

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review on Monday, March 25, 2024, at 5:02 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Marjorie Molina, James Mitchell, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT: Councilmembers Tiawana Brown and Lawana Mayfield.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember Tariq Bokhari.

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much. We have Consent Items 22 through 41 that can be considered in one motion unless there is someone on the Council that would like to have a separate vote for any one of the items between 22 and 41.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 22 THROUGH 41 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS REMOVED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE REMOVED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

Mayor Lyles said is there anyone that would like to have a separate vote?

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Molina, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.
--

The following items were approved:

Item No. 22: Police Psychological Services and Fit for Duty Evaluations

(A) Approve a contract with FMRT Group, LLC for Police Psychological Services and Fit for Duty Evaluations for an initial term of two years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 23: Pedestrian Signal Housing Components

(A) Approve a unit price contract with General Traffic Equipment Corporation for the purchase of Pedestrian Signal Housing Components for a term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 24: Freightliner Parts and Services

(A) Approve a contract Amendment #2 with Excel Truck Group for Freightliner Parts and Services to increase the total contract amount by \$1,500,000, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for the remaining renewal term of one year with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract and this amendment were approved.

Item No. 25: Solid Waste Services Transitional Workforce Labor Contract

(A) Approve a unit price contract with the Center for Employment Opportunities for transitional workforce labor for an initial term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price

adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 26: Storm Water Educational Campaign Media Planning and Placement Services

(A) Approve contract amendment #1 to execute the first of two, one-year optional renewal terms to the contract with The Agency Marketing Group (SBE) for education campaign media planning and placement services, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for one additional, one-year renewal term and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract and this amendment were approved.

Item No. 27: Interlocal Agreement for Relocation of Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure

(A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute an interlocal agreement with Mecklenburg County for construction of sanitary sewer line relocations, adjustments, and improvements, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to approve the reimbursement request for the actual cost of the utility construction.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 102-103.

Item No. 28: CATS Magnetic Transit Passes Printing Services

(A) Approve a contract with EDM Technology for Magnetic Transit Passes Printing Services for an initial term of two years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to three, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 29: Airport Air Filtration Products and Exchange Services

(A) Approve a unit contract with United Air Filter Company for the purchase of air filtration products and related services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 30: Airport Ground Power Unit and Pre-Conditioned Air Unit Parts

(A) Approve the purchase of ground power unit and pre-conditioned air unit parts by the sole source exemption, (B) Approve a unit price contract with ITW GSE, Inc. for the purchase of ground power unit and pre-conditioned air unit parts for a term of three years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 31: Airport Property Lease with Xtreme Aviation

Approve a five-year lease agreement with Xtreme Aviation, LLC for warehouse and office space at the Airport.

Item No. 32: Bond Issuance Approval for Poplar Grove Apartments

Adopt a resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue new multi-family housing revenue bonds, in an amount not to exceed \$31,000,000, to finance the rehabilitation of an affordable housing development known as Poplar Grove Apartments.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 104-107.

Item No. 33: Set a Public Hearing on Kelly Woods Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for April 22, 2024, for Kelly Woods Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 108-109.

Item No. 34: Set a Public Hearing on the Parkwood Avenue Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for April 22, 2024, to consider historic landmark designation for the property known as the "Parkwood Avenue Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church" (Parcel Identification Number 083-093-09).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 110-111.

Item No. 35: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$1,313,459.42.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 112-120.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 36: Aviation Property Transactions – 5500 Wilkinson Boulevard

Acquisition of 49,049 square feet (1.126 acres) at 5500 Wilkinson Boulevard from Billy R. Johnson Jr. for \$1,500,000 and all relocation benefits in compliance with Federal, State, or Local regulations for Aviation Master Plan.

Item No. 37: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Kings Branch Stream and Sewer Improvements, Parcel # 1

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,948 square feet (0.07 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement; 16,178 square feet (0.37 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement within Existing Storm Drainage Easement; 6,050 square feet (0.14 acres) in Permanent Utility Easement; 10,653 square feet (0.25 acres) in Permanent Utility Easement overlapping Existing Storm Drainage Easement and Existing Sanitary Sewer Easement; 1,816 square feet (0.04 acres) in Permanent Utility Easement overlapping New Sanitary Sewer Easement at 604 Archdale Drive from GK Lexington Green, LLC for \$78,225 for Kings Branch Stream and Sewer Improvements, Parcel #1.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 121-122.

Item No. 38: Property Transactions – Ideal Way, Parcel # 1

Acquisition of 1,135 square feet (0.026 acres) Storm Drainage Easement at 2144 Kirkwood Avenue from Ellen Reid W. Sutton and William Sutton for \$27,108 for Ideal Way 816, Parcel # 1.

Item No. 39: Property Transactions – Rea Road Widening (I-485 to Williams Pond Lane), Parcel # 4

Acquisition of 3,363 square feet (0.077 acres) Fee Simple Outside Existing Right-of-Way, 5,381 square feet (0.124 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 7,221 square feet (0.166 acres) Permanent Utility Easement, 975 square feet (0.022 acres) Storm Drainage Easement and 8,584 square feet (0.197 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 7810 Ballantyne Commons Parkway and 5231 & 5235 Piper Station Drive from Colony at Piper Glen, LLC for \$444,600 for Rea Road Widening (I-485 to Williams Pond Lane).

Item No. 40: Property Transactions – Spring Valley Road, Parcel # 1

Acquisition of 932 square feet (0.021 acres) Storm Drainage Easement and 1,688 square feet (0.039 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3011 Spring Valley Road from David Alder and Rachel Lahbabi for \$10,950 for Spring Valley Road 3022, Parcel # 1.

Item No. 41: Property Transactions – Thermal Culverts Storm Drainage Improvement Project, Parcel # 7

Acquisition of 5,790 square feet (0.133 acres) Storm Drainage Easement and 2,318 square feet (0.053 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 6000 - 6032 Pineburr Road from HDP Glen Cove, LLC for \$100,000 for Thermal Culverts SDIP, Parcel # 7.

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, thank you, Mayor and members of Council. Tonight, we have, as an agenda item, an update on the Residential Development in the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance), and we have Alyson Craig that will provide that update, as well as we have a closed session item, Mayor, a real estate matter.

Alyson Craig, Planning, Design and Development said good evening, Mayor, Manager, and members of Council. I'm here tonight to talk to you about an update to the UDO, kind of what we've been seeing. So, the way I'm going to lay out the presentation this evening is, first, setting the stage, where are we now. Of course, when we are talking about evaluating how we're doing the UDO, the most important thing is to point back to our Comprehensive Plan goals. Then, I want to talk a little bit about what we're seeing in terms of submittals. We're about nine to 10 months after the UDO has gone into effect. Then, I want to talk a little bit about market trends. Of course, the market doesn't solely drive our decisions, but it is an important thing to understand when we are planning for the future. Then, I want to give a brief update about an update from the Transportation Planning and Development Committee referral, that was a referral from last summer, and talk about an upcoming text amendment that we will be filing tonight related to conservation development, and then discuss some other recommendations that I will be making this evening that we'll discuss more in committee.

So, first, starting with Charlotte's vision. Of course, the Comprehensive Plan is born from many years of community engagement, talking about what we wanted to see in our future, and as a reminder, the UDO is a tool that implements the Comprehensive Plan. So, we continue to evaluate what we're seeing to make sure that we are aligned with our Comprehensive Plan goals. Then recognizing that, while we have these goals in place, there are different ways in which we can implement these goals. So, I want to highlight two from the Comprehensive Plan tonight. First, is goal number two, Neighborhood Diversity Inclusion, that Charlotte will strive to have a diversity of housing options by increasing the presence of missing middle density housing. Number three, is housing access for all. Charlotte will ensure opportunities for residents of all income to access affordable housing. So, I think we can all agree that these are two very important goals to the City of Charlotte, but I think over time and we've been talking about the Comprehensive Plan and the UDO and even seeing what we've been receiving in site plans, is how exactly do we implement these goals, and we may not always be on the same page about that.

So, I want to stop for a moment and just highlight what we're seeing. So, we are really seeing a limited number of new infill duplexes and triplexes. When we talked about these goals in the Comprehensive Plan, this was a source of many, many conversations, concerns that we will see rapid change in our communities and wanting to make sure that we are not introducing change too fast, particularly in neighborhoods that are vulnerable to displacement. So, we implemented controls in the UDO that help to regulate height and driveway cuts, to help manage these changes, and a result, we haven't really seen a lot. We've seen about 140 duplexes and about 20 triplexes since the UDO went into effect. Right now, if you look out in the skyline, there is a ton of apartment activity, there is a ton of construction going. It is booming for sure right now. What I want to make sure you are aware of is that there's not a lot in the pipeline that's coming after that. It is a very challenging cost market, so the construction costs are very high, and frankly the lenders are not lending on these types of projects right now. I'm expecting that this will be the conditions for at least another year, if not two years. We're not seeing rezoning requests even. If you go back and you look through some of your last rezoning meetings, there's really very little to no apartments being proposed. What we are seeing is many, many requests for townhomes. You're seeing that in the rezoning process. There's tons of requests for rezonings in your packets. Not really seeing anything as it relates to single-family housing. It's really mostly townhomes, and these are great, because they're an opportunity to increase our ability for homeownership. So, we like townhomes.

The other thing that we're seeing, by-right, is that most of the subdivisions that are coming in since the UDO went into effect, about 90 percent of them that are coming in by-right, are being submitted with duplexes and triplexes using a conservation development option, that is something that is an option to deviate from the base standards in the UDO. The reason why people are using this is because the market is strong in attached units, they need smaller lot sizes, but we think that we need to right-size this tool to make sure that we're actually getting the conservation that we need.

I wanted to talk through a little bit of market trends. So, this is a graph showing, from 2018 to 2023, the number of new building permits that have been issued. So, like I was talking about, and you've seen, tons and tons of apartments, that very top color there in green, you'll see that particularly, over the last three or so years, we have had a boom in apartments. This isn't surprising. There's a lot of interest in living in South End, a ton of apartments going up there. In 2020, we did an alignment rezoning for TOD (Transit Oriented Development), so went ahead and the City proactively rezoned the TOD Corridor, and so there was a lot of development by-right. So, you're seeing a lot of activity in the apartments. We won't really see a lot of the effects of the UDO in this figure, because it didn't go into effect until halfway through 2023. So, this is really just what was happening in the market beforehand.

A couple other things to note. You can look at the bottom color, that dark blue, those are the number of new building permits issued for single-family detached, and you can see that those have been declining over the last few years. In turquoise, those are your townhomes, and you can see that the demand and the number of building permits issued for townhomes has increased over the last few years.

I want to talk a little bit about pricing. So, these are Charlotte average-home prices for new construction from 2018 and 2023, and you can see in 2018 the numbers between single-family homes and townhomes were fairly similar, and while they've both increased over time, you've seen a much stronger increase in the average cost of a new single-family home than you have for a townhome. I'd even say the trends are going up for single-family and they're going down for townhomes, and while I wouldn't say that a \$418,000 townhome is affordable, it's certainly more attainable than \$554,000.

In terms of new construction closings. So, this is the number of new construction closings for single-family detached, townhomes and condos, since 2010. What I want you to notice on the bottom with the darker blue, again the single-family, that the number of new construction closings in 2023 was the lowest that it has been since 2012. We've continued to see an increase in the number of new construction closings for townhomes, and in fact in 2023, it was almost equivalent to single-family homes. I want to just remind you all that the work and the recommendations that I'm presenting here tonight, they do relate back to last year's 2023 referral to committee. We have come before the committee three different times. The September 2023 update was fairly brief, but we did present some considerations in August 2023 and in February 2024. Some of things we really wanted Council to focus on is, thinking about in these subdivisions and these larger developments, looking at the quantity of the unit, so how many units you're getting, the quality of the development, and then the location, like where the development actually is.

So, this evening, after this presentation, we'll be filing a text amendment for conservation development. Again, we discussed this in committee, and so I want to just walk through what this is and why we're making this text amendment now and wanting to proceed with immediate action, is that again, it's a development option in the UDO, that allows you to deviate from the base standards in N-1 (Neighborhood-1) zoning district, allows you to reduce your lot size by 50 percent in exchange for additional open space. What we're finding is we're not really getting what we intended, so a conservation development is a tried-and-true planning concept. It's been around for decades, and the idea is that you take a traditional layout of a subdivision and you cluster and allow smaller lot sizes, so the open space is not in the individual larger lot, it's protecting larger areas of tree save, open space, conservation area, while allowing some additional density. Instead, and this is an example project that's been submitted,

what we're seeing is not really getting at what we had intended, and so I'll point to a couple things. You'll see in the top right, you've got units that are fronting other units, so the 43 through 45, you probably can't see those numbers, but those units where the first red arrow is, they're actually facing the side of another building. The development is very close to existing subdivisions, so there's not really a transition that's there that's adequate, that we believe. Again, the open space is smaller, it's fragmented.

