ability to close a gap in signal funding or things like that. At this point, without having further conversations, we would have to see where that would stand for a pedestrian crossing at this location.

Ms. Watlington said thank you. That'll be something that I'll be particularly interested in when this one comes back to us, because it sounds like, even though there's not criteria that meets this high-risk intersection, we just heard a couple of anecdotal stories where residents have concerns. So, we certainly don't want to wait until something happens, God forbid, a child or someone is hit, before we do something about it. So, I'd love to get an understanding of what could be here, and how much that would cost, and then an understanding from the petitioner on what they might be willing to contribute, so that we can solve the problem, rather than waiting for it to find us. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you to Ms. Parker and Hidden Valley Association for coming out. Thank you also to the developer. Yes, as Dr. Watlington mentioned, I've talked about cumulative impact for a long time. Ms. Parker mentioned several apartment complexes in that area. I would be curious to know what's been approved lately. If we could have some type of map. I know I asked for those things in District Four, for the approved and by-right development, so we can see the cumulative impact. I know that's not listed, and we look at developments independently, but the neighbors feel it. They feel all of the new approvals and the traffic. So, I'd like to know what is out there, and I know the developer, I understand that this is your petition and you feel like it shouldn't be your problem, I get that, but the neighbors do feel it. When Hidden Valley was in District Four in my district, there was a developer that did donate for traffic improvements. So, that's certainly a concession or something we can possibly talk about, and if the City is able to fill in that gap, but I'd like to know what has been approved in that area, because in our book we only have two petitions, and we know that that area is changing rapidly. So, I think that that will be something fair for us to consider.

Another thing, when you talk about cumulative impact, in our book it says that this petition alone is going to change Julius Chambers capacity to 128 percent at capacity. We know that our children are having challenges in schools. So, these are the kind of things that we want to take a look at. So, I appreciate your coming out and speaking, but just from a policy perspective, I think it would help us to get a bird's eye view of what's going on over there. We know these residents. They don't come and have that NIMBYism, and say, Not In My Backyard. These are valid concerns. So, I would like to, again, have a map or a list of what's been approved in the last two years within one mile of this area, so that we can see what the impact truly has been, and I'm going to push again. This is something we should be looking at as a city. We shouldn't be looking at these independently. I'm looking at these. This petition in this area is going to impact the school, Julius Chambers, to 128 percent. I'm curious if there are any others in the book tonight in that same area, and we're not adding those percentages together. So, that's all I have. I look forward to continued work, and hope that there can be some accommodations, a lighted pedestrian crosswalk. I mean, those kind of things seem reasonable to me, and then the two entrances and two exits, they asked for that. How many entrances and exits are currently designed?

Mr. Elsey said there's one entrance and exit off of Tom Hunter Road, and that's our only public road that we're accessible. Tara Lane is a private road off of the developer to the north.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Well, I hope you can continue to work with the residents. Thank you.

Councilmember Brown said this is a comment for Ms. Marjorie Parker. I heard you. You spoke for about eight minutes, and I really appreciate you having the leadership that you have in Hidden Valley, a historic community. Thank you for when you see the Z go up, you know the Z go up, and you gather together, and you lead your community to come down. Leadership and community engagement is very important in these projects. They matter. So, I just wanted to say to you on the record publically, thank you, because I've watched you grow and develop your community into a caring and nurturing community. They care about the character of your community and what goes on in your community, and we need more of that. So, I wanted to give you a round of applause for

stepping up and being a leader of excellence in historic Hidden Valley community. So, thank you so much for that, and I know we'll see you more in the future. Thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said I have a couple questions, and you both can stay there. First of all, thank you, Mr. Elsey, for reaching out to me. I was able to have a meeting with you very, very early on, even before there was an actual petition number for this petition, and of course, I directed you to Ms. Parker, and we've been in touch a couple of times about this particular initiative. So, this area, in particular Tom Hunter, is a road that has a lot of high-speed vehicles going through, because they're connecting from one side of the Sugar Creek Corridor over to North Tryon. So, there's a lot of high-speed traffic that comes through there. I too would like, Mr. Carpenter, to see what the cumulative impact is for some of the approved sites, because we know we have the Hoover Townhomes that are right there at the end, and then we also have another townhome development that's going in on the same road, but closer to North Tryon, and so that is bringing in additional trips as well.

So, I also believe that Tom Hunter Park is a great park. Hidden Valley Neighborhood Association has their National Night Out in that park annually. So, it's a big park, it's a nice park, and with this particular project, I believe it's adding 168 multi-family units. That means you're going to have a lot of people, but also children, who are going to want to, with excitement, run across that street and get to that park after school and on the weekends. I know you all have had some conversations around a hybrid beacon crosswalk, but I would like to see if you all could continue to come together to work on that, because with the additional children and there are children already there, it's prime for a potential accident to happen, in particular with the one ingress and egress out of this property with 168 units. That means you're going to have lots of cars, probably close to 400 cars, coming in and out all the time, and there's no real safe way to cross that street, or even get out of this particular complex. So, I think looking at some safety options, Mr. Carpenter, whether it's a hybrid beacon crosswalk, maybe it's some kind of light system that could go in, but there needs to be a safe way to get across that street.

Now, sir, I know you've said that you've been in contact with the subdivision that's abutting this particular site about an additional egress and ingress, but maybe while you're here, you can sort of push to have those conversations, because think that's a lot of cars to be coming in and out of just one particular entry on a road that has very high-speed cars going back and forth. So, I really wanted to make sure that we can continue to have those conversations. Mr. Carpenter, did you want to come up and make any comment about any potential safety options here from a traffic calming measure, or crosswalks, etc.?

Mr. Carpenter said I'll just say that after being made aware of some of the concerns about the crossing here and the access to the park, for not only the new development, but existing residents along Tom Hunter, we've done some internal discussion on whether a crossing could be approved here, and I think there's preliminary support for the crossing. So, we just have to have more conversations about what's available from a City perspective as far as partnership to make it happen, or what the developer can offer to assist in creating something at this location.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, great. I think the four of us need to continue that conversation, because I think that's a really important aspect that the community is really wanting and has been asking for several times. Thank you, Mr. Carpenter. So, this is our hearing, and I think we have some additional conversations and some additional work to do, which of course, Ms. Parker, I echo what Ms. Brown has said. You have done a fantastic job leading the Hidden Valley neighborhood, and thank you to all the residents coming out, because this is important and this is potentially a lot of families being added to a neighborhood. So, if we're going to do it, we need to make sure that it's done right and built into the fabric and context of what the neighbors would like. I also didn't see any sort of renderings of what you are looking to potentially build. Do you have renderings of what would potentially be there?

Mr. Elsey said we don't at this time. Typically, it's my understanding with the zoning, is you set kind of a baseline of what type of setbacks and different things, and then as you develop your building permit, you put together all the elevations. I think that's how it works. Is that right, Joe?

Mr. Mangum said we typically don't have elevations for rezoning petitions.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said it's just this is a historical community, a longstanding community, in Charlotte. It would just be very interesting to see, or at least hear, about the vision for this site and how it would fit into the fabric of that area. So, that's all I have for this evening. Thank you, and thank you, Ms. Parker, and thank you to the residents of Hidden Valley for coming out.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-060 BY MECKLENBURG COUNTY FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 27.47 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF EAST W.T. HARRIS BOULEVARD, NORTH OF ALBEMARLE ROAD, AND SOUTH OF HICKORY GROVE ROAD FROM R-20 MF(CD) (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, CONDITIONAL) TO N2-C(EX) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-C, EXCEPTION).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development said yes, thank you, 2025-060 is located on the east side of W.T. Harris Boulevard. It's approximately 27.5 acres. Current zoning is R-20MF(CD), Multi-Family Residential, Conditional, and the proposed zoning is N-2C(EX), Neighborhood-2C, Exception. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-2 Place Type, so this proposed plan is consistent with the Policy Map.

A little background. The site was rezoned in 1988 and was proposed to be developed with 251 multi-family stacked units. That approved plan was never developed, and the site is currently vacant. Proposal calls for the development of a poet park. Petitioner requests exception provisions, as specified by Article 37 of the Ordinance, so they'll have to include a sustainability benefit and a public amenity benefit. Sustainability benefit will include the preservation of onsite open space above and beyond what's required by the ordinance, and the public amenity benefit will include an inclusive playground, in addition to passive amenities, such as walking trails and a multi-use lawn. The following exceptions are requested. In lieu of including new streetscape improvements along the frontage of W.T. Harris Boulevard, the existing sidewalk and street trees will remain. However, the petitioner does plan to install the required streetscape improvements after completing phase two of the park development, assuming that they receive funding for the project from Mecklenburg County.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation, site, and building design. As the proposed zoning is consistent with the Policy Map, the N-2 Place Type supports public open spaces, such as parks and community amenities, and the site is served by transit. I'm happy to take any questions following Mr. Carmichael's presentation.

John Carmichael, 600 South Tryon Street, Suite 2300 said thank you, Madam Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, and the Zoning Committee. I'm John Carmichael here on behalf of the County. With me tonight are Jennifer Brooks and Bert Lynn with the County, and they're here to answer any questions you may have. Maxx did a very thorough job going through the request. Just briefly, it is zoned right now R-20MF(CD), and the approved plan would allow 251 multi-family units. This proposal is to rezone the

site to N-2C(EX). If the petition were approved, the only permitted use of the site would be a public park. The EX is to request the exception that Maxx described. Simply put, it is to allow the existing sidewalk and streetscape improvements located along the site's frontage on East W.T. Harris Boulevard to remain in place. The County would have the intent to install new streetscape improvements when they receive funding for those improvements. That is a long frontage, it's about 2,000 feet, so it's an expensive undertaking, but they'd like to get phase one of the park developed, phase two, provide the benefit to the community, and then when they get funding for the streetscape improvements to implement those, but once again, there is an existing sidewalk located along that site's frontage, and we're happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Councilmember Molina said thank you so much for the presentation. This is one that we've talked about that I'm very excited about. Park space is something that, not only I, but the residents on the East Side are very excited about. I've heard so many good things about this particular park. Commissioner Jarrell and I, we've talked extensively about this particular park. So, I just want to put you guys in the area that we're talking about. So, Albemarle Road and W.T. Harris, where it meets, you come off of Albemarle, turn on W.T. Harris, literally like in front of Spark Centro. So, you've got Spark Centro kind of across the street, and literally the park is almost adjacent to it. Mr. Driggs and I, we've talked about this, because there's another petition that we're going to be working on with staff that just doesn't make a whole lot of sense, but we can work through that. This right here, another win for green space and park space in East Charlotte where families can go and enjoy. So, I'm very excited about this particular petition, so thank you for this.

Mr. Carmichael said thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I echo what my colleague, Councilmember Molina, said, and also thanks to County staff. I know that in past couple of years, you all have ramped up your acquisition for park space. We really appreciate it. I hear that from a lot of our neighbors. I live on the East Side, and I just appreciate how you have made very intentional investments throughout the City in preserving our park space and acquiring more. We certainly appreciate that. Thank you.

Ms. Molina said Madam Mayor Pro Tem, Bert's an east-sider. So, it actually works, because to have somebody who's involved, who understands. Thank you for the work. The County along Albemarle Road, in addition to this park, has acquired land for a library. They've got a library coming down the pipeline. I mean, there's so many things that are working in tandem with what we're doing on the City side from the Mecklenburg County side, that just, you're making progress across our City. So, like I said, this is great. I echo the sentiments of Councilwoman Ajmera, park, library, keep it coming, great job. Just very, very excited. Thank you guys on the County side for your partnership and your work.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-043 BY CITY OF CHARLOTTE FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.37 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF CHIPLEY AVENUE, WEST OF PAUL BUCK BOULEVARD, AND EAST OF MONROE ROAD FROM N2-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B) TO CAC-1 (COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER-1).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is under 2.5 acres along Chipley Avenue, adjacent to the Bojangles Coliseum complex, just west of East

Independence Boulevard there. The site is currently zoned Neighborhood-2B, and the petitioner is proposing to go to Community Activity Center-1. That is consistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for the Community Activity Center Place Type at this site. This is a conventional petition, meaning we do not have an associated site plan for it. This is a City-owned property abutting the Bojangles Coliseum complex, and the petition would bring the site into consistency with the Policy Map. The CAC-1 zoning district includes standards to buffer and transition uses adjacent to more sensitive areas like the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. There are no outstanding issues, and staff recommends approval of this petition. I'll be happy to take questions.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-081 BY CITY OF CHARLOTTE ON BEHALF OF SAMARITAN'S PURSE FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.9 ACRES LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF NATIONS FORD ROAD, SOUTH OF RED ROOF DRIVE, AND NORTH OF FOREST POINT BOULEVARD FROM IMU (INNOVATION MIXED USE) TO OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-081 is approximately 2.9 acres located on the west side of Nations Ford Road, south of Red Roof Drive, and north of Forest Point Boulevard. The site is currently vacant. Current zoning is IMU. Proposed zoning is OFC, Office Flex Campus. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Innovation Mixed-Use Place Type. Staff recommends approval of this petition, as it's consistent with the IMU Place Type. The OFC Zoning District is intended to address large-scale office, research, and medical campuses, that may include some light industrial components, with supporting uses primarily designed to serve the everyday needs of employees and visitors. The site is adjacent to property zoned OFC to the north and east. The site is under common ownership with the adjacent warehouse facility that is zoned I-1(CD) and recommended for the IMU Place Type. Be happy to take any questions.

Councilmember Brown said thank you so much for your presentation. I just saw on here, I've watched that there was no one at all that showed up for the community meeting and I know Samaritan's Purse is within their vicinity? Zero, right?

Mr. Mangum said that's correct. There was no one present.

Ms. Brown said alright.

Councilmember Ajmera said this rezoning petition is on behalf of Samaritan's. So, the City of Charlotte is the petitioner, so I'm just trying to understand the relationship there.

Mr. Mangum said sure. There was an issue that the petitioner encountered in the permitting that we discovered was a bit of a mix up that occurred with the text amendment. So, this is an effort to assist the property owner with their development intentions.

Ms. Ajmera said so, there was an issue in the text amendment? So, if you can just elaborate on that, I'm not following?

Mr. Mangum said there was an issue. The petitioner, they previously rezoned two years ago. They were kind of caught by a text amendment, and we take the blame. We did not connect those dots. So, we're trying to correct that issue.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, I got it. Alright.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: HEARING ON PETITION 2024-141 BY NVR, INC. FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 107.31 ACRES LOCATED NORTHWEST OF NORTH TRYON STREET, SOUTHEAST OF I-85, AND SOUTH OF WEST MALLARD CREEK CHURCH ROAD FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL), IC-1 (INSTITUTIONAL CAMPUS 1), AND N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is 107 acres of vacant land in the University City area, generally located among commercial, multi-family and campus uses, serviced by multi-modal transit options. The site is predominately zoned Institutional Campus-1 and Neighborhood-1A, with a very small portion of the site to the southeast zoned General Commercial. The Neighborhood-2B is the proposed request for the site, which is consistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for Neighborhood-2. The proposal is for up to 575 townhome-style units. Access to the site will be provided via Berkeley Place Drive, Salerno Drive, and Emerald Cove Drive. Accessible curb ramps would be reconstructed at the intersection of West Mallard Creek Church Road and Berkeley Place Drive, and the pedestrian signals would be made accessible. The traffic signal at this intersection will also be upgraded, and the northbound left turn lane on West Mallard Creek Church Road will be extended.