Then, I think the most important thing to note here is that, while you've got a couple public streets, there's a series of alleyways that are throughout the development. With alleys, there's no requirement for street trees. They may be less expensive now, because the streets are not as wide, there's not as much area as a public street, but you're just deferring a cost. So, ultimately, the responsibility of maintaining those alleys goes to the HOA (Homeowners Association). So, while it's less expensive right now, it will come back in terms of maintenance to be a requirement that the homeowners and the property owners will have to then pay for. Then, there's some concerns about emergency service and if solid waste can access.

So, we're proposing a text amendment, again, I mentioned will be filed tonight. This is, really feel, is closing a loophole and addressing some unintended consequences in the UDO, and really focusing on increasing the quality and the quantity of conservation and open space, so that would be an additional 15 percent of tree save, to be a total of 40 percent. Right now, a project that is two acres in size, could use this development option, and we propose that we increase that to five. So, again, you're creating larger areas of quality open space, and increase the minimum dimensions of open space so that you have larger areas, and make sure there's clear standards of what usable open space is supposed to be. We'll add a perimeter buffer requirement and require lots to front onto public streets or open space. So, again going back to that quantity, quality, and location, this text amendment, I think, really addresses the concerns about quality, but indirectly, because you're requiring additional things to be set aside for public streets, for open space, and for a perimeter buffer, it will result in a decrease in the number of units.

So, we've been before the UDO Advisory Committee, have met with a number of different stakeholders, and then we'll have two info sessions for feedback to staff on April 2, 2024, in the night. We'll have information on Charlotte UDO website, we'll send out emails, we'll post it on social. The schedule is, again, we're filing tonight, it'll go to Planning Commission, a public hearing is set for April 15, 2024, go to Zoning Committee later than month, and then requesting Council action on May 20, 2024. So, as it relates to this, again, staff's been doing a lot of research in the background.

I want to talk about two recommendations that I want to bring forward tonight, and then we'll certainly go back to the Transportation, Planning and Development Committee for further discussion. The first is prioritizing new housing supply in key locations. So, there's a reason why everyone is using this conservation tool. The addition of smaller lot sizes is needed for new development projects. So, we want to create a new type of development option, called compact development. This is something that other cities have. We had a version of this in the pre-UDO standards. Raleigh has something similar. So, we allow smaller lot sizes, and we allow projects to reduce these lot sizes if they're an affordable project, or if they're a development that's located near a center, high frequency transit, priority areas for housing supply, and maybe explore other priority locations. Again, this is new and exploratory and we're going to be working in more detail with different stakeholders to talk about what this would look like.

So, right now in the UDO, the way the lot standards are set, is there set so that you're protecting existing neighborhoods, and so they are larger, because we want to protect the lotting patterns of existing neighborhoods, but when you're creating a new subdivision, you're in a sense, creating a new neighborhood. So, we want to be able to allow flexibility in these lot standards to make sure that we're getting the kind of projects that we want. So, this example shown here, this is an affordable housing project. It's in an N-1A zoning district, which has a 10,000 square foot minimum lot size, and what they're really wanting here with these duplexes, are for-sale affordable duplexes, to

reduce the lot size to 6,000. I think that this is a great concept for making sure that we're allowing different types of housing, particularly affordable housing, in our communities.

The next recommendation is talking about right-sizing housing diversity. So, in Neighborhood-1, we have six different zoning districts, A through F, with A being the least intense and F being the most intense.

Councilmember Bokhari arrived at 5:19 p.m.

While our lot standards reflect a gradient of intensity from A to F, we haven't really allowed for that gradient of uses, in terms of the allowable uses in the different districts. So, the proposal that we have before you today is that, on infill lots and in new subdivisions, that we limit triplexes to corners only, in the zoning districts N-1A, B, C and D. Triplexes can be challenging, because there's a challenge between maintaining the pedestrian environment, but also recognizing that there's cars in driveways and driveway cuts, and it's really hard to have both of those, and so thinking that it's better to have triplexes on a corner where you could have driveways on two different street frontages to really space that out. We also recognize that there is a lot of demand, there's ownership opportunities for townhomes. So, we want to allow townhomes, they're not allowed now in N-1E and F, and potentially even incorporate those into the compact development option, because again, townhomes there's a lot of demand for them and there is a lot of opportunity to provide additional homeownership through a townhome. Lastly, we haven't seen a lot of duplexes, as I mentioned. In fact, I think the latest numbers that I've seen, it's a little bit less than what we've had in prior years, and so we need to look at those standards to make sure that duplexes are viable. Again, these are a great product, they've been around for decades. We've always allowed duplexes on our corners, and so making sure that we do have an opportunity to see more of these.

So, I wanted to show you a map. These are all the different Neighborhood-1 zoning districts in the City of Charlotte. So, right now we allow single-family duplexes and triplexes in all of those zoning districts, and so what I'm proposing is that, in N1-A through D, that triplexes are only allowed on corners, and that in E and F, we introduce townhomes to those zoning districts where they're not allowed today. You can see from the map, there's not a lot of purple, and we don't have any N-1F on the ground today. So, this would require a rezoning, but it would be consistent with our policy and meet our needs and the goals in the Comprehensive Plan. Ultimately, after the Community Area Planning process, there will be an alignment rezoning, where we will go through and align the zoning with the Policy Map. So, at that point, the City proactively will be adding more of E and F, but that will be after the Area Planning process occurs.

So, the schedule for both of those recommendations, and again, I've mentioned that we've spent the last few months doing a lot of research and analysis. We've been working in the background. We've hired a consultant to do some testing and do some market analysis for us, and really the next few months wanting to get some additional feedback from the community. For the compact development option, I think it's really important to engage the design community, just because it is very, very technical, and we are laying out sites and doing site plans and making sure we have those individuals in the room to make sure we're getting that tool correctly. Then, of course, going to our Advisory Committee, having stakeholder meetings, having in-person and virtual engagement. We'll have more information on all of our social and websites, send out emails. So, we'll have more information to go to the committee and Planning Commission in April 2024 and May 2024, again the same groups file potential text amendments then, and public hearing and Council action in June 2024 and July 2024. So, with that, I am happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Ajmera said can you go back to the slide where you had 90 percent. So, 90 percent of residential subdivisions submitted are duplexes and triplexes. So, this wouldn't apply to those that have already submitted their plan. So, this would be moving forward. How many units approximately are we talking about here?

Ms. Craig said there's probably 1,500 or so. There's a good number, but again, there's a lot of activity, and I'll say to you, a lot of these projects that are being submitted, they look like two and three-unit townhomes. So, they're not in the traditional form of a duplex that you might see in some of our older, more established, neighborhoods. So, once you have a complete submittal in, then you are held to the regulations that are in place when you submitted.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you, Ms. Craig. So, go back to the slide where it talks about, what was the intention where you had side-by-side comparison. The slide where it talks about the intent of having this as part of the UDO. So, certainly, I like that with this amendment we'll be able to preserve our rich tree canopy. I've been advocating for it for a while, especially our open space. As our city grows at such a fast space, open space and greenspace continues to be a challenge. So, having that as part of this amendment would certainly help, but at the same time, there is another part of the equation, which is the housing density. How do we address our affordable housing crisis by having more housing density? It doesn't necessarily mean, to your point, that \$414,000 unit is affordable, but it's more affordable than single-family home that would cost \$550,000. I need to understand this more in depth. At this point, this is a new concept. I would need to see more data, because I feel like we just went through this exercise a year or two ago, and it's been only six months or eight months, and we are back at it again. So, there is a lot that we need to unpack here before I can say, "Hey, I'm board with this." Certainly, I appreciate how this would help us create more open space, greenspace, also preserve neighborhood's character. For projects less than five acres, this wouldn't apply, right?

Ms. Craig said right now, projects less than five acres. So, two acres or more would be able to use these provisions, and we're recommending that we go to five, so that you are getting larger expanses of open space, but the compact development option that I talked about, would be two acres and more, so again, like trying to make sure that we're getting that housing supply. I just wanted to mention too, I just want us all to remember that we haven't really updated our regulations in 30 years, and we're trying to tackle housing affordability and tree canopy and stormwater and conservation, and so many different things, and regulations, the words are very important and very impactful, and so a very slight change in a word, could mean that you're putting homes on alleys instead of on a public street, and so wanting to make sure we've got that right.

Ms. Ajmera said no, that's fair enough. I think having a specific example, Alyson, would help. "Hey, here is an example. What would be developed under current language that we have. What will be developed under this amendment?" I think having that side-by-side comparison, having an example, would certainly help us. Most of us are not planners, land use experts. So, I think having that would sort of help me understand what are we trying to get to? How about infill, where it's less than an acre? We often see that. Any changes to that?

Ms. Craig said so, the infill changes that we're recommending are in terms of the uses, and so the only changes really would be limiting triplexes to corners, and introducing more townhomes, which are not allowed in our N-1 zoning districts.

Ms. Ajmera said so, in terms of allowing townhomes, limiting triplexes to corners, ultimately, we are trying to take away density, rightfully so in certain instances, but we introduced a lot of these regulations around stormwater and a lot of nuances that was part of the UDO with the promise that they'll get more density. So, I think as part of this overall analysis, I think having cost analysis would be also important, and we did that exercise as part of the UDO. I know Mr. Driggs had asked for a cost benefit analysis as part of the UDO exercise. I think having that would also be helpful and having this UDO and what would this be under amendment from the cost perspective. That's all I have. I'll touch base with you one-on-one to really dig deeper.

Ms. Craig said sure, and I just wanted to say too, I'm a very strong proponent of affordability and housing supply, and really what we didn't do initially in the UDO is really right sizing and making sure we are prioritizing density where it's most important.

So, I think it's really more about making some adjustments, so that we are getting housing supply in the areas that are most important, and maybe recognizing that in our less intense districts, that maybe that's not the place to put the highest density.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, no, that's well said. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said Ms. Craig, thank you. So, I want to be clear, we're talking two things here. One of them is addressing the cluster/conservation issue, and other one is the referral. So, on the cluster/conservation thing, I regard this as essentially closing a loophole. Like, we had that provision with a certain idea in the mind, and the idea was that if you could create a contiguous open space for the benefit of people, then their individual homes could be on smaller lots. That's not what we're getting. So, we're on a faster track to try and address that. The concern I have, Ms. Craig, is that we exclude the plans that we think are not respectful of our intent, but without denying our original purpose. So, if someone comes along with a plan that does align with what we intended previously, is that going to have to change, because of what you're suggesting, or would that plan still work?

Ms. Craig said so, it depends on if it's been submitted or not, and so anything that's been submitted would follow past regulations, but we would work with other individuals that may be in a preliminary stage of sketch plans or like preliminary designs, to talk to them about how to meet the updated regulations.

Mr. Driggs said but what I'm saying is if somebody comes along with a brand new plan that was fine according to what we intended, is that now not going to work, because of changes that you're making in order to combat what we consider to be improper?

Ms. Craig said I mean, if they've designed the site without buffers, without public streets, without adequate open space, then they will have to make some adjustments if this amendment is passed, and it probably will result in a reduction in units.

Mr. Driggs said so, that's a little more than just excluding the things that we didn't want, and that concerns me a little bit. The other question I had was, and we talked about this a little bit, but how much extra density are people getting because of the fact that they're doing this the way they are? Or putting it differently, if we now apply the new rules to some of these plans, do you have any idea how much smaller the density would be, how many fewer units there would be?

Ms. Craig said we've been doing some testing, and it's tough, because every site's different. It depends on how it's shaped and what the topography is, and all of those sorts of things. So, I've seen anything from a 15 to a 30 percent reduction, but it really depends on the site, and that's just an initial stab, and I'm sure a site designer would probably have a different.

Mr. Driggs said we used to assume it was about 20 percent under the old. So, talking about the effectiveness, you said we would work with people. We need to be pretty specific about who can proceed and who can't. Given that we only have a six-week line, there are going to be people who have been working on something for a while. So, are we going to make clear what can still move ahead and what can't, or is the intention on May 20, 2024, that that's it, nothing else passes?

Ms. Craig said I mean, I think that because of the concerns that we have for things like emergency access and the maintenance of streets and things that I think are really critical for people who may not even understand that, when they purchase the house or they rent a house in the neighborhoods, I think what we're trying to do is make sure that we're protecting those individuals.