A minimum of 5.3 acres on the site will be dedicated and conveyed to the County for a future public park, and two access trails from the new public right-of-ways on this site will be provided to connect to existing greenways along the southern portion of the site. The proposal includes enhanced open space commitments to ensure each unit can readily access open space areas and that these areas are adequately amenitized, and it provides preferred architectural and design details that are also committed to throughout the plan.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of a couple of outstanding issues related to site design. The proposal is consistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for a Neighborhood-2, and it's in an area that can generally support a multi-family product, given its proximity to activity centers containing goods and services for future residents. It also has proximity to transit, including the Blue Line, and connections to existing greenways. This area of University City is characterized by a mix of multi-family development and activity center uses among those larger campus areas, and the proposal is contextually consistent with what is already in the area and what's envisioned for the future. I'll take any questions following petitioner comments.

John Carmichael, 600 South Tryon Street, Suite 2300 said thank you, Madam Mayor Pro Tem, members of the Council, members of the Zoning Committee. I'm John Carmichael here on behalf of the petitioner. With me tonight are Scott Mundy, the petitioner, and Shaun Tooley with LandDesign. As Holly said, that site contains about 107 acres. It's located at the southern terminus of Berkeley Place between I-85 and North Tryon Street. This is an aerial of the site. It's undeveloped. The site is right here, and this is just a context map to let you know what the surrounding uses are. You've

basically got all apartments to the north and northeast of the site, except there is a parcel owned by Novant Health. To the south of the site, you've got apartments, a townhome community, and one single-family detached residential community. So, from a contextual standpoint and land use standpoint, we think the proposal is consistent with what's around it in terms of surrounding uses. The site's currently zoned N-1A, IC-1, and CG. The request is to go to N-2B to accommodate a community that would have up to 575 townhome units. The overall maximum density would be 5.36 units per acre. As Holly said, the rezoning request is consistent with the adopted Policy Map, which places the site in an N-2 Place Type, and the parcels to the north and south are located in an N-2 Place Type or in a Neighborhood Center Place Type.

This is the site plan. You'd have vehicular access from Berkeley Drive, Salerno Drive, and then from Emerald Cove Drive to the south. Approximately 40 of the 575 townhome units will be located south of the creek. A maximum of 20 percent of these units could be front-loaded units. The remainder will be rear-loaded or alley-loaded units. Each unit would have a garage, and then amenitized open space would be dispersed throughout the site. Mallard Creek Greenway traverses a southern portion of the site, and then Barton Creek Greenway connects to the Mallard Creek Greenway on the site. Additionally, as Holly indicated, a minimum of 5.3 acres of the site would be dedicated to the County for a future public park. There'd be two access trails from the residential community to Mallard Creek Greenway. You can access University Place, which is the Mixed-Used Development to the south of the site, via the Barton Creek Greenway, and you could also access the J.W. Clay Boulevard Transit Station utilizing the Barton Creek Greenway. It's about a half a mile walk to that transit station.

The community amenities, the greenways and the public park would provide, we think, wonderful recreational opportunities. There's a lot of tree save as you can see. University City Partners has issued a letter of support that we'll provide to you. We appreciate the Planning staff's recommendation of approval, and we'll resolve the outstanding site plan issues this week. Happy to answer questions.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you, John, for the presentation. I look forward to the University City Partners' letter. If you've worked with John before, he does a great job in reaching out to the Council member and to the community and really bringing quality development too. So, I appreciate the five acres dedicated to the park and accessing the greenway, and I'll look forward to the letter, and then we can talk more offline. I don't have any questions. Thank you.

Mr. Carmichael said happy to do that. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said oh, real quick, I'm sorry. You mentioned one single-family neighborhood. Was there any neighborhood opposition to the petition?

Mr. Carmichael said so, it's called Welwyn. We had a neighborhood meeting, 22 people attended, and I think they had some questions and some concerns, but Scott Mundy had subsequent conversations and meetings with them. They have a concern about the quality of Emerald Cove Drive, but there are only 40 homes that would access Emerald Cove Drive. I will tell you, to be totally transparent, there are only 40 homes that would access Emerald Cove Drive, but the petitioner would dedicate right-of-way across this creek for a future connection to be built by someone else, not the petitioner, presumably the City, at some point in the future, that would allow a car to travel from here on the northwest corner of the site across the creek to Emerald Cove Drive. So, that could increase traffic on Emerald Cove Drive. I don't when that would occur, if ever, but the right-of-way was requested to be dedicated by C-DOT, and the petitioner agreed to do that. We did have a meeting, it was very active, and then Scott has had individual meetings with those neighbors since the community meeting. So, I'm not aware of any opposition, but I can't look you in the eye and tell you there's not any.

Ms. Johnson said I'm not aware of any opposition, and the residents from Welwyn are welcome to reach out to me and we can talk through that, but we can talk more offline. Thank you.

pti:pk

Mr. Carmichael said thank you so much.

Councilmember Brown said so, Councilmember Johnson, I know that I've echoed you with Mr. Carmichael. I've done a lot of work with him over the last year and a half, and he's been consistent with you going out in the community, representing your people, making sure that you're transparent. You're just amazing. So, I just wanted to say thank you.

Mr. Carmichael said wow, thanks.

Ms. Brown said you are. You've been a joy to work with for the record.

Mr. Carmichael said thank you very much, appreciate it. I feel the same way about ya'll.

Councilmember Ajmera said I think we appreciate the kind of petition you bring forward. You put in a lot of due diligence before it comes forward and you try to address it. We certainly appreciate that. I think it doesn't go unnoticed, but I look forward to continuing to work with District Councilmember Johnson on this.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-009 BY DAVIS MOORE FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 40.43 ACRES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF JOHNSTON ROAD AND THE SOUTH SIDE OF PROVIDENCE ROAD WEST, NORTH OF DONNINGTON DRIVE FROM INST(CD) (INSTITUTIONAL, CONDITIONAL) TO INST(CD) SPA (INSTITUTIONAL, CONDITIONAL, SITE PLAN AMENDMENT).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-009 is a little over 40 acres located on the east side of Johnston Road, south of Providence Road West. It is partially developed with a hospital and medical offices. Current zoning is Institutional, Conditional. Proposed zoning is Institutional, Conditional, Site Plan Amendment. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Campus Place Type, the teal color. The proposal is for an additional 56,000 square feet of medical office uses, for a total of almost 107,000 square feet of medical office uses, as well as 48 beds and 13,000 square feet of additional health institution uses, for a total of 216,000 square feet and 96 beds of health institution uses. Would maintain previously approved development standards, including setbacks, permitted use limitations, architectural standards, and environmental features. Would also maintain approved transportation commitments with the conversion of the right-in/right-out access on Providence Road West into access A to an unsignalized crossover with the westbound left turn lane with 100 feet of storage on Providence Road West.

Staff recommends approval of the petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation and site and building design. It is consistent with the Campus Place Type, and would allow for minor increases in square footages to already permitted uses. I'll take any questions following the petitioner's comments.

Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700 said thank you, 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. John's a hard act to follow, but I'll do my best. I'm here tonight on behalf of Davis Moore, as well as Novant. This is really just a testament to how well the hospital's doing in this location. You can

see on this aerial, everything is fully built out on the site, except we've got a building pad that's there was anticipated for us to expand the hospital and the facilities.