Mr. Driggs said so, this will be discussed in the UDO Advisory Committee?

Ms. Craig said it has been. In March 2024 it was discussed, yes.

Mr. Driggs said okay. So, I'm just interested to hear if there's an industry response there, and make sure that's part of our overall deliberation. So, as to the three recommendations, is that your answer to the referral, or will it be more related to the referral, or are those really the only things that we should expect?

Ms. Craig said at this point, these are the three things that I think we should be prioritizing. I think, again, it's right-sizing where we want housing. We've heard some concerns about some large developments with duplexes and triplexes and really intense development in the ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction). We've heard a lot of concerns there, but we also have heard from our housing advocates how important housing supply is. Then, we're in a market right now where townhomes, they're being financed, they're being built, and they're providing homeownership opportunities, and I think that these three recommendations really will address the concerns, while still allowing for us to say that we're implementing our vision and making sure we're providing housing.

Mr. Driggs said and those would apply for two acres on up?

Ms. Craig said the compact two acres and up, but again, these are early concepts that we want to work. That one in particular needs to be worked through with the design and development community, because it is so technical, and then we can talk, of course, more broadly about just the policy implications of allowing these in targeted areas where we want to grow.

Mr. Driggs said I mean some of this goes right back to what we were talking about so heatedly a couple of years ago, but I'm glad at least that we are now tackling those things, but thank you for that. Good presentation. Thanks.

Councilmember Watlington said I've got a couple of things. Firstly, I think that, in terms of effective date, that's really up to how many of us around the dais are happy to have it go into effect. So, I think we can talk about those kinds of things in terms of when we'll see those changes. Myself, I'm fine to go ahead and have this new update effective upon approval, but I'm open to conversations about what that runway could look like. My question for you, Alyson, is on slide four where it talks about the 90 percent residential subdivisions, I'd love to see where those are.

Ms. Craig said sure. I don't have a map in the deck, but we have mapped that, and I'd be happy to provide that in a followup.

Ms. Watlington said awesome. Then, my next question, or not so much a question, more of a comment on slide five. What jumps out to me, even as you mentioned that the 2023 increase in multi-family is not necessarily reflective of the UDO, I find it interesting that we have this activity. I wonder how do we match and map that towards what our true goal seemed to be in the beginning, which was about missing middle and about affordability, because to your point, where a lot of these are being built, it really attracts a different type of customer, not necessarily those folks who are not able to pay that market rate or that luxury price point. So, I just wanted to hear your comments on that. What do you think is driving this multi-family piece? Is it just the market irrespective of our policy?

Ms. Craig said I think it's a few different things. I think there was a lot of pent-up demand from the pandemic. I think that there was a lot of interest in living in South End. I mean, there's a ton of people moving to South End. Certainly, a function of us rezoning the blue line and having TOD by-right and having that transportation available there, I think that also drove things, so I think it's that. I think some of our younger generation may prefer to not live in a single-family home. They're looking for something that's more about the experience and less about their space. So, we see that with these smaller lot subdivisions as well as apartments, and so, there really wasn't any other option. So, it was either multi-family or as a single-family home, and they may want something in between, but we didn't have that ability, so people were going to apartments. So, it's a number of different things, but again, I think that everything that I've heard and learned in the market, is just that there is no lending for multi-family. So,

we'll probably have another spike in 2024, because you're going to have a lag, but then it's going to come back down.

Ms. Watlington said okay. I also think it's interesting that, if you look at the numbers now, it's about 38 percent more expensive still to purchase a home versus renting. So, I think that's certainly prohibitive, which speaks to the need in my opinion for more ownership options. My next question and I know I've asked you this before, but I just want to offer it up again. I would love to see our peer cities who maybe have not implemented some of these increased density, because I want to see what impact that has on the price differential between single-family detached and townhomes, because certainly as there are fewer and fewer single-family detached, of course, I would expect their price to rise. I'm very curious to see if we can understand what role that density policy has in creating a price differential or minimizing it. Then, as I go over to slide 11. So, looking at these two, if I'm understanding it correctly, and please correct me if I'm wrong, the intent is for the same space to have the same number of units, it's just that because the lots are smaller, you get more greenspace?

Ms. Craig said so, there's different approaches to conservation, particularly over time. I mean, I think when it was originally conceived, it was that it's the same number of units, but a lot more open space. Now, the way conservation is leaning, I think there is an allowance for a little more density, as long as there's a significant and meaningful amount of open space provided. I don't think we care as much about, is it 10 for 10 or is it 10 for 15. It's more about what you're actually saving on the side.

Ms. Watlington said right, and so I think this is very much a win-win, in that it preserves open space, it preserves permeable surfaces, but also you don't necessarily see less units, you see smaller lot sizes, which should translate to a more affordable product. So, I'm happy to see these particular changes. When it comes to recommendation number one on slide 16, I just want to call out there that, as you'd mentioned wanting to make sure that we still preserve the character of existing neighborhoods, I wanted to know how you all are thinking about subdivision, in particular? What do you mean when you say subdivision? There are places in our city where we have neighborhoods, and then there are adjacent areas that may be completely different in character, in terms of that development, but they flow together as if they were one neighborhood. So, how are we thinking about delineating? I understand infill and neighborhood character, but as we talk about transitioning from one neighborhood to another, how are you all thinking about that?

Ms. Craig said so, that's one of the things that we're wanting to add in the conservation, is allowing more transition area. So, this compact development option, prioritizing development where we need it the most, maybe that transition is a little bit different or smaller than it might be for conservation. This is a new concept for us, and I think it's going to take us a little bit of time to develop, but we're trying to find that happy medium between researching it and analyzing it, but also recognizing that we need more housing, and attached housing is an option and is important for townhomes and homeownership. So, we need to have a tool for that. We don't need to rush it, but we need to find a solution.

Ms. Watlington said absolutely. So, I would just offer up, as you all are figuring that out, and I know, like you said, you don't have all the answers, but let's think about not only what's in neighborhoods and avoiding infill development that doesn't match, but also thinking about how those neighborhoods, even if they're subdivisions, connect to each other and their impact on each other. So, I'm curious as to an N-1A through D, I see that you're recommending that we make the change from triplexes allowed, to triplexes on the corners only. Why are townhomes not included here, or are they baked into A through D?

Ms. Craig said so, when the UDO went into effect, townhomes outside of two buildings, were only allowed in Neighborhood-2. So, we really went back and thought through policy and looked through our goals, and think that really what the policy was intending to do was to allow higher density or our higher intensity residential development in our

higher intensity zoning districts. So, right now, outside of a couple buildings, unless you rezone to N-2, you can't do townhomes, and so we think it's important to introduce back.

Ms. Watlington said so, then I'll say this, that I could be more comfortable with allowing townhomes in some of those lower intensity uses, particularly because they provide an ownership option versus the triplexes on the corner. So, I don't know what the rest of Council feels in that way, but I would welcome townhomes as an option in the lower intensity areas as long as they're done, obviously, with respect to the character of those neighborhoods. Then, just in general, as I link this back to the conversations we were having earlier with the Budget, I think we've got to think about strategically how do we link our dollars to our development policy, and if these are the types of development that we are trying to encourage, that has to show up in how we incentivize development all the way through our Budget and our bond cycle as well. One of the other things that, just as we're having those conversations that I think is important to think about, is beyond just new development, how do we use our dollars to, not only direct new development, but also leverage existing development, because we know that there are vacancy rates in a lot of these buildings. So, we don't necessarily have to subsidize building new ones, but we probably need to figure out how to further leverage the programs that we have that are specific to letting people, or creating attractiveness, of allowing folks into these vacant units in some of these existing properties. Does that make sense?

Ms. Craig said yes. Thank you.

Ms. Watlington said okay, thanks so much.

Councilmember Graham said Ms. Craig, thank you very much for the presentation, and thank you for meeting with me last week. So, I don't have any questions really. I have some comments on it I'd like to make for the record, and to some of my colleagues. One of the things that we said we would do, when we passed the UDO, and we acknowledge, is that it was not a perfect document, and that they'll be steps along the way where we would have to make amendments or changes based on what we saw happening on the ground, and we've done that before. I think the first text amendment that you outlined is another example of seeing what's happening on the ground and making the appropriate corrective action to ensure that we keep the integrity of the UDO moving forward. So, I think that's really appropriate.

Number two, A and B, gives me a little bit of heartburn, because it's almost like déjà vu. Part of what we said was that the 2040 Plan that we adopted, and the UDO, was not for how we are living today, but how we see our city and people and planning live tomorrow, 2040, 2050, 2060, and making the tough decisions necessary today for a better tomorrow, and I think we've done that, and I'm open for amendment and changes. Part of what I think, as a Council, that we have to do for the development community and our residents and our neighborhoods, as it relates to the UDO and planning, is provide a level of certainty that people understand what the rules of the games are, and that we don't change the rules in the middle of the game, and have people go back and redo their work. I think that it doesn't bode well for Charlotte as a friendly community to do business in, from a development perspective, and unabashedly, I'm pro-development, plan growth, plan development, good infrastructure, good land use policies, good vision for the community. I think that's what makes our community grow and prosperous. So, I'm a little concerned that we've got the onion out and that we're peeling it back, and I'm almost certainly starting tomorrow, we're going to get a lot of phone calls, because of the uncertainty of what people can do and what they can't do and what the future holds. The UDO in itself was a series of compromises among developers and residents, and even members of this Council went back and forth in terms of trying to get a document that wasn't perfect, but a document that we all agree that we can move forward with, and we did that.

So, I hope that as we go back to the community, that we're really intentional in terms of the community engagement, with a wide variety of audience, to ensure that we have

some certainty on that timeline we try to address, so that we can make a decision yes or no sooner than later, so people can have an understanding of what we're doing and why we're doing it, and they can understand what the rules of the games are. I'm a team player, so I'll go along with it, but some of the questions that I've heard, in talking to my colleagues before this meeting, is getting in the weeds, and been there done that. Thank you.

Ms. Craig said thank you. We did know that by changing and updating our regulations, like we haven't really done, that we weren't going to get everything right, and I completely agree with you about certainty. I mean, the community wants certainty. The development community wants certainty. Council wants certainty. So, I think we're just in a period where implementation is new, and so we're learning and we're trying to make informed and data-driven decisions, and I think this will not remain this way. I think it's just about making sure we're getting it right, but I appreciate your point.

Councilmember Johnson said I really appreciate the presentation. I think that one of the things you said, that one of the things that might have been overlooked was, and you can repeat it if I paraphrase incorrectly, but we didn't focus initially on where those high-density needs should be. I know that, as one of the Council members that was opposed to the UDO, it was for that reason. I know that some of these challenges were foreseeable, and I think that that's all that we were trying to communicate. You said, "Development where we need it the most." Can you define that, please?

Ms. Craig said I mean, we may all have different opinions about what that looks like, but I do think that it is very important to have housing next to transportation options, and so, I think that's key, which is why we rezoned along the blue line, as making sure that we're connecting housing and transportation, because that's a real cost. I also think the Activity Centers that are outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and in the Policy Map, are areas where we're focusing on creating that 10-minute neighborhood, and it's also, you heard earlier today, talking about the strategic investment areas, and you mentioned centers, we're trying to connect the dots of infrastructure and housing and density, and so by really focusing on those centers, I think we're trying to compliment those. So, those would be the first things that come to mind, but there may be others as we start to talk to the community that we may need to think about.

Ms. Johnson said one of the things that I would add is, let's take a look at the infrastructure. So, I think that was just an important piece, and that's why we pushed for the infrastructure discussion. If we can balance the infrastructure capacity, if you will, or funding or plan, with these high-density areas, I think that's what we talk about, when we say responsible and strategic development. In looking at the map, one of the things that Councilmember Ajmera said, she talked about a comparison. I'd also like to see that comparison, what was allowed in that neighborhood before, or just more definition. If we could get more definition, and Councilmember Watlington asked that question also. So, single-family, duplexes and triplexes on corner lots in N-1A through N-1D. So, right now, quadplexes are only allowed on arterial roads, is that correct? So, that kind of detail, if you can give us that information. So, the proposal is that quadplexes would be allowed on the same lots where duplexes and [inaudible].

Ms. Craig said we haven't quite figured that out. So, quadplexes are, sometimes there's actually a good picture of one on the bottom right here. I think, in the past, their build was like two up, two down, so it was like the same footprint as a duplex. It's a great product, particularly when, like in the UDO, we talk about it requiring an affordable unit in order to build them, but then they're also sometimes built end to end, four in a row, so it's essentially a 4-unit townhome. So, we are still trying to figure out what we might want to change with that, but I appreciate you connecting me with a developer that's wanting to do something like that, and is struggling because it's not allowed, and it seems like a great product, and she's talking handicap accessible and affordable. So, I didn't get into that, because it's kind of a nuanced part of it, but we are looking at that, and maybe expanding, because right now they're only allowed in all the districts on an arterial with an affordable unit.

Ms. Johnson said and so, we'd need to see that, if this change is going to be the same or if you're considering allowing it.

Ms. Craig said we're considering something different, but we just haven't figured that out yet.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so we'll get more detail on that. Then, I was a little confused. I heard three different things for this change. I heard two acres or more, five acres or more, or one acre or more. So, can you explain the changes that you're proposing?

Ms. Craig said yes. So, conservation development, and that's where we're reducing the lot sizes, that would be five acres or more, so that the area that you're conserving for open space and tree save is higher. There's a compact development option in priority areas, which we'll continue to talk about. That would be two acres or more, because I think those are probably smaller projects, adjacent to centers or adjacent to transportation, and then there's the change, this last one about right-sizing housing diversity. So, this would be for infill lots and for new subdivisions. So, it's those three changes.

Ms. Johnson said and that's one acre or more?

Ms. Craig said no. So, this would be on infill lots, so like an individual lot that's in any neighborhood from N-1A to, so, it could be 10,000 square feet, half an acre. It just depends on what the lotting pattern in that particular district is.

Ms. Johnson said because what I don't want to see, or I don't think residents want to see, is a quadplex allowed on a small infill lot. I would make sure we were going to stay away from that. Okay. As far as, and we had this conversation in our small group meeting, the housing demand for single-family, I'm with Councilmember Watlington when we talk about the sales versus the demand. Those sales, or the closing don't necessarily illustrate the demand, I think, because it's kind of a limited product at this point, right? So, how do we increase the number of single-family developments in the City? Is there a plan for that? That's what I'd like to see. I'd like to still, if we can, take a look at single-family development. We heard that Goldman Sachs presentation. I don't know if you've had a chance to pull that, but we don't want to run the risk of having too much multi-family in the City and we have vacancy rates, because we hear from residents. If there's a market for it, if we can incentivize builders, I don't know what that looks like, but I think that single-family, there's still a market for that.

Then, lastly, if the market's changing and we have so much multi-family pending, do developers have an option, I guess, to come back and give us a new petition, or is there a plan or an option for them to reconsider what's being built? Is that just the regular redevelopment process? What can happen, because I know there's a lot of multi-family pending development in District 4? If there are any developers that want to take advantage or recognize the need, is there a plan, or what would happen?

Ms. Craig said so, any project that had gone through the rezoning process for multi-family and they wanted to do something different, they would have to come back before you all with a new plan and a new public hearing and a new vote. So, in order to change course like that, if it's a conditional plan, they would have to come back.

Ms. Johnson said are we seeing that, because I think we've talked about one multi-family development in my district that, because of the market needed to change or the developer was looking, I guess, to sell the project, or, are we seeing that right now?

Ms. Craig said I mean, we're seeing some, and there are still people that are going through and wanting to just keep their entitlements and wait and see how the market transpires. So, it's hard to say, because it's the financing conditions that are very challenging right now, and so I think a lot of developers are kind of waiting to see how that plays out.

Ms. Johnson said so, do you have a list of petitions that are delayed, or?

Ms. Craig said I mean, we could certainly go back and look at approved projects and reference back to those that haven't started the permitting process. I mean that's probably something that we could create.

Ms. Johnson said I'd like to see that for District 4, at least. I don't know what the other Council members would like to see, but I would like to see that. Thank you. That's all I have.

Ms. Craig said okay.

Councilmember Bokhari said I'll just start by saying I'm a little confused by how these recommendations came from the referral to see how duplexes and triplexes in larger projects developing by-right are impacted in the UDO, but I'll put that aside. I'm sure we'll talk about that later. I just think wholistically, as I look at all this and I remember back to the two years of very contentious battles that we had over this topic, there were a lot of things that many of us saw as fundamental problems with the UDO, that made this moment and the moments we're still experiencing, very anticipatable. We absolutely knew there were some things that were coming, and we screamed it as loud as we possibly could, and we weren't able to be successful there. Two of the biggest ones were the capping of large development density, i.e., heights in certain areas that were not logical. Some things have been adjusted, but really, we were very conservative as it related to large projects in density, which we knew we needed, and we were very aggressive on small developments. This was abolishing single-family zoning. I think that's the crux of one of the greatest flaws that we had committed during that time, and that's why we had a razor-thin vote, and I think the biggest lesson everyone learned out of this is, don't make massive City changes on a razor-thin vote, because a lot has to happen and be figured out, and if the foundation is not firm on that, there's going to be a lot of problems.

So, Councilmember Graham left, but it's funny, because we were opposed to each other in that two-year period, and I find myself in absolute agreement with his statement right now on really, what are the impacts of what we're doing? It hasn't been a full year that this has been the law of the land, and we're circling back saying, "Okay, well it's time to make these changes now." The two goals of the UDO, in my terms, were simplify the ordinances to the building and the community at large, that's predictability. They need the predictability to be able to operate in these worlds, and for us to continue being moving things around, doesn't make a lot of sense, and then increasing the units that are available to meet the demand that is growing in Charlotte.

So, for me, I mean I have a really big problem. I still stand firm on my position from the two years going into this, but for staff and Mr. Manager, for you guys to hear, there's two things that will be nonstarters for anything that I'll vote on. I have to have these before I support anything. Number one is, it can't be an ordinance or a change that says, "These are the rules for this part of town, and these are the rules for another part of town." It has to be consistent, which is why I'm just curious, at a glance, and I'm just seeing this for the first time, so I need to have time to talk to staff, but 2.1 was the abolishment of single-family zoning. I don't know what's changed between now and less than a year ago that would give us this aha moment, but why would we, rather than make things more complex, just not go back and reverse 2.1, if that's what we're going to do? It can't be a political reason as to why 2.1 was implemented to begin with. It needs to be an actual reason why that isn't the thing we're actually doing, or are we trying to soften its wording, and say "Well, this part of town it's okay to do that, but not here."

Then, number two, I don't want to talk about another thing until we get serious about infrastructure. We constantly hear this. We heard it in the last zoning meeting, where these neighbors, who are now experiencing all of these very anticipatable moments that the UDO has brought, they're asking where are guys at with your responsibilities of water and stormwater, sidewalks, roads, all the infrastructure necessary, and the answer is, we've done nothing since then of materiality compared to how much time we

continue to spend on the rules to dump rocket fuel on development and growth. So, I appreciate the fact that some of the things we predicted are coming to fruition. I don't appreciate it, but I recognize it, and the wrong answer is to go and try to create, here's a little, thread the needle here or there. That's how we have the Frankenstein patchwork quilt that was the ordinances before, and we are in danger of following down that same path. That's how these things occur. So, let's fix it and let's fix it correctly, now that people seem to be recognizing that.

Councilmember Anderson said thank you, Alyson, for the presentation, and I was able to connect with you last week to ask some specific questions on the recommendations here. So, I don't really have a lot of questions. What I would say, though, is that where you have the market trends, and we understand the macro-dynamics that are going on from an economic perspective, but I think what I'm hearing you say, in addition to addressing the conservation portion that's being abused, is also seeing that we need to be malleable for diverse housing types. What we're seeing in the marketplace overall is the baby boomers who dominate the employment market, and they are dominating the homeownership percentage as a whole, they're exiting out of the workforce and downsizing. That's a trend that's been occurring and will continue to occur over the next few years. Conversely, just at a national level, we have 70 percent of the millennials saying they would like to be homeowners, but they can't afford it due to high costs and they don't make enough money. So, introducing opportunities for a diversity of housing types in a way that makes sense and respects the aesthetic and charm of established neighborhoods, I think is a good strategic outlook approach. So, I'm looking forward to, as we continue discussions on this particular recommendation, and hearing from the public as well, what we're hearing the public here in Charlotte say.

Mayor Lyles said alright. I think everyone has had an opportunity to speak to the issue. Thank you very much, Ms. Craig, for bringing this forward, and making these adjustments. We are very fortunate to be in a city that's still growing, very fortunate to be in a city that we can still talk about the accommodation for housing supply. We're not perfect, but I will tell you, Charlotte is above its weight, when we talk about these kinds of issues. So, a lot of that has to do with how the staff has approached this, and of course they'll be changes, but I know that we're in the right direction across this country, if you look at any other major city, like those that we often visit. Okay, thank you guys.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION (AS NECESSARY)

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, seconded by Councilmember Molina, and carried unanimously to go into closed session to instruct City staff and negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken by the City in negotiating the price or other materials terms of the contract, or proposed contract, for the acquisition of real property pursuant to NC General Statute § 143.318.11 (a) (5).

The meeting was recessed at 6:10 p.m. for a closed session in Room 267. The closed session recessed at 6:48 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, March 25, 2024, at 6:54 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT: Councilmembers Tariq Bokhari, Tiawana Brown, and Lawana Mayfield

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said thank you for your patience. Sometimes we have time management issues, and so we hope that you will accept that this was one of those times for us. So, I want to call to order the Charlotte City Council Business Meeting for March 25, 2024, and I'm glad that you actually stayed and didn't leave us. So, let me begin with a call to order, and then we will start with introductions.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Graham gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by all.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said the next section of our agenda is what we call our public moment to have speakers come down and petition the Council. As a result of these petitions, what happens is that you're given two minutes to speak, and then we will refer that to the appropriate staff person within the organization who will then follow up with you individually, so that we can make sure whatever you petition, we get it right. We do have protocols for disruptions at our meeting, and I'm just going to tell you what happens if we have disruptions. So, if the speaker that's down at our podiums, we have two, they come down the stairs, please be careful as you walk down there, if your allocated time to speak is over, if you do not stop, we will tell you that you're disrupting the meeting and please stop and leave the podium. If you still don't stop, you're violating G.S. 143-318.17, and are subject to being escorted out of the meeting chamber and charged with a misdemeanor, if you do not cease to talk and go back to your seat. So, we know that there are many people that have very, very powerful points that they want to make, but we want to ask you to please respect and continue to address within our rules, so that everyone has the opportunity to be heard. So, with that, we have awards and recognition. Ms. Johnson has a recognition for us tonight.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

ITEM NO. 6: BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS MONTH

Councilmember Johnson said I am honored, for the fourth year in a row, to read a joint proclamation to recognize March 2024 as Brain Injury Awareness Month. I was kind of hesitant to read it today, because I know that there are folks here that want to really come before us and talk about some important issues, but one thing that I know, is that most of us know someone in our lives who have suffered a concussion or a stroke or an anoxic injury. So, brain injury affects so many in our lives, and it can be life changing. So, I'm honored to advocate for those survivors and read this today.

WHEREAS, more than 2.8 Americans sustain a brain injury every year, and over 5.3 million Americans live with a brain injury-related disability; and

WHEREAS, over 80,000 people in North Carolina will sustain a brain injury this year, and many survivors will be left permanently disabled, and acquired brain injury includes a traumatic brain injury sustained from blunt force trauma, and nontraumatic brain injury is from strokes, aneurysms, tumors, infections, and anoxic injury; and

WHEREAS, active duty and reserve military members are at an increased risk for sustaining brain injury, compared to their civilian peers; and

WHEREAS, research on abused woman shows that 40 to 90 percent of the victims of domestic violence suffer physical injuries to the head; and

WHEREAS, research shows that up to 50 percent of the homeless individuals and 25 to 87 percent of incarcerated adults, experience a physical injury to their head; and

WHEREAS, public awareness and understanding of the dangers, prevention and treatment of these injuries and effects on the family, are critical to help aid individuals in recovery:

NOW, THEREFORE, we, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, and George Dunlap, Chair of the Mecklenburg Board County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim March 20, 2024, as

“BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS MONTH”

in Charlotte and in Mecklenburg County, and commend its observance to all citizens.

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Homicide Rate

James Barnett, 1335 Dean Street said good to see you. Mayor and Council members, I want to thank you for affording me the opportunity to come before you. I came prepared with a three-minute speech. It's been a long time since I've been here, so it's two minutes, I'm going to make it short, and get on out of the way. First of all, I want to say thank you to all of the Council members who have addressed murder rate in the City of Charlotte and around the country. We, at the Stop the Killing Crusade, believe that the only way you can solve this problem, the faith community has to be involved, and we're calling upon the faith community to get involved. I put in your package a headline from the newspaper of 2001, when the Latino community had a murder rate of 27 percent. They came to us, and now the Latino murder rate is down less than 10 percent. What we're saying is that once we care, with [INAUDIBLE] and unity, we can get things done.