As staff mentioned, it's fairly narrow in the focus and the scope of the rezoning. It's really about two things. We'd like to be able to add 56,000 square feet of additional medical office, 13,000 square feet and 48 beds to the hospital functions. Other than that, everything on the campus is going to stay the same. The tree saves that's between the existing residential along the periphery of the site all remains intact. This really just gives us the ability to add a new building along the site's frontage. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Driggs said not a question. Actually, just want to note, we appreciate Novant's investment. We knew that more was going to be happening at this location, so it shouldn't come as a surprise to anybody. It was really, as I recall, about CON's (Certificate of Need), and things like that. So, we're just realizing the full extent of what was discussed before, and again, I think residents will be grateful to have this medical facility option. So, thank you.

Ms. Grant said thank you.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: HEARING ON PETITION 2025-034 BY VEER HOMES, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.20 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF ALLISON LANE, EAST OF ALLISON WOODS DRIVE, AND WEST OF PROVIDENCE ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-B (CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-034 is approximately 6.2 acres located on the west side of Providence Road, south of Interstate 485 and east of Allison Woods Drive. The site is mostly wooded and occupied by three single-family dwellings. Current zoning is N-1A. Proposed zoning is N-2B, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. The proposal would allow for 79 multi-family attached quadraplex, triplex and duplex units. Buildings could contain a maximum of six single-family dwellings, and maybe a maximum of 140 feet in length. Up to four buildings could contain six dwelling units. The building height would be limited to 48 feet. Blank wall expanses on corner end unit facades facing public streets would be limited to 20 feet. Committing to internal tree plantings along private alleys at a 40-foot spacing. Committing to providing amenitized open space that will include at least four of the following elements. Enhanced planting in excess of minimum standards, speciality paving materials, shading elements, seating options, a minimum dimension of 30 feet in all directions and decorative lighting. Would implement an eight-foot planting strip and eight-foot sidewalk along the site's Allison Lane and Allison Woods frontage, as well as an eight-foot planting strip and 12-foot multi-use path along the Providence Road frontage.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to transportation and site and building design. The petition is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for the N-1 Place Type. This portion of the Providence Road Corridor hosts a number of commercial uses, institutions, and moderately dense, multi-family projects among other residential projects. The petition provides a transition between the Community Activity Center of Providence Road and the less intense residential areas to the west of the site. The petition proposes a mix of residential housing types, including multi-family attached, quadraplexes, one duplex, and one

triplex. The petition's building forms are consistent with those seen in the adjacent multi-family attached development to the west zoned MX-1. The site is adjacent to a Community Activity Center. It is not accessible to pedestrians due to a lack of sidewalk connectivity. I will take any questions following the petitioner's presentation.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street, Suite 100 said Mayor Pro Tem, Council members. Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner, Veer Homes. This is the site. This is the hard corner of Providence and 485, a site we've seen everything develop up around it. We've been watching this site for years, and I tell you, I thought it would be something much more dense than this proposal. So, I think that's pretty welcoming for folks in the community. I spoke with Councilmember Driggs several months ago before we filed, and I think it was fairly welcome news to him. So, happy to have staff support on this petition. Again, there's the look, that's the 485 ramp. So, to see someone coming to build kind of medium density, for sale, your townhome-type housing here, I think that's a good opportunity for the community. We are having some ongoing conversations with some of the neighboring property owners here, but I think everyone realizes that this site is going to develop. I think they're fairly pleased that it is medium density. Again, happy to have staff support. We are a little bit challenged. Staff is asking us to find a ped connection to Providence Road. That is a struggle for us for topography and engineering reasons, but we'll continue working with them and folks in the community, and happy to answer any questions you have.

Councilmember Johnson said okay. I just want to talk about, again, cumulative impact, and we will definitely follow Councilmember Driggs' lead on this, but I noticed the capacity for Ardrey Kell with this petition.

Mr. Brown said I noticed that too, it says 151 percent.

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Mr. Brown said we just rezoned two years ago that high school right up there. I think that is probably not the current number. So, I saw the same thing you did, and I'd be very surprised with a new high school that's still the number, but we can check into that for you.

Ms. Johnson said okay, yes, if you can do that, because there's another one in District Seven, and it also says 151 percent to 152 percent. So, that's just an example of how we're not getting the information.

Mr. Brown said I'm sorry to cut you off, but I saw the same thing, and it looked funny to me.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-040 BY TDC GREENVILLE, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.21 ACRES LOCATED WEST OF STATESVILLE AVENUE, NORTH OF CALLAHAN STREET, AND SOUTH OF ROMEO ALEXANDER ROAD FROM MUDD(CD) (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, CONDITIONAL) TO MUDD(CD)SPA (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, CONDITIONAL, SITE PLAN AMENDMENT).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Maxx Oliver, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-040 is located on the west side of Statesville Ave. The site's approximately 2.21 acres and is currently undeveloped. The site's currently zoned MUDD(CD), Mixed-Use Development District, Conditional, and the proposed zoning is MUDD(CD) SPA, and that is a Site Plan Amendment to the existing zoning district. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Community Activity Center Place Type, and the MUDD District is consistent with the CAC Place Type.

A little background on the site. In 2018, the 5.28-acre site was rezoned to MUDD(CD) to allow the development of a multi-family project with up to 250 units. The maximum height was limited to 65 feet with the exception of this area along Callahan Street. The plan also committed to affordable housing standards, and this Site Plan Amendment calls for increasing that maximum height in this area from 45 feet to 55 feet, and also revises the affordable housing standards. The new standards for affordable housing provide at least 10 affordable units, five per household, earning between 60 percent and 80 percent AMI, and five units for those earning between 80 percent and 100 percent AMI.

Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the site aligns with the Policy Map recommendation. The site's located in an area that's been identified as lacking housing opportunity. Affordable housing commitments are proposed, and the Site Plan Amendment doesn't alter the number of units approved under the previous plan, and the site's also served by transit. I'm happy to take any questions following Mr. Jackson's presentation.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. I just want to verify with the Clerk, because on my list I do not have anyone signed up to speak for this particular petition.

Ariel Smith Lead City Clerk said correct, there are no speakers for this agenda item.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, just wanted to verify that. I will say that I'm very familiar with this particular project. I've actually been out to the site to view the site. I think it's in a good location, and there are a lot of positive attributes for this. My only question would be, and Mr. Oliver, I'm not sure if you can answer the question, but there was only one attendee for the neighborhood meeting. So, were you a part of that neighborhood meeting, because I was surprised?

Mr. Oliver said I did not attend the neighborhood meeting. They do provide a community meeting report. I don't know every detail off the top of my head, but as you imagine we let everyone know, every property owner, within 300 feet of the site. So, there's a good chunk of that radius that's not necessarily houses.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said sure, sure. Nevertheless, I am familiar with this particular petition and this particular project, so thank you.

There being no speakers, either for or against, the 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. 2025-046 BY NORTHWAY HOMES LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.17 ACRES LOCATED WEST OF TAPPAN PLACE, NORTH OF HERRIN AVENUE, AND EAST OF THE PLAZA FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) TO N1-C (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-C).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just under 0.2 acres located just east of the commercial core of The Plaza, along Tappan Place in an area that's generally pretty residential in nature, though, it is just east of that commercial area. It is currently zoned General Commercial, and they are proposing to go to Neighborhood-1C. This is consistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for a Neighborhood-1 in this area. This is a conventional petition, so there is no associated site plan. Given that it is consistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for Neighborhood-1 in this area, it brings the site into consistency and also compatibility with the surrounding single-family character of the neighborhood. Generally, that commercial designation on the site doesn't make as much sense, given that we are looking at a residential core of the neighborhood, rather than being located along The Plaza itself. So, we believe that this is an appropriate shift to bring the site's entitlements into alignment with the surrounding zoning and away from commercial, and I'll take any questions.