So, we come to you today, after 36 years I hear fighting, 45 years after the Ebony magazine publication on Black-on-Black crime. So, I'm coming publicly to invite you to a program we're having on April 21, 2024. They call it Unity in the Community. We invited Pastor Shirley Caesar to come. We're going to have a big praise and worship service, a call to the community to come together, but particularly the faith community, to come and take the lead and help to decrease the murder rate. I want to say, Mayor, thank you for all you've done to support us and all the other members on the Council that have supported us. We're getting back out here, and we're going to win this battle. Nobody can save us from us but us. Thank you for allowing me to have my two-minute speech in my three-minute time.

Novant Health Charlotte Marathon

Tim Rhodes, 12228 Plover Drive said Mayor Lyles, Council members and City Manager Jones, thank you for allowing me a couple minutes to say hello. My name is Tim Rhodes. I'm the managing partner of the Novant Health Charlotte Marathon. I just wanted to take a minute tonight to say thank you for allowing us the privilege of showing off the best of Charlotte, North Carolina. The Novant Health Charlotte Marathon runs through Uptown, East over Myers Park, Dilworth, South End, Villa Heights, Plaza Midwood, NoDa, and I've probably missed a couple. The economic impact of this event this past year was almost \$2 million, and we were able to donate \$138,000 to local charities, including our flagship charity, the Novant Health Hemby Children's Hospital. After 19 years, the City has played a big part of our success, from the Charlotte-

Mecklenburg Police Department to the Department of Transportation, the Charlotte Regional Visitors Authority, and the Sanitation Department, just to name a few.

In 2023, we welcomed runners from 43 states, and the District of Columbia, plus 13 countries. We have experienced 30 percent year-over-year growth the past two years, and this year, our 20th year, we expect over 9,000 participants. We offer a full marathon, a half marathon, a 5K, and relays, so there's something for everyone, including you, so I want to extend an invitation. We just want to invite you to come on down, and if you don't want to run, you can cheer and be a part of the festivities November 16, 2024, and we start and finish in Uptown Charlotte. Just, again, wanted to say thank you, we appreciate it, and we're honored to represent the City of Charlotte.

Animal Care and Control

Ann Gross, 2300 Ramblewood Lane said good evening, Mayor Lyles, City Manager and City Councilmen. My name is Ann Gross. I am a volunteer, President and Founder of a nonprofit, all volunteer group, called Friends of Feral Felines. We have been in existence 25 years, and we assist our citizens to work with these outdoor community cats who are stray, unowned, or feral, meaning they're afraid of people. They get spayed and neutered and vaccinated for rabies and distemper. They get a left ear tip for identification. This program is being done throughout the United States and Europe. It's considered the state of our treatment for these cats. We, since January of 2024, have done 292 cats with citizens of our community, and we'd like to thank, sincerely, our Charlotte Animal Care and Control, because they opened up, at the end of January 2024, eight spay/neuter/vaccination clinics for the community cats, a week, they'll do eight cats, and quarterly, they'll do a high-volume clinic for up to 40 cats. Now, this might not seem like an important thing to do in Charlotte, but without this program, these cats are proliferating, and this program will protect them from disease, it'll protect our community, and it is a very worthwhile program. Finally, it reduces the community cat population, because they are no longer reproducing, and so it's a win-win situation. Our ask today is that we have the City funding, like a line-item budget, for animal control to continue. Thank you.

Mindy Cetel, 4600 Spicewood Drive said greetings, Mayor Lyles and Council members. I'm Mindy Cetel, a recently retired physician, actually a neurologist and sleep doctor, the head injuries. I'm here today as a volunteer with Friends of Feral Felines. We are deeply concerned about the population explosion of our City's unowned cats. It's staggering that, if unchecked, two cats can become 2 million in a span of eight years. Trap-Neuter-Return is globally recognized as a humane approach. Effective TNR (Trap-Neuter-Return) stabilizes, then reduces populations, resulting in healthier remaining cats. It decreases shelter admissions and alleviates euthanizing healthy felines. Euthanasia is ineffective, as well as emotional and financially draining for all. Social inequities often impact the density of our community cats in large part due to insufficient affordable and accessible spay/neuter services. The good news is that logistics have recently been identified, which optimized TNR effectiveness across a diversity of municipalities. Logistics include intensive targeting of areas with the greatest cat density. This requires coordination and timely affordable veterinary services. We plead for permanent line-item funding for sufficient services, facilities, and logistics for the best effectiveness of TNR. Details of municipalities with successful programs are provided in your packets. Dedicated funding along with committed volunteers, befit our beautiful, thriving City. Our approach to community cats reflects our ability to come together as a community for the good. Thank you for your consideration.

Kelsey Joseph, 2022 Sage Park Drive said Council, thank you for your time and service. My name is Kelsey Joseph. I'm a dedicated community member that volunteers with several organizations addressing homelessness, food insecurity, and animal welfare. One of those is Friends of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Services, helping Animal Care and Control as they are in constant crisis, despite having an outstanding nationally recognized leadership team. This is what I want to talk to you about today, because it affects some of our most vulnerable populations, animals who cannot help themselves and our neighbors who are struggling to meet their own basic needs. In

2017, you approved a Budget for a new shelter, and then those funds were reallocated. We've been pleading for a year now for you to make ACC (Animal Care and Control) a priority again. I, along with many others, have invited you to come tour the shelter, and some of you have, and we greatly appreciate that. For those who haven't, I brought some shelter information and images to you tonight. The first photo in your folder was taken on July 3, 2024. When most City staff members were celebrating the Fourth of July with their families, ACC staff was euthanizing dogs, lifting them into wheelbarrows, and then shoveling their bodies into the incinerator, which the second photo illustrates. This is a daily occurrence at the shelter. I'm sure you can empathize with the emotional toll that takes on City staff and our community. The next page in that packet includes a list of progressive programs that ACC implements. These are recognized in the animal welfare field for being creative and lifesaving; however, their abilities are limited. Why? Because ACC is chronically underfunded. The ACC leadership team knows how to mitigate these problems. What they need is your support financially and structurally to do so. So, I'm asking you to please make Animal Care and Control an independent City department and increase its budget. We do not have time for advanced planning and waiting another seven plus years. Thank you.

Housing

Taneka Nicholson, 707 Siegle Avenue said yes, good evening, honorable members of the City Council, Mayor Lyles. I, Taneka Nicholson, stand before you today to address a critical need within our community, transitional housing for young woman aged 18 to 25. As we strive for equality and diversity, it is imperative that we recognize and address the unique challenges faced by this vulnerable demographic. For many young women transitioning into adulthood, the journey can be fraught with uncertainty and instability. Without adequate support systems in place, they may find themselves at risk of homelessness, exploitation, and other forms of harm. Transitional housing offers a lifeline, a safe and supportive environment, where these young women can rebuild their lives and pursue their dreams. Transitional housing provides more than just a roof over their heads. It offers wraparound services tailored to their specific needs, from life skills training, educational support, to mental health, counseling, and career guidance. These programs can empower young women to break the cycle of poverty and adversity. By investing in Second Chance Living, I planted a seed for Second Chance Living. It's for young woman. We're not only invested in their futures, but also in the future of our community. When these women are given the tools and resources, they needed to succeed, they become active contributors to society and enrich our neighborhoods and drive positive change. I urge the City Council to prioritize the development and funding of transitional housing programs for young woman aged 18 to 25. Together, let us create a brighter and more equitable future for all members of our community. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Airport Impacts on Property

Stephanie Lanse, 7818 Douglas Drive said good evening, City Council members and Mayor Pro Tem. My name is Stephanie Lanse, and I represent the Steeleberry Acres neighborhood, which is located about a half mile from the airport. My community is concerned about the lack of notice to residents regarding the rezoning Petition 2023-112. Out of the 80 plus homes in our neighborhood, only one resident received a notice. Had that one resident not informed me, this could have been passed last week with practically zero community involvement, which is very concerning to me. While this one petition might not seem like a big deal, it's actually a piece of a much larger puzzle around airport development and expansion. Future plans could include rezoning of a historic cemetery from residential to commercial, and turning old Steele Creek Presbyterian Church into a logistics center, that would eventually host six to seven large warehouses in our community. What we are asking for is more transparency and to afford our neighbors the opportunity for community engagement. I feel the next meeting should be a comprehensive meeting with developers, NC-DOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation), CDA, and hopefully the continued support of Councilmembers Brown, Johnson and Mayfield. There are a lot of great things included in the future plans, in my opinion, but my concern is the lack of transparency and that

our community has had no involvement. We need more information and simply have not been afforded that opportunity. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Gaza Crisis

Nasfat Shehadeh, 1246 Effingham Road said dear respected Mayor and Council members, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I'm Dr. Nasfat Shehadeh, Hematologist/Medical Oncologist, taking care of patients with cancer and blood disorders in Charlotte. I'm a Palestinian American doctor with deep roots in Palestine, and I've been taking care of American patients for the last 30 years. I have a large family, including five sisters, still living in West Bank. So, this is very personal to me. Just last week, my nephew was shot and killed by the Israeli Military. He was only 16 years old. As a cancer doctor, I frequently see patients who struggle or simply cannot pay for their cancer treatment. It baffles me how this country, my country, continues to send billions of dollars every year to kill and displace my family, yet my patients in America cannot afford cancer treatment. Here in Charlotte, I see it day by day. This is our sixth month asking you to listen to us and introduce our ceasefire resolution since cities, as far as Chicago and San Francisco, and as close as Durham and Boone, have passed ceasefire resolution. You may ask why we keep coming month and after month. Just last week, Canada affirmed it will no longer sell weapons or provide military aid to Israel. This slippery slope has just started and will cause the same ripple that it did when toppling apartheid South Africa.

Just a few weeks ago, an active-duty Airforce serviceman by the name of Aaron Bushnell, passed away in a courageous show of protest against this genocide. His last words were, "I will not be complicit in this genocide." Will you? Dear Mayor and Council members, as your constituents, it is your duty to stand with us. If we continue to fall on deaf ears, please do not come asking for our votes in November 2024. In passing ceasefire resolution, better late than never. It is morally the right thing to do, and probably beneficial to you all. It might help you to be liberated. Thank you.

Mitchel Bollag, 6924 Orr Road, Concord said my name is Mitch Bollag. As a constituent and as a Jew, I stand before you with a heavy heart, urging you to pass a resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire in Gaza. The continued attack on the entire civilian population of Gaza is a clear case of genocide and is one of the few examples in modern history of starvation being used against an entire population as a tool of war and oppression. Other forms of collective punishment are routinely used in war crimes such as domicile, attacks on hospitals, and the entire healthcare network, destruction of all civilian structures of government and human services. Massive and indiscriminate bombing of civilians are occurring every day. How many Jewish children would we allow to be slowly starved to death, not only in front of our eyes, but funded by our tax dollars? I think we all know the answer to that question. In the meantime, over 12,000 Gazan children have had their young lives snuffed out while we debate whether or not we can take this one simple step. It is really the very least we can do. What is happening is a disgrace to our civilization and a stain on our collective humanity. Passing this resolution is not a political act. It is a reaffirmation of our common humanity and basic decency. We must act now. We don't have another day to wait. Thank you.

Jenna Awad, 16108 North Point Road, Huntersville said my name is Jenna Awad. I'm a Palestinian American and resident of Mecklenburg County. I moved to North Carolina in 2022, where I've been practicing as a Pediatric Speech Language Pathologist. I have dedicated my career to teaching children how to communicate and achieve self-determination. I chose this field because of my passion for justice. I have, and never will be the one to stay silent through injustice, whether it be in my career or through activism for all oppressed people. Every single day, since October 7, 2023, for the past 170 days, we wake up to the most disturbing and horrific images and videos of Palestinian children being massacred, and yet, I proceed to get dressed, go to work, where I spend my days putting on a smile, trying to be the best speech therapist I can be for the children that I serve, all while mourning the thousands of men, women and children brutally murdered in my homeland, paid and backed with our tax dollars. We no longer need to read you the statistics of this brutal genocide for you to know that it is a

genocide. We all see what is happening and your willful ignorance is not an excuse. I'm disgusted and disturbed that the bombs used to ethnically cleanse Palestinians are funded by our tax dollars.

I refuse to accept that not one of you can stand up and advocate for the injustices that are occurring under your noses. You claim that City Council does not address political matters, but somehow you have the power to amend City code ordinances that criminalize our First Amendment rights, and which got me wrongfully arrested. Now somehow you do not have the ability to sign a paper that states, "We condemn the killing of innocent children." Every single one of you are complicit in this genocide. As an educator of our youth, as a resident of Mecklenburg County, as a citizen of this country, and as a Palestinian, I insist that you answer the demands of the people of Charlotte and stand with the side of justice and humanity by passing a ceasefire resolution. Free Palestine.

Airport Community Roundtable

Preston Hagman, 9721 Vixen Lane, Huntersville said my name is Preston Hagman. I represent the ACR, the Airport Community Roundtable. We represent a series of professionals, both pilots, community leaders, to better the noise abatement procedures at Charlotte Airport. We came here a few months ago and told you about the Part 150 Study that's going to be released this summer. As like any big study that's been going on for two years, that's going to be delayed. I did bring some paperwork I was going to hand out at the end of this for you to see the new schedules. There's so much information that we've done over the last few months, tried to increase the north flow/south flow departures on divergent paths to really minimize the impact of noise with all the traffic that's coming out, especially with the fourth parallel runway coming out at Charlotte, that's going to increase the amount of traffic significantly that comes out of Charlotte Airport. So, again, we have all the community leaders. We've been talking to The Tower and TRACON (Terminal Radar Approach Control), to see how we can modify the flight paths. We've already had success in raising the limits of the some of the intersection by 1,000 feet, which actually lowers the decibels in the surrounding communities. Again, with that fourth parallel runway coming up, the amount of traffic that's going to be just overwhelming our communities, how we can mitigate those, both the arrivals and departures. Just simple little things like, if we can keep airplanes going up the center of the lake, so not to have an effect on the communities, and turn higher, and the same thing in an approach, so we're not coming against the communities.

So, again, the main thing for me coming here today, is to notify you that the Part 150 is going to be delayed a few months. We're not sure when, but it was supposed to be at the end of May 2024, now it's probably going to be later in the summertime. So, again, I put lots of information for you to digest, and we'll see you in a few months. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you. Appreciate the work that you're doing very much. It's an important part of our mission to do this well and to get it right.

Gaza Crisis

Salma Earney, 1605 Hawkstone Drive, Waxhaw said hi, my name is Salma, and I'm a senior in high school. I'm here to share with you guys a perspective that I believe will be useful in making your decision on the ceasefire. So, first of all, I've heard there's a lot of opposing opinions, sharing that it's unnecessary to pass a resolution, because the City Council can't solve a war, but that's not true. To me, it's about recognizing the pain of your civilians. In my government class, in the first week or two, we read Locke. One of the documents that spoke out to me was that he shared, "Citizens give the government power." It's not just Charlotte that would be recognizing the violence, but international cities as well, and as we speak, other City Councils have passed a resolution, about 100. I'm here today, because I know you guys have these titles, because you genuinely care about your people and the City of Charlotte. I know you'd want to keep them safe and validate their feelings. People here and at home have either been physically affected or have lost their direct family and friends. If you were to go on your phone right

now, and look up Palestine, I'm sure you'd come across a video of innocent families losing their loved ones. A woman, she went down to go get bread for her family, she came back. She saw her husband and kids buried within the ruins of her home. She tried to call them to wake up, she tried to do CPR (Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation). They clearly did not wake up. How would you react if that was your family? I would do the same thing. I would not believe it. I'm sure most of us would do the same.

Your citizens are in pain. They're watching their loved ones disappear knowing that they can't save them. Not just for political reasons, passing a ceasefire resolution will validate the pain that your citizens feel, and also join the other 100 U.S. cities that recognize this violence. Please take responsibility for your title and recognize and work and stand with your citizens that believe in you. Thank you.

ZONING

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF ALLEYWAY BETWEEN SCOTT AVENUE AND FOUNTAIN VIEW STREET

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Gina Collias, 315 Garrison Drive, Kings Mountain said good evening, Mayor Lyles, Mayor Pro Tem Anderson, and City Council members. My name is Gina Collias. I'm urging City Council to please deny or to continue this petition to abandon the alleyway between Scott Avenue and Fountain View Street. Our family owns Twin Oaks Shopping Center in front of the alleyway, and my late father-in-law, Nick Collias, built Twin Oaks on land that my husband's grandparents had owned. Nick ran Dickadee's restaurant on Independence Boulevard and started Twin Oaks with Dickadee's Deli. Then, something classic came in and currently Fern, Flavors From The Garden is the main restaurant there and they're an anchor. This shopping center was designed to be an anchor restaurant center. SunCap is planning to put the majority of the alleyway inside a parking deck, possibly subterranean, with low height limitations, as they build multi-family condos on top. The average parking deck entrance height is seven feet. SunCap told me that there was no way for any of our delivery trucks to access the alleyway from Scott through their parking deck. They said the alleyway would be completely blocked for 12 to 18 months at a minimum during construction. So, we would be deprived of meaningful, reasonable, and continuous ingress and egress on the alleyway for vital food deliveries and supply chain deliveries. Twin Oak's Restaurant Ferns receives four deliveries from an 18-wheeler from Cisco every week, and you have a copy of the Cisco truck pulling through, and Cisco tells us they can only enter through Scott Avenue. They tell us that Fern has to have the deliveries by the 18-wheelers from the type of foods that Fern serves, and they said there's no way they can enter on Fountain View, because it's too narrow, they can't turn the 18-wheeler around, and there's also a hill that comes in on that side, the topography. They said it would be too dangerous for their 18-wheeler to stop and block East Boulevard with their flashers. They said the average delivery is 22 minutes.

So, we are a commercially zoned shopping center, and it's our property zoning right to have reasonable and continuous commercial access and to expect us to have deliveries from our supply chain for our tenants and our customers. Amazon trucks can't get through a parking deck. UPS trucks can't get through the parking deck. Our dumpster trucks can't get through the parking deck, and the dumpster has to come in perpendicular to the dumpster to dump. We have other box trucks that won't be able to come in. So, the other thing is, is SunCap could raise the height of their parking deck to allow delivery for our trucks, or they could create a walking bridge between the condos over the alleyway. Thank you very much.

Celia Collias, 315 Garrison Drive, Kings Mountain said my name is Celia Collias. I'm the granddaughter of the late Nick Collias, a Charlotte restaurateur. My grandfather graduated from Myers Park High School in 1955, and I graduated from Myers Park High School in 2015. About 35 years ago, my grandfather directed the design and build of Twin Oaks Shopping Center on East Boulevard between Scott Avenue and Fountain View Street. Twin Oaks was built on land that belonged to my great grandparents, and at the time was home to two beautiful oak trees, hence the name Twin Oaks. One oak was sadly destroyed by hurricane Hugo, and the other oak has since been preserved as a sculpture in honor of my grandfather's memory. Before the Council today is a resolution to close the alleyway between Scott Avenue and Fountain View Street, the alleyway directly behind Twin Oaks Shopping Center.

I stand before you to speak on two points regarding that resolution. The points are one, procedural notification, and two, the public interest. The procedure for permanently closing streets and alleys, Statute 160A-299, states that a copy of the resolution must be "Sent by registered or certified mail to all owners of property adjoining the street or alley," prior to the public hearing. Please note, it doesn't say portion of street or alley, it says, "The street or alley." All of the owners of property adjoining the alley did not receive a copy of the resolution by mail prior to this public hearing; therefore, the procedural requirements of Statute 160A-299 are not met. These procedural notification requirements exist to foster respect and to encourage good neighborly behavior. They are important and they have not yet been completely fulfilled.

My second point is about the public interest. The portion of alleyway between Scott Avenue and Fountain View Street should not be abandoned without an easement for delivery truck ingress and egress. That alleyway is a vital artery for small businesses in the area, and the current plan for abandonment is a death kneel against those businesses, and therefore, against the public interest. There are paths forward for development that protect the public interest, and this is not one of them. I'm respectfully requesting that you defer the vote on this alleyway abandonment until such a time that all the parties, with Council support, can come to a resolution that protects the public interest as well as the commercial property rights of small businesses whose livelihoods depend on reasonable and continuous ingress and egress of delivery trucks as part of their commercial supply chain. Thank you for your time.

Rich Fennell, 525 North Tryon Street, Suite 700 said thank you. Mayor Lyles, members of the Council, thank you for letting me speak. It has been a long time, and I've really enjoyed this. Most of what I do is in court. Seeing this has just been fantastic, and I'm grateful for it. So, I just wanted to say thank you. It's been a joy to watch, and I appreciate what ya'll do. I do understand that progress is progress, and this development, when I was first asked to look at it, I looked at the alley and the alley has been in disrepair for a long time, and this development is going to clean it up and it's going to turn a 10-foot alley into a 24-foot permanent easement going from Scott to Fountain View, and that all sounds fantastic, but then when we were talking about this a week ago, when I started to go from fantastic to uh oh, is when I found out that the Scott entrance is going to be covered. The guys were very forthcoming about what their plans were, and I asked, "What does this do? Can I get a truck through?", and they said, "No." So, that redoubled my interest in trying to figure out exactly what happens in the alley. I haven't had time to do a traffic study, but I've sort of done my own traffic study, and some of my partners and I have been out at that alley from 6:30 a.m. in the morning some days, in the middle of the day, in the afternoon, trying to figure out exactly what goes on back there, and is it possible to actually function if we have a restaurant that needs these truck deliveries. How do you make that happen?

I think I'm pretty creative, and although I litigate for a living, I try to avoid litigation, but I can't see how it works. I can't make it go. So, we've been trying to schedule a meeting to see if there's a way to bridge this. If they are insistent on that cover, then I don't know what the resolution is, but I hope that there is one. When I was talking to them last week, we talked about Fountain View as being sort of a pressure release valve for this shopping center. Fountain View, the earliest I was out there, was 6:30 a.m. last week, and Fountain View from 6:30 a.m. to 6:35 a.m. becomes a parking lot. It is crazy,

because at 6:30 a.m. they park, 6:31 a.m. park, 6:32 a.m. they park, 6:33 they park. I tried to get through Fountain View this weekend, to see what you would do to try to get into a full parking lot at the shopping center and could not get down the street. So, trying to live with just Fountain View as a relief valve, beyond just the technical difficulties of getting a truck in there, is not doable. We've got to have Scott, but we've got to have Scott for trucks, we've got to have Scott for larger vehicles than just cars. I mean, I can give you what passes for my traffic study, but what I found is that there's a car that goes through that alley from Scott to Fountain View every 4 1/2 minutes, and I've got six different data points. What I'm trying to protect is not like I saw at 7:00 a.m. in the morning, somebody reading his bible while he was driving through our parking lot. I'm not trying to protect that.

Gregg Watkins, 1704 Fountain View Street said Mayor, Council, thank you for the opportunity to speak here tonight. I just want to be clear, I'm here tonight as a private resident of Fountain View Street and I am opposed to the abandonment. I'm also speaking here on behalf of a number of neighbors on Fountain View at 1622, 1626, 1700 and 1708 Fountain View, who are also opposed. Honestly, I'm kind of surprised to have to be here tonight. When my wife and I saw the abandonment signs go up on our street, we contacted the City and were told in writing that there would be no change to the connectivity in the alleys that run north/south behind our homes, and the east/west connector that you're hearing about tonight, but this was prior to the public hearing, and we thought all was good. We had it in writing that there was no change to the connectivity, but now, just last week, days before the vote on this, we learned that the developer was planning to eliminate access to Fountain View, and we just don't understand why the City told us one thing and the developer is now proposing something else.

We agree that the current use of the alleys could be improved behind the SunCap property, but we just don't see why it should come at the expense of private property owners. I will say that my wife and I, we've lived in our little bungalow for 25 years. It was built in 1929. It's the only home we know in Charlotte. We raised our kids in it. We hope to retire in it, and it's been a great house and neighborhood, but our neighborhood is growing fast. From our front porch we can see four cranes, two at Atrium and two on a development in East Boulevard, and with all this growth and change, who is to say how those alleys could and should be used in the future? We should not cut off this future connectivity. Connectivity benefits all residents, both old and new, and I urge you to help us find a solution here. Thank you.

Patrick FitzGerald, 1320 Fillmore Avenue, Suite 300 said that's right. Good evening, Mayor Lyles, Mayor Pro Tem Anderson and City Council members. I speak to you on behalf of the Executive Board and residents of 1320 Fillmore Condos, which is directly across Scott Avenue from the planned development. We are concerned that the proposed resolution will have an adverse effect on our residents. Together with 1315 East Condos, we represent about 400 residents plus retail and office buildings and office space. The two buildings together are bisected by our privately maintained alleyway between Scott and Kenilworth Avenues, which services are residential and commercial traffic. The increase in density from the 1401 East project, adding about 300 residential units, plus retail and office, would generate unprecedented traffic on Scott Avenue and East Boulevard. Unfortunately, as proposed, a portion of that traffic will short-cut through our alley, as people naturally take the shortest route between Scott and Kenilworth. Our alley has already suffered extensive damage from cut-through traffic and required expensive repairs. Not only passenger vehicles, but commercial vehicles delivering to the restaurant, shops and residents of both buildings and elsewhere, take up that alleyway throughout the day. Even though there are stop signs at the entrance and exit points of our garage, anyone pulling out of the garage has to be extremely careful not to get hit by other vehicles who are speeding through the alleyway trying to cut across.