David Murray, 5950 Fairview Road, Suite 710 said thank you, Mayor Pro Tem and Council. I'm happy to answer any questions.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: HEARING ON PETITION 2025-048 BY CASTLEBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 7.96 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF SUNSET ROAD, WEST OF GUTTER BRANCH DRIVE, AND EAST OF OAKDALE ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just under eight acres on the south side of Sunset Road in Charlotte's Extraterritorial Jurisdiction. This portion of the Sunset Road Corridor has a mix of multi-family and single-family residential development. The site is currently zoned Neighborhood-1A, and the petitioner is proposing to go to Neighborhood-2A, Conditional, and that's consistent with what was approved recently and just to the west several months ago, which was a Neighborhood-2A, Conditional request as well, as you can see on this map. This is inconsistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for Neighborhood-1 at this site. The proposal is for up to 80 townhome-style units. A minimum of 50 percent of the buildings across the site would have no more than four units per building, so that's sticking more to N-1 building forms. Connections will be made to the public streets that are proposed or existing to the east and west of the site, so to the N-2A to the west, as well as the MX that's to the east. A 12-foot shared-used path would be provided along Sunset Road. The proposal commits to preferred open space standards to ensure amenitization, as well as minimum dimensions. Architectural standards exceeding UDO requirements are also committed to. Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues. The site is directly abutting developments of similar residential product types, and although it's inconsistent with the Policy Map, it fits a number of the items that we look for in a Place Type change to Neighborhood-2, including its location along an arterial being situated among similar N-2 developments, and located near a designated activity center, among other items, and I'll take questions following petitioner comments.

Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700 said Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council, again, Bridget Grant, Land Use Consultant with Moore & Van Allen. Pleased to be here on behalf of Castlebridge Residential. Also with me tonight is Matt Langston with Landworks. Holly did a great job describing the site. As she mentioned, while it's

inconsistent with the adopted land use policy, the site is currently wrapped with townhome developments on both sides, and we are happy to answer any questions.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 24: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-049 BY HIGH STREET DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT, INC. FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 32.35 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF TREVI VILLAGE BOULEVARD, SOUTH OF NORTH TRYON STREET, AND WEST OF HUDSPETH ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this 32-acre site is located in the northeastern portion of the County near the Cabarrus County Line in an area with a range of multi-family and single-family entitlements at varying stages of development. The site is currently zoned Neighborhood-1A, and they are proposing to go to Neighborhood-2A, Conditional, which is inconsistent with the Policy Map's recommendation for Neighborhood-1 at this site. The proposal is for up to 190 townhome-style units. A minimum of 50 percent of the buildings would contain four or fewer units, with no more than 10 percent of the buildings having six units, which is the maximum, or most intense, building type allowed on the site. Access to the site will be through extensions of existing and proposed public streets, which stub to the site, including an extension of the existing Trevi Village Boulevard along the southwestern edge of the site. The petitioner commits to dedicating and conveys a minimum of one acre to the County for a future public park on the eastern portion of the site. The plan includes preferred site design and architectural standards, as well as enhanced open space notes for amenitization, as well as minimum dimensions.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of a couple of outstanding issues, which the petitioner has already begun addressing with us. The site is adjacent to projects proposed for multi-family uses, providing consistency with the land development pattern proposed in this petition. The petition would expand the proposed public street network in the area and its nearby commercial entitlements, and the proposal includes a commitment to future parkland, which future residents on this site and nearby projects may access, and I'll take questions following petitioner comments.

Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700 said good evening once again. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm here on behalf of High Street District Development with Tom Burr, who's with me tonight, as well as Eddie Moore with McAdams representing us on the design side. We appreciate Holly's recognition that though this is inconsistent with the adopted land use policy, it's adjacent to multi-family that's under construction, as well as other townhome development. So, essentially, our site is central and to the middle of all of that. We'll be working with staff to address any of the outstanding issues related to the site design, and with that I'm happy to answer any questions. I apologize, the clicker's not working.

Councilmember Johnson said I would like to see a map of the approved and by-right development near this area. I know it's in the ETJ, but it is near District Four. When I talk about cumulative impact, I want to bring your attention to the District Four Petition, Item No. 18. That had an impact on Julius Chambers High School. I think that it would increase to 128 percent capacity, and this petition says the same thing, although, the earlier petition had 575 multi-units, and this one has 190. So, this is just another example of how we're not considering these petitions and the impact on infrastructure and schools cumulatively, and the residents feel it. So, I would like a map of the pending

and approved and by-right development in this area, so that we can take a look at this. Thank you.

Ms. Grant said yes, I'll provide those maps.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 25: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-050 BY CHARTER PROPERTIES, INC. FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 11.45 ACRES LOCATED AT THE NORTHEASTERN CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF STEELE CREEK ROAD AND BROWN-GRIER ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-050 is about 11.5 acres located on the northeastern corner of Steele Creek Road and Brown-Grier Road. The site is vacant and currently zoned N-1A. Proposed zoning is N-2B, Conventional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the N-2 Place Type. Staff recommends approval of the petition, as it is consistent with the N-2 Place Type recommendation. The proposed N-2B Zoning is consistent also with a recently approved rezoning for a large Mixed-Use Development just to the north of the site, and I'll take any questions following the petitioner's comments.

John Carmichael, 600 South Tryon Street, Suite 2300 said thank you, Madam Mayor Pro Tem, members of Council and the Zoning Committee. I'm John Carmichael here on behalf of the petitioner. With me tonight is John Porter with Charter Properties. As Joe said, the site's just under 11.5 acres, northeast corner of Steele Creek Road and Brown-Grier Road, which are both state-maintained major arterials. This is an aerial of the site. This is a zoomed-out aerial and it's for the purpose of showing you basically some existing nearby developments. Berewick Town Center is located to the northwest of the site. There's additional commercial to the north of the site, and then you've got Pringle Square Apartments to the east of the site. The site is currently zoned N-1A, and you've got MUDD-O zoning to the north, O-2(CD) to the northeast, R-12MF(CD) to the east, and then N-1A to the west and south. The request is to rezone the site to N-2B to allow uses allowed in the N-2B zoning district on the site. This is a conventional rezoning request. The adopted Policy Map places this parcel in the Neighborhood-2 Place Type, so the rezoning is consistent with the Policy Map.

This is the approved rezoning plan for the parcel, the parcels to the north of this rezoning site. The rezoning site is here. It is outlined in green. There will be pedestrian vehicular connectivity, or there would be, from this site to the development to the north. The development to the north is approved for a variety of uses, including office and medical office, a community hospital, commercial uses, and residential uses. So, the N-2B uses that would be developed on this site would be supportive of that Mixed-Use Development to the north, and also, there'd be a lot of internal connectivity. So, you could leave this site, travel through the parcel to the north, and get to Berewick Town Center, or the other commercial to the north, without having to get on Steele Creek Road. You would have to cross Steele Creek Road to get to Berewick Town Center, but you could do so at signalized intersections at Shopton Road West and Dixie River Road.

We met with the Steele Creek Residents Association on May 13, 2025, to share the proposal, and then as you probably well know, they respond with an email and give the board's position, and the board's position is that they are not opposed. We're happy to

answer any questions that you may have. We appreciate staff's recommendation of approval.

Councilmember Ajmera said did you say the board was not opposed?

Mr. Carmichael said not opposed, yes, ma'am.