Previously, the developers of 1401 East proposed to mitigate the risky situation by relocating the alley on their property by about 20 feet northward, encouraging traffic to go up Scott, which is a one-way northbound avenue, thus, any vehicles leaving their

property would have to go against traffic on Scott, if they wanted to use our alley. Only a few days ago, we learned that the developer has recanted, and now proposes to leave their alley aligned with ours as it is now. They propose to install a traffic diverter, known as a pork chop, to channel existing exiting traffic north on Scott away from our alley. However, we've seen repeatedly where our property is concerned, far too many drivers who are taking the shortest route, again between two points, ignoring the signage and creating an additional likelihood of automobile accidents and personal injury. Therefore, we strongly oppose, and urge you to disprove of, the current plan for 1401 East, and instead require the developers to revise their plan as it was previously presented to our communities, so that their alley and ours are not aligned, and the risk to people and property is minimized. Thank you.

Gary Klasen, 1315 East Boulevard said good evening. I'm Gary Klasen, the President of the 1315 East Condo Board. The alley separating 1315 East and the Fillmore Condos serves more than 260 units. It provides regular resident access. It allows garbage removal, moving vans, service trucks and commercial businesses, and we have to compete with vehicles that are cutting through. This alley is not able to handle the potential short cuts for the hundreds of residents planned for this ridiculously high building that is planned for across the street. We agree with our Fillmore neighbors that the proposed alleyway should not directly connect with our alley. We already have way too many cut throughs. The proposed barrier entrance and exit is not going to deter anybody from driving right over the barrier or cutting through from the entrance area, when Scott street is clear. We already have to keep calling the City, unsuccessfully I might add, so that no parking signs are followed before the alley, allowing us to get onto Scott Street. That's already a current problem. The new barrier is going to be ignored as well. We ask you to find a better solution to this issue.

Construction issues have been raised today. We do expect that if this new, huge building is built, you're going to have to find a way to effectively manage all the construction equipment and find parking somewhere for those many workers. These plans are necessary, because there is no parking garage availability in the area right now. The restaurant and retail stores and parking lots on East Boulevard are not an option. As a volunteer at the Dilworth Soup Kitchen, I deliver lunches to the Charlottetown Terrace residents. Pearl Park and Baxter Street are inundated with construction worker cars on both sides of the street for the new Medical University. You probably don't know that narrow East Boulevard is paralyzed for long periods of time during those periods when utility work was done, because drivers were sandwiched into long single lanes. Scott Avenue was not a picnic either. So, unfortunately, you'll be hearing about many of these things from area drivers as well in the future, because this needs to be addressed, but please, fix the alley issue first and realign its location on behalf of the residents in the area. Thank you very much.

Ellen Citarella, 322 E. Kingston Avenue said Mayor Lyles and members of Council, my name is Ellen Citarella, and I'm speaking on behalf of the DCA (Dilworth Community Association) Land Use Committee tonight, where I serve as Chair. You should've received a copy of an email I sent today to Mayor Pro Tem Anderson, laying out the land use committee's position. It is as follows. We encourage all property owners along the affected alleyway to agree, make sure that no one is ignored. We are not advocating for any party, but we want everyone to work together for the betterment of the neighborhood. With Council support, we think that can happen. We'd like to point out that, contrary to the statement published in the resolution to close, no letters were sent to property owners who own parcels along this T-shaped alley. In addition, this alley closing, as presented, is contrary to the public interest, as you've heard, and the property owners in the vicinity of the alleyway will be deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress, as required per North Carolina General Statute 160A-299. In closing, I'd like to thank you for your consideration to this matter, and for the work that all of you do on behalf of our City.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street, Suite 100 said Madam Mayor, Council members, Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner, SunCap. Do we have any visual aids? This is impossible to follow without looking at something. I don't know if there's a copy. This is

helpful. So, if you all can see the screen and I handed out some visuals. First of all, we're happy to have a hearing. We're happy that these issues have come about. I hope you will not take action tonight. I hope that you will continue. We're happy to continue conversations. I think, as you heard, the petitioner has been speaking with property owners, but I did want to give you a little bit of an orientation. If you can see here, this is Scott Avenue, this is Fountain View. I don't know if the pointer can follow me on this. The existing alleyway is in red, and if you go out there today and look for it, you will not find it. You'll see a parking lot, you see all kinds of stuff, but you would not recognize an alley, unless you looked at a plaque and found it. Alley runs north behind the Fountain View lot, and you won't find that either. You'll find fences, trees, power poles, there is a legal alley. So, what is going on, if you look at this area in red, this is what SunCap has petitioned to abandon, an old 10-foot-wide alley that lines directly up with the alley that you just heard the neighbors, their concern is these alleys line up. So, the existing alley lines up with their alley. It is 10-foot wide. It cannot accommodate the types of trucks that Ms. Collias was talking about. So, the old alleyway just doesn't work. If we decide just to leave that old alley, that's fine. It will not function and address any of the issues you've heard about.

What the petitioner proposed was to abandon that red alley, and replace it with a new public easement, which you see in blue, which extends across, that is 24-foot wide. They are not proposing to abandon the portion of the alley behind the Collias Shopping Center. Additionally, they've proposed a new easement that would connect to the alley behind the Fountain View property owners. So, the proposal is to abandon about 4,500 square feet of existing alley, that's 4,500 would go away, and this proposal includes new dedication of public access of 10,500 square feet approximately. So, dedicating about two and a half times the amount of publicly accessible land. I don't know that we'll be able to address all the concerns you've heard. Certainly, we need to talk with the owners. We want this shopping center to remain viable. We think it's a great amenity to the property next door. It is true that this blue alleyway, it does go through our building at this point. So, in this area here, there would be only eight feet of clearance, and no, a semi-truck could not move through that, nor could a semi-truck move through the existing 10-foot alley if we're limited to that. So, we're happy to continue conversations. We feel like the new area that we're creating in this area will provide more maneuvering. One of the concerns, again, we're talking about a new alleyway here to connect up to provide Fountain View access to their alleyway, which is currently not used, but it could be used in the future when we have access to that.

Councilmember Anderson said thank all the neighbors for coming out and expressing concern. This issue was really brought up about a month ago, after a meeting where Ms. Collias became aware of the abandonment, and began doing her own studies around traffic flow, etc. This is a multi-layered issue. The first piece of it, I do want to say just across the board, notwithstanding this particular issue, but we have to correct the home notification process to neighbors who have not been notified of things like abandonment, things like rezoning. We just hear that over and over again, that people are completely unaware of it. In this particular case, I do understand that the Collias' property was not deemed an adjoining property, and therefore, they were not notified, but in those cases where it is true, we need to address that issue.

What I will say is that SunCap, as a developer, has been at the table having multiple discussions, and Collin has been present as well, with small business owners, with residents, and with the DCA, and we have made some progress. So, there is some positive progress throughout this process. However, there's still a lot to be addressed and dealt with, and we need to ensure that the residents along that Fountain View area, have reasonable access to the egress and ingress of their properties. Then, we also need to make sure, and staff is continuing to do this, to resolve the issue as it relates to operation of large delivery trucks, trash collections, adjacent to the Collias property, as it relates to the SunCap plan. SunCap is also performing a review of the truck size to demonstrate that certain operations will be maintained, so they will be going through that exercise. They also have agreed to have maximum extent possible of openness to the alleyway during construction when we get to that point. So, there's so many issues and challenges that the residents, that small business have right now, that we have not

resolved. What I'd like to do is I'd like to, if I could Madam Mayor, put forth a substitute motion. We have two, one on April 8, 2024, or one on April 22, 2024, so that we have more time for continued collaboration. As I mentioned, we have made some progress, but there still has to be continued conversations, and I'm happy to see the conversations occurring.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to defer the adoption of Part B to a business meeting in April 2024.

Councilmember Ajmera said Councilmember Anderson was right on point when she talked about how this needs further conversation between all the parties. I learned about this issue over the weekend, when Ms. Collias had reached out to me, and we have had multiple back and forth over the weekend, and Debbie Smith and her team have been working with Ms. Collias, petitioner, and all the parties involved. Certainly, there are valid concerns that residents of Dilworth community have raised, in terms of commercial access and reasonable and continuous access. As a family, we often visit Fern. That's one of our favorite restaurants. So, when I learned about this, I actually drove by, and I see the issue here. In fact, I wasn't able to comprehend that issue until I was able to drive by. So, when Mr. Brown had done a visual presentation, that was even more helpful. There is a lot more conversation that needs to occur, Ms. Anderson, so I don't know if we will be able to reach a resolution by next Business meeting, so I do not want us to lock us in to have a resolution by next Business meeting or have this in our agenda. I would like us to consider having, where there is a resolution, and then have this on our agenda item, because if there is no resolution, I will not be able to support this, because there are some valid ingress and egress issues that you heard clearly from our community members. I do hope that we have a resolution, but if not, I don't think there is anything pressing for us to have this item on our agenda in April 2024.

I see Ms. Smith here smiling. If we can just have staff come forward and help us address some of the alternatives that they were looking into, and then also if you can address the notice of public hearing and how it went out. I'm not sure how some residents did not end up getting it. Also, if you can just tell us, did you provide a list of all the neighbors to be notified to Mr. Brown?

Casey Mashburn, DOT said so, good evening. My name is Casey Mashburn with the Department of Transportation. It's a pleasure to be with you here to speak to a couple of points, and particularly the notification. As part of the general statutes, we are required to notify adjoining property owners, so those touching the alleyway and abandonment that's in question. So, our staff does that notification. We have sent out all of those requirements. Additionally, to notify the public, we published the abandonment twice in the Mecklenburg County Times, so in the public newspaper, and also posted signs on the street to notify them. That's all-in accordance with the general statutes.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you for saying that. So, for those of you who did not receive notice of public hearing, if you can just touch base with them. They may not be adjoining property owners. Maybe they did not receive a notice as a result of that, or maybe they are. So, we need to figure out where is the gap here. What is adjoining property owner? If you can just define that.

Mr. Mashburn said immediately adjacent to the alleyway that will be abandoned. So, the alleyway abandonment in this instance stops at their property corner, so they are not technically considered an adjoining parcel at that point.

Ms. Ajmera said at some point, we'd like to discuss this definition. It's up to the Council to make an amendment and notify in future what that definition is and maybe expand that, but that's for another day. If you can just give us an overview about alternatives that you have been reviewing with the petitioner that will address communities' concerns.

Mr. Mashburn said so, there are multiple alternatives that we're working through. A number of them have been mentioned by both Mayor Pro Tem and Mr. Brown. So, we're working with the petitioner and Ms. Collias and the family to look at the alternatives, specifically to address the truck-turning templates that have been mentioned here, to make sure that do have that access to their parcel. They will also maintain access on Fountain View and East Boulevard, as was mentioned as well, but that is one alternative. Another alternative is also discussing the timeframe during construction and how the alleyway will be impacted during that time. I think the difficult piece will be, as Mr. Brown alluded to, the height and what type of vehicles that can access that alleyway during that period of time.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, thank you so much. That concludes my questions. I also wanted to recognize Ms. Ellen Citarella for coming to speak on behalf of the DCA. She's one of my favorite neighborhood leaders. So, thank you for also your email, that was helpful.

Councilmember Johnson said C-DOT, if you can stay up there. I'm sorry, what'd you say your name was?

Mr. Mashburn said Casey Mashburn.

Ms. Johnson said oh, hi Casey. So, there were some specific options that were named by the residents, and I wanted to kind of go through them. So, they asked for [INAUDIBLE]. There were a couple reasons. The business owner not being able to have deliveries. I mean, that's a nonstarter for most of us, I think. Councilmember Molina, a couple weeks ago, shared concern about the growth in the City displacing small businesses, so this is huge. So, even for a day, a small business can't afford to not have deliveries. So, if you've got a shopping center, they have to be able to have their deliveries, period. For me, there's no acceptable timeframe that they would be closed due to construction. We already see that in residential areas where there's a challenge, but these are very, very compelling arguments. We also heard from residents. So, I wanted to know, what would happen to this development if the alley was not closed? That's my first question, and I guess we can ask Collin that question, but I also heard different arguments. We were told that trucks currently aren't able to get through the current alley. So, I guess we can ask the resident what the problem is, if they're not currently using that.