Ms. Ajmera said so, will they be issuing a letter of support?

Mr. Carmichael said I can share this with Councilmember Brown. They send you an email following the meeting with their position, and I'm happy to forward that, and that comes from Abdul.

Ms. Ajmera said so, I look at this rezoning petition, there are about 11.5 acres, and I see it's conventional. I'm just trying to understand how the decision was made to have this conventional versus conditional.

Mr. Magnum said sure. It's consistent with the recommended Place Type, which is N-2, the requested zoning being N-2B.

Mr. Carmichael said that was the reason, it was because it's consistent with the Policy Map.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. I know this is not a small site, so I'd like to see a site map, but again, this is up to the District Council member. I'll be following District Council members closely on that. I'd love to hear District Council member's perspectives on this, knowing that it's conventional, so we don't have a site map. That's all I have, thank you.

Mr. Carmichael said thank you.

Councilmember Brown said so, thank you, Mr. Carmichael. You are engaged with Steele Creek Residents Association, which is going to be well-rounded and beneficial for the community. I know that we do not have a site map yet. Are there any talks about what it may look like or be?

Mr. Carmichael said but since this is a conventional rezoning, and Ms. Hagler-Gray may want to interject, the developer knows what he wants to do, and in a neighborhood meeting or at a meeting with Steele Creek, you can show what his intent is, but legally we couldn't do that here. We can meet with you offline.

Ms. Brown said alright, no problem. Steele Creek knows, so we'll get with them. I have no other questions. I'll just reach out to Steele Creek Residents Association and see what their position is.

Mr. Carmichael said thank you.

Ms. Brown said you said that they support it?

Mr. Carmichael said well, the way they phrase it is they're not opposed.

Ms. Brown said they're not opposed means that they support it, because if they were opposed, they would be real clear.

Mr. Carmichael said right, and I'll forward this email to you, happy to do it.

Ms. Brown said okay, thank you. I have no further questions, Mayor Pro Tem.

Councilmember Molina said it's not traditional to speak after the District Rep. I just want to make sure that I'm clear. Again, I'm always trying to look for those opportunities for public consumption. Tell me, for public consumption, conventional, what does that mean?

pti:pk

Mr. Mangum said conventional means that the petitioner is requesting to develop under a specific zoning district with no additional conditions.

Ms. Molina said okay, and that means we can see what they're going to do, or not see what they're going to do?

Mr. Mangum said we can look at the UDO, and we can look at the district that they are currently zoned, and we can look at what they are proposing to go to, which has a list of permitted uses and development standards.

Ms. Molina said so, that's means based on what the asked zoning type is, they'll have a list of permitted uses that they have to stay within, and they don't actually provide us what you would say a picture of what that would look like, but we got some guidance based on what the zoning type is. Am I saying that right?

Mr. Mangum said correct. The uses will be limited to what is allowed in that specific district, they'd be held to all the development standards of that district, without further paring it down in a conditional plan.

Ms. Molina said okay, and in a conditional plan, they would actually be saying to us, this is what we do, this is what we intend to do, and there would likely be some type of condition that they would impose or be willing to. Can you give me that in comparison, please?

Mr. Mangum said right, it could be a limit on uses. It could be a specific number of a specific use, square footage or units. It could have transportation commitments, and in a conventional it is simply just, we would like to rezone to this district and develop under the standards of this other district.

Ms. Molina said okay, thank you, because a lot of the times when we're talking to community members, and we're saying all these terms and stuff like that. I mean, even sometimes we, right, we've got to come to ya'll and ask ya'll to kind of break it down if we don't know. I remember when I first started, I had no clue what any of that meant. So, I can't even imagine our poor residents out there, like okay, they're hearing all these terms and things, and it could be confusing. So, thank you for giving me that. That's all I have.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said Ms. Hagler-Gray, did you have a comment?

Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said I think Joe pretty much covered it. I just wanted to make sure we were answering your question that anything allowed in the district is what is possible for the potential site when you have a conventional plan. So, it's limited to what is allowed in the district, but everything in the district is under consideration, which is why you don't have a specific site plan.

Ms. Molina said that's good. That's really good to know. Thank you so much for that.

Councilmember Johnson said just to clarify to our City Attorney, you said anything allowed in the district. Do you mean anything allowed on that site or that area?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said any uses allowed in that particular district in the UDO.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so she doesn't mean just our districts, our seven districts.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said no, I'm sorry.

Ms. Johnson said it's not just the districts. It's anything that would be allowed per the UDO, but the reason it can be confusing, and I asked this question at the noon meeting when I was talking to Dave and Monica, when it's a conventional versus conditional. One thing about conventional, and correct me if I'm wrong, it doesn't allow us to work with the developer to get these types of concessions for the residents. We're limited on

the input when it's a conditional. So, we, as Council members, I'll speak for myself, frown upon conventional petitions, especially in residential districts, and District Four for certain, I think you all know that. When are we, as a city, allowing conventional? I would hope that we're allowing that less than conditional, just because these developments do have such an impact on current residents.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said yes. So, Ms. Johnson, I just want to make sure that we're not intruding on any of the petitioner's rights. So, if they have a right to submit a conventional petition, they have that right to do so, and I just want to make sure, Ms. Hagler-Gray, that we can walk that line of inquiry, but we want to make sure that we are not somehow putting a color or a light on one particular petition or another.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said yes. I think, Councilmember Johnson, if you're just asking in general when staff may be more supportive of conventional versus conditional, I think Dave can answer that question.

Ms. Johnson said thank you for understanding. Thank you.

David Pettine, Planning, Design & Development said yes, we can jump in and provide a response. So, I'll give this petition as an example. Joe had mentioned that it is consistent with the Policy Map. So, we know that our policies that we adopted looked at this area, and identified this is as a spot for multi-family, whether it be townhomes or apartments. So, we take that into consideration knowing that we've already kind of viewed that and had community input on that outcome. We trust in the development standards and the UDO. We know we're going to get road connections from Ollie Drive, which is just next door here, so we're going to get a continuation of that street network, because the ordinance requires that. So, when we look at these starting out as coming in for the pre-sub, and somebody says, "Hey, we want to go conventional." Is it consistent? Yes, so we take that into consideration. Are there land uses around it that are compatible or similar in nature? In this case, we have townhomes next door and a large mixed-use project, which will provide connectivity as well, so land use impacts on adjacent properties are fairly minimal and they're consistent with those types of development outcomes that are already next door, so we don't have single-family directly next to it or on the other side of it where we might need different buffers and those types of things. So, we take all that in consideration and we let the petitioner know, yes, this is probably a candidate to start out conventionally. We also give them full transparency that as they talk with the community, as they talk with the District Reps, as they talk with other folks that are involved in the project, if they start to see that conditions are warranted they could always pivot and add those conditions. In a petition like this where we see it's consistent, the land use impacts are fairly minimal to those adjacent properties, we know what our standards are in the UDO, we trust that we're going to get some of those outcomes that we talked about. We're still going to look at transportation impacts in the permitting side of things, because that's also now a requirement of the UDO. Storm Water stuff will get captured, because those standards have been enhanced in the UDO as well. That gives us a little bit more comfort with some conventional petitions when they kind of meet some of those criteria that we start out with and that's consistent overall with that Policy Map. So, that's a little bit of how we look at that and how we go through that process.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you, and we spoke earlier, and one of the things in our book, it's notated when it's conditional, but it's not notated when it's conventional.

Mr. Pettine said correct.

Ms. Johnson said so, rather than us assuming, if you could help to highlight, I think that that would make it easier.

Mr. Pettine said yes, we can look at it. I know there's tabs that separate each of your petitions in your notebook. Maybe on those tabs next to that petition number where it can just say conventional or conditional, that's something that we can certainly look into when we print those books out for you. I think when we send out some of the

information over the weekend, that we usually do to help you guys prep, some of that information does also have a column that says if it's conventional or conditional as well. So, that's always a place to check, but we can certainly look to see if there's a way we can put those tabs in the notebook that say CD or Conventional or CV, or something like that for you guys.

Ms. Johnson said well, I appreciate it, thank you, and thank you for listening, your team, you and Alyson. You know I've been talking about QR Codes on rezoning signs for a long time, and those are going to be effective this month. So, I appreciate the way you all listen.

Mr. Pettine said I'll use that as a plug too. We'll be in front of TPD (Transportation, Planning and Development) in September 2025 to talk about some of those process improvements that we've got, including some changes to the staff analysis and things we're doing to enhance engagement and notification, so stay tuned for that. There will probably be some updates in September 2025 and then again in October 2025.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said it's funny going back over time. It's really complicated. We've had situations where you could do something conventionally; however, it wasn't going to be a gas station or whatever. The irony to me too is the goal of the UDO was to simplify all of this, and we were trying to get to a place where a lot of this was more programmatic, and that level of discomfort, though, still remains that we always had, that you're approving something and you're not quite sure what that could be, and we don't like to let go, and that's what we're doing. We do have to deal with these as they come to us in the context of where we are with our rules and so on. So, they're allowed to apply for a conventional rezoning, and then of course, it could be up to us to decide whether or not to approve it. So, that's where we are. I'll just leave it at that, but there are more intricacies that I remember that we sometimes get into into permitted uses, optional uses, and sort of qualifications in each case. Thanks.

Ms. Brown said Mr. Carmichael, thank you again for coming before us with the petition. I do want to thank Councilmember Johnson for digging deep, though, because I took a lot of good notes here, and I think it's important for us to be able to break down what exactly is happening for those that are watching that may not understand. Sometimes it gets complex with the UDO and text amendments, and all those things. So, it's a joy to know the history that you have, not just in District Three, but as a whole, with working on your petitions, that you are as transparent, and you'll go back and forth and you'll dig and you do the work. So, it's just a joy to know that. As representing for the District Three Rep, knowing that the Steele Creek Residents Association is very active in the community, it's good to hear that. So, I just wanted to make sure that I understood exactly what was going on, and now I do, so thank you so much, alright.

Mr. Carmichael said thank you.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 26: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-053 BY DAVID POWLEN FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 34.03 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF ALBEMARLE ROAD, WEST OF NOVANT HEALTH PARKWAY, AND EAST OF I-485 FROM B-1(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL) AND O-2(CD) (OFFICE, CONDITIONAL) TO B-1(CD) SPA (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL, SITE PLAN AMENDMENT) AND O-2(CD) SPA (OFFICE, CONDITIONAL, SITE PLAN AMENDMENT).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just over 34 acres on the north side of Albemarle Road in an area where we have quite a few institutional uses, as well as some multi-family uses and vacant parcels. This is for a site plan amendment to a plan most recently from 2014. It was Petition 2014-069, which was for B-1, Conditional, and O-2, Conditional zoning, for up to 117,000 square feet of medical office uses, as well as some general office, retail, commercial establishment uses, and it has a hospital on the site. So, currently built-out, we have the Novant Hospital and some medical office along the Albermarle Road frontage. What they are proposing to do is a site plan amendment, which is just modifying within conditional notes and increase to the square footage within that B-1 Conditional portion of the plan along Albermarle Road, the medical office square footage. So, increasing that from 37,000 square feet to 59,500. So, it's a pretty small change overall, especially when you consider the overall allowed square footage across the site in 2014 was 117,000 square feet.

Staff does recommend approval of this petition. It is consistent with the 2040 Policy Map' recommendation for the Campus Place Type. We just have a couple of very minor technical revisions to clean up. This does keep the site's entitlements consistent with what's already approved on the site, and allows for continued investment into critical healthcare infrastructure, and I will be happy to take questions after petitioner comments.

David Powlen, 3700 South Boulevard, Suite 200 said good evening. David Powlen with V3 representing Novant Health, and I'm happy to answer any questions that Council may have.

Councilmember Molina said I'd like to, again, highlight that this area is the 485 area, and I remember when we were talking about, from a land use perspective, with favorability and development. This is one of those areas that is based on road use, highway use, proximity to a highway, all of this area has over the last decade just exploded with retail, housing, there are just developments. I think the good thing that we see, and especially with putting a hospital there, is something additional that the residents in the far east area can access, but in addition to now a hospital use. Like I said, there are restaurants, there are all of these different amenities that are kind of happening concurrently, which is heartening. I don't know if you were here earlier, but in another area of, what we call the far east, out by Plaza Road Extension and Plott Road, they've got a very different reality. My imagination says that those humans, when they need like medical service, now they have a place where they don't have to go all the way Uptown to get this service. So, I'm just heartened to see some of the developments that are out there, and that's really just the only comment that I have. So, thank you so much.

Mr. Powlen said you're welcome.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 27: HEARING ON PETITION 2025-054 BY BISBIKIS PROPERTY GROUP FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.08 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF LITTLE ROCK ROAD, SOUTH OF QUEEN CITY DRIVE, AND NORTH OF I-85 FROM N1-A(ANDO) (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY) TO CG(ANDO) (GENERAL COMMERCIAL, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-054 is a little over an acre. It's located on the east side of Little Rock Road. The property is currently zoned N-1A(ANDO), that's the Neighborhood-1 Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay. Proposed zoning is CG(ANDO), General Commercial, Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Commercial Place Type. CG district is consistent with this Place Type. This is a conventional rezoning petition, there's not an associated site plan, and would permit any use allowed on the CG zoning district.

Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the proposed zoning is consistent with the Policy Map recommendation. The site's located near I-85 in an area that's dominated by auto-oriented commercial uses, and a rezoning would eliminate residential entitlements on a parcel that may be undesirable for housing due to the high-intensity commercial corridor environment. I'm happy to take any questions following Mr. Fields' presentation.

Walter Fields, said thank you Mayor Pro Tem and Council and Zoning Committee. I'm Walter Fields representing the petitioner in this matter. I recall finally when Mayor McCrory would tell me I had three minutes, but I didn't have to use them all. We appreciate the staff's assistance in working with us on this petition. This is a little orphan parcel that for some reason got completely surrounded by all sorts of highway-oriented business uses, and yet remained with a Residential zoning classification. This is sort of a cleanup petition, consistent with the adopted plans of the City for this area, and I'll stop at that point and see if there are any questions that I can answer.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 28: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-055 BY PORCHA THOMAS FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.52 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF PARKWOOD AVENUE, EAST OF ALLEN STREET, AND WEST OF PEGRAM STREET FROM NS (NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-055 is located on the north side of Parkwood Avenue, and it's just a little over half an acre. Current zoning is NS, Neighborhood Services, which is a Conditional zoning district. Proposed zoning is NC(CD), Neighborhood Center, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type for the site, and the NC district is inconsistent with this Place Type, and approval of this petition would revise the Policy Map to the Neighborhood Center Place Type. The proposal permits the development of principle and accessory uses allowed by-right and under prescribed conditions in the NC, Neighborhood Center zoning district, but prohibits certain uses that may be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, such as automotive-oriented uses, such as vehicle fueling facilities, dealerships, car rentals. Parking lots is a principle use, just as an example.

Staff recommends approval of this petition, as the current zoning of NS permits a range of uses that are consistent with those allowed in the NC District. The site is in an access-to-amenities gap, as identified by the Comp Plan, and the NC Place Type promotes a variety of uses, such as retail, restaurant, office, and multi-family, that may fill this gap. The site is also served by transit and a short walk from a greenway. I'm happy to take any questions following Ms. Thomas' presentation.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. Welcome, Ms. Thomas.

Porcha Thomas, 328 Plymouth Avenue said thank you, good evening. I'm the owner of Green Bird Properties, and I appreciate being here. I am here for any questions you might have.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. I just have one question. It sounds like you had some nice participation with the neighborhood meeting. Was there any pushback or concerns that the residents raised?

Ms. Thomas said the biggest feedback, I would say the majority of everyone, except for one person, well, there was a family member there that supported that, the opposition was mostly concerned about just getting a general zoning for the other two parcels. I had an idea for what I was going to do with one parcel. So, they were just concerned that a general rezoning would limit them from having any feedback around what was the intention behind the project. So, I reassured them that I was hopeful to be able to work, or possibly partner, with a builder around this project, so I would be personally involved, and I'm still committed to doing that with the right buyer for this property.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said got it, and did you have any interaction with the neighborhood associations?

Ms. Thomas said the neighborhood association that did push back was the Belmont Association. The Villa Heights Association, which is the neighborhood that it's residing in, were fully supportive.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said okay, alright, excellent. Any additional questions?

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 29: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-056 BY DELRAY AT PROVIDENCE ROAD WEST, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 10 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF PROVIDENCE ROAD WEST, WEST OF BRYNFIELD DRIVE, AND EAST OF SANDSTONE CREST LANE FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said Petition 2025-056 is approximately 10 acres located on the south side of Providence Road West, west of Brynfield Drive, and east of Sandstone Crest Lane. The site is mostly wooded and has one single-family dwelling on it. Current zoning is N-1A. Proposed zoning is N-2A, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. The proposal is for a community of 110 multi-family attached residential units, as well as accessory uses. Building height will be limited to 48 feet. Buildings will have a maximum of five units per building. Usable porches and stoops will be a predominant feature and will be at least six feet in depth. A 25-foot Class B landscape yard will be located along the southern property boundary, and a 10-foot landscape area along the eastern property boundary, with one evergreen shrub every five feet, and one large maturing, or two small maturing trees, every 50 feet. Street trees will be provided along internal alleys. Petition commits to having all units having access to Providence Road West via an internal sidewalk network. Petition commits to publically accessible open space that will be amenitized by a menu of elements that may include enhanced plantings, speciality paving materials, shading elements, seating options, public park, interactive elements, and decorative lighting. Implement an eight-foot planting strip and eight-foot sidewalk along the Providence Road West frontage. The site will have two access points. Access A will connect to a new north/south public street extending through the site. Providence Road West will be widened to accommodate a westbound left turn lane

into the site at Access A, and Access B would be a right-in/right-out onto Providence Road West.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to site and building design. Petition is inconsistent with the Policy Map recommendation for the N-1 Place Type; however, it's located in an area with a range of multi-family and single-family housing types, with pedestrian access to commercial nodes. This petition proposes residential uses consistent with the surrounding development. The site is less than one mile from a Neighborhood Center. It includes commercial, medical, and personal service uses. The site is adjacent to developed N-2 uses to the east. Where adjacent to N-1 uses to the south, the petitioner has committed to a 25-foot Class B landscape yard, which exceeds the ordinance required 10-foot Class C landscape yard. I'll take any questions following the petitioner's comments.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street, Suite 100 said thank you, staff. Mayor Pro Tem, Council members, Zoning Committee meetings. Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner, Delray. This property literally touches South Carolina. So, it's about as far out as we can get on Providence Road West. Appreciate staff's overview. Even though it is inconsistent, if you look at the map, kind of everything fronting Providence Road West is already N-2. I think this medium-density townhome product makes sense. We appreciate staff's support. We continue to have conversation with the neighbors. I've got a meeting with an adjacent property owner tomorrow, really to talk about the buffer treatment between our site and the single-family homes. Joe mentioned, we're already exceeding the ordinance standard. So, I'm just going to see if there are any site particulars we need to be aware of. Happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Johnson said I just wanted to say for the record that this has 110 residential units, and the impact on schools is Ardrey Kell to 152 percent. When I talk about cumulative impact, we actually have closer to 900 units in this area that would seemingly impact the schools to a higher capacity. So, this is the kind of example that I talk about. The residents feel it, although, we're looking at them independently. We've looked at three petitions and they all say will increase the capacity to 152 percent at Ardrey Kell High School, when it's actually a total of 875 to 900 units that would have a higher impact.

Mr. Mangum said we're going to confirm that number. I'm not sure if that factors in the new Ballantyne Ridge High School.

Ms. Johnson said whether the number is right or not, the math is not mathing. We're using the same number for all of the petitions, and there's a total of 875 units. So, when I say cumulative impact, if petition A, B and C are approved, where are we getting the information on what the actual impact is to the school? Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said so, I will just note, we had a presentation by CMS some time ago about how this actually works and their process, and in fact, the capacity calculation is kind of interesting, you need to study it, it's not just there aren't any more seats. They take the teachers, and they take the utilization of the classrooms, but the one thing I would caution against, as I said earlier, was we cannot involve ourselves in the CMS thing. We cannot regulate the growth of the City based on the existing capacity or even the planned capacity of the schools. I think we know there's \$2.9 billion in investment that's already underway by CMS, but I just have a concern that we need to stay in our lane as it were. So, we need to think about appropriate land use. CMS and the schools need to figure out how to serve the people that choose to live where they choose to live, otherwise we're basically setting ourselves up to allow the growth of the City to be dictated by the capacity of the school system, and it's supposed to be the other way around. The City grows and the school system expands in order to accommodate the growth. So, if this is going to be a big issue, we need to study it more carefully, and I suggest that we engage with our colleagues on the School Board to I guess align, what we're seeing with what their plans are. They do actually have a detailed process for doing this analysis, existing capacity, expected need, and so on. It does have in part to do with fact that the lead times, like, we'll approve something now,

it could be two or three years before that hits. So, they are in fact looking ahead and they're saying that in two or three years, we have to be at such and such a place based on what we know. Anyway, it's a long conversation. I had a bunch of questions I wanted to ask, but I think what I'll do is move to close the hearing and adjourn.

Mayor Pro Tem Anderson said thank you. Mr. Driggs, I did just want to add to your comment, because we did have CMS come in a while ago, and maybe it might be beneficial to have them come back and present how they do their utilization calculation, as well as some of the new schools that are planned to come online. We've referenced this new high school, Ballantyne Ridge, that we know is planned to be in the pipeline to come online. So, perhaps they might have some information to just share with your committee, Mr. Driggs, again around their utilization calculation and the frequency of it, because they do it more often than we initially thought. So, we were surprised by that last term, so that might be helpful.

Councilmember Watlington said I want to make sure that we're clear with ourselves and our constituents that it's not the other way around. We don't build and then the school system figures out how to fix it. Part of our responsibility, as we consider the factors for zoning, is population, and it is anticipated growth, so we don't get in a situation where our schools are overcrowded. That is absolutely within our lane. So, I just want to make sure that for those around this dais and those that are listening that we're clear, that our job is to consider population growth and its impacts when we're making zoning decisions. We don't leave it to school system to figure out on the back end.

Ms. Johnson said and if that's how Mr. Driggs decides to lead, then that's his personal decision, but again, I think it's responsible that we consider the impact on schools and the cumulative impact on infrastructure and all of that. So, we each lead our own way. Thank you.

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

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.



Ariel Smith, Lead Clerk

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 50 Minutes
Minutes completed: September 9, 2025