Mr. Brown said I think trucks are currently driving through the parking lots back there, but they could not stay within the 10-foot alleyway. That's the issue.

Ms. Johnson said so, I haven't seen this. So, they're currently using it or not? Can I ask a resident. Let me ask a resident, yes, thank you. I'm sorry, but I'm hearing conflicting information. So, in order for us to make a decision, we need to know the facts. Thank you.

Ms. Collias said thank you. I'm Gina Collias, and I believe that the 18-wheeler is eight-foot wide, so it does fit inside a 10-foot-wide space, and it comes four times a week, and then they do have box trucks also from Cisco and then Amazon and UPS. I have pictures of all the trucks coming through, and I gave all of you a picture of the Cisco truck coming through, but it has to be able to make a right turn on Scott, go down the alleyway. The new development is going to have businesses on the bottom, and they're going to need deliveries too.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so did Mr. Brown get a copy of this photo?

Ms. Brown said I did. We think the trucks drive through there, they're driving outside the alleyway, and that's the issue. Is there a way to continue access to the site? That's exactly right, our site will need access. We just, frankly, are not sure that it's reasonable to require and/or possible for a 10-foot alleyway to serve semi-trucks.

Ms. Johnson said okay. One of the residents also mentioned an easement, they mentioned increasing the height, and then they also mentioned realignment. So, initially, was the plan to have the alley in a different space?

Mr. Brown said there have been different conversations, that is correct. One option, as you say, is to not abandon the alley. If the alley is not abandoned, SunCap can build its development, but we think probably none of the people you've heard from are happy, because we don't think the truck can access it, we know it lines up directly with the neighbors who don't want it lining directly up with them. It's just not a great outcome. We won't make all the people happy, including my clients, but my hope is that we come up with something that checks as many boxes as we can.

Ms. Johnson said so, SunCap can move forward without closing the alley?

Mr. Brown said that's correct.

Ms. Johnson said and how will that impact the development?

Mr. Brown said they'll just have two different buildings on each side of a 10-foot alleyway. You can't have two-way traffic on a 10-foot alleyway, which is why we're proposing 24 feet.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. That's all the questions I have. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said this might be a question for Debbie, but I want to make sure that we have said in April 2024 that it would come back. That is the motion right now on the floor. So, the time to do this is considered.

Ms. Anderson said so, just a couple points here, and that we have been in discussion with over the last several weeks. The petitioner has the right to build up against the legal alley, but the legal alley is only 10 feet wide, and so, because it's open and unrestricted right now, there's no real issue with that. So, that's why we want to make sure we're getting to the right resolution for the small business owners and residents, and of course, the developer. Debbie might have to come up and speak to this as well, but it's my understanding that, due to the process for an abandonment of an alley, instead of a rezoning for example, there is a certain time limit that is required to come back and address it before the process has to start all over again, but can you address that for us please, ma'am?

Debbie Smith, C-DOT said hi. Good evening, everyone. Debbie Smith, Charlotte Department of Transportation. In fact, there is no immediate timeline, as long as you want to defer it. We offered some April 2024 dates that were the quickest available, but we want to help facilitate as much conversation between the developer and the community as possible.

Ms. Anderson said excellent. So, with that, Madam Mayor, if I could amend my substitute motion and say that we defer this issue to a Business meeting in the future, giving time for the residents and small business owners and developers to come to a compromise. I'd also like to keep the public hearing open. We haven't closed it officially yet. So, I'd like to keep it open so as this conversation continues, the residents will have an opportunity to come up again and be vocal around where we've landed, as it relates to the compromise.

Amendment was made to the substitute motion by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to (A) Defer the issue to a Business meeting in the future, and (B) keep the public hearing open.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you for accepting my friendly amendment. I think that's a good idea.

Ms. Johnson said I'm sorry, one other question. They mentioned the notice goes out to the adjacent owners and in the Mecklenburg Times. So, am I missing something? I've never read the Mecklenburg Times. Is there anyone that reads that?

Mayor Lyles said I think one of the things that we have a problem with is that the state outlines the process, not us, and it says publish in a newspaper. The Mecklenburg Times is where you find all the houses that are for sale, or taxes, and it's basically a lawyer's. Am I saying this correct, a lawyer's newspaper?

Ms. Johnson said and I get that. I think we had a Daily Recorder in Ohio. So, if you're looking for that, that's fine, but I think for the public, we do need to take a look at maybe putting the notice in the Observer, or we've talked about before, Next Door, something like that. So, if our goal is to communicate with the public, we need to be cognizant of where we're placing that. I mean, we can't expect members of the public to read that publication, I don't think.

Ms. Anderson said Mayor, can we have Ms. Smith address my amendments to the motion and this particular topic?

Ms. Smith said great, Mayor Pro Tem, thank you so much for that opportunity. Would love to be able to continue and offer a suggestion, that you are allowed to close the public hearing, and that you would only need to defer Action B, which is the decision, and that that would be an acceptable motion for you to consider.

Ms. Anderson said so, Ms. Smith, just as we consider that, in the future if there's, of course, movement on this particular issue, would we be able to hear from the residents? Would they be able to come up and speak to that if we've closed the public hearing this evening?

Ms. Smith said right, I might need to ask Casey on that one.

Mr. Mashburn said so, I believe you would have to, at that point, offer folks to come back up to speak and ask them questions; however, if we do not open and close the public hearing today, then we would have to start the process of intent over again, which is the two Council member action that you all are used to. So, that would be a multiple-month delay versus a potentially one-month delay.

Mayor Lyles said alright. I'm looking at Mr. Baker.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said I know some of you want to continue the public hearing, but typically you do that to a date certain, is my understanding. So, I believe that they could continue it to a date certain, and if for some reason you get information back from the staff that they need more time, then you could just take it off of the agenda and put it on a future agenda. That's sort of where you're headed, if you wanted to allow folks to come back and speak on the matter, particularly if you don't have complete resolution.

Mayor Lyles said so, Mr. Baker, how would that motion be framed? Lots of procedure here guys. Just give us a moment.

Mr. Baker said correct me if I'm wrong, I would recommend that you continue the item, the public hearing, until the fourth meeting in April, April 22, 2024, sure, and that gives them a month to work through this, and it's on the agenda, so you don't have to do anything else, absent hearing from the neighbors or the developer that they need more time.

Ms. Anderson said so, Mr. Mashburn, would that not trigger restarting the process over again if we were to do what City Attorney just recommended?

Mr. Mashburn said so, Mr. Baker is the attorney. I will say that the most important piece of that is that we have opened the public hearing, and that is what you adopted as an

intent, and then what was also published and distributed, which I do think satisfies the general statutes, that we are following the process correctly. So, if Mr. Baker is comfortable with continuing the public hearing, then I am as well.

Mr. Baker said yes, by doing this, you're giving the public notice that the hearing will start up again on April 22, 2024.

Mayor Lyles said alright. So, we have a motion on the floor.

Mr. Baker said you're not going to close the public hearing.

Mayor Lyles said not closing it. We're going to have a motion on the floor to remove this item until the last business meeting in April 2024.

Councilmember Driggs said the operative word is continue. We're continuing the hearing on April 22, 2024.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to continue the hearing until the April 22, 2024, Business Meeting.

ITEM NO. 9: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON ALVERTON AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, seconded by Councilmember Johnson, and carried unanimously to (A) Close the public hearing, and (B) Adopt Annexation Ordinance 771-X with an effective date of March 25, 2024, to extend the corporate limits to include this property and assign it to the adjacent City Council District 4.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 053-056.

POLICY

Mayor Lyles said the next item is the City Manager's Report. Do you have a report?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said no report, ma'am.

Mayor Lyles said no report.

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 11: AUTHORIZATION OF THE SALE OF CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution authorizing and approving an installment financing contract for the proposed financing and calling for the execution and delivery of various documents necessary to complete the sale of Certificates of Participation.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 096-099.

ITEM NO. 12: SALE OF CITY-OWNED LAND FOR WEST SUGAR CREEK REDEVELOPMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to (A) Adopt a resolution approving the sale of 4.32 acres of city-owned property at 5342 Reagan Drive and 5350 Reagan Drive (parcel identification numbers: 089-064-47 and 089-064-31) to Prosperity Hidden Valley, LLC for \$1 for the development of affordable housing, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete the sale of the property.

Councilmember Anderson said if I could just add some brief comments. I'm just very excited about the progress and the speed which this has occurred. You guys will remember, it was about a year ago where we had a debate around whether we should do that, and within that amount of time, we have closed, selected, remediated, relocated, and found a good partner in less than one year. So, when we say City government moves slow, in certain cases we can move quickly. I also want to say that many of the other residents who used this motel as home, they've all been rehoused and some of them have found permanent housing that they deem is better. So, Prosperity, Hidden Valley, is joining us this evening. They have been selected as our developer. They have ties to the community. They are committed to building quality product that is for-sale affordable homes that is directly abutting historic Hidden Valley neighborhood, which is a for-sale affordable home community. So, I couldn't be more pleased with the progress that we're making and understanding that affordable housing is a fundamental right to everyone who lives in our community. Everything that we can do on Council to ensure we are providing safe, affordable, stable housing, then we should be committed to that effort. So, thank you all of you who voted in support of this. Thank you for your continued support. I'm so happy to see Mr. Kennedy up there, and looking forward to the work that you'll do in the community.

Councilmember Ajmera said I share the excitement here. Our Corridors of Opportunity program has come a long way. I think earlier today during the Budget, we were discussing how our dollars have been matched by the Federal Government and have really helped us tackle affordable housing, public safety, in our community. So, I'm certainly very happy to have supported Corridors of Opportunity initiative, specifically the purchase of this motel that aligns with our Corridors of Opportunity goals for this specific Corridor. In fact, I was talking to a business owner in Sugar Creek Corridor a couple weeks ago, and I met this young lady who is a business owner. She talked about how she has seen investment come in past two to three years, that she hasn't seen in decades. So, this is an investment in an underinvested community. This has certainly been long overdue, so residents as well as business owners in Sugar Creek Corridor have certainly appreciated the effort that we are putting to help all of our Corridors, safe, affordable and equitable.

Councilmember Johnson said so, this is exciting. There is a fine line between improvement and gentrification and displacement, we know that. So, when this hotel was sold, the folks that lived there who couldn't afford market rate or had a criminal background or eviction on their record, they were required to move other places. So, it's good to hear that they're in a better situation. Also, this is an advantage or a benefit for

that area, and I'm happy that we are intentional about the affordable housing in that area, and it's Mr. Kennedy? Okay, Mr. Kennedy. So, I'm very happy. I think that this is, again, intentional and deliberate of an equitable approach to redevelopment. So, I'm looking forward to supporting this as well. Thank you.

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

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 55, at Page(s) 100-101.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: SPECTRUM CENTER AGREEMENT REVISION

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham and seconded by Councilmember Anderson, to (A) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute an agreement between Charlotte Arena Operations, LLC and the City of Charlotte in an amount not to exceed \$30,000,000 for additional Spectrum Center improvements and \$30,000,000 for the City's investment in a new practice facility development, (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance 772-X appropriating \$30,000,000 in proceeds from Certificates of Participation in the Tourism Capital Projects Fund for additional arena improvements and repairs, (C) Adopt Budget Ordinance 772-X appropriating \$30,000,000 in proceeds from Certificates of Participation in the Tourism Capital Projects fund for the City's contribution to a new practice facility development, and (D) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute contracts necessary to amend agreements for the Spectrum Center renovations and advance construction of the new practice facility related to the City's agreement with Charlotte Arena Operations, LLC.

Councilmember Watlington said I wanted to just circle back to the conversations we've been having ongoing in regards to economic development contracts and activities. I just want to make sure that we're clear about the expectation before the contracts are actually executed, that any substantial change to it, any specifics that need to be finalized, do come back to Council, even if it's not a formal vote necessarily. I'm particularly interested to make sure that our City Attorney's office is involved, and that we're advised accordingly right before the final execution of the contract. So, I'd like for Mr. Baker to speak to the role that we should expect from the Attorney's office as we go forward.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said thank you for that, Dr. Watlington. In the RCA (Request for Council Action), there is reference to expected future City Council engagements, which include an update on the final agreement prior to execution. That has been a conversation that I've had with several of you, because you don't have a contract in front of you. You've got deal points, and a contract has to come about with that. So, right now, these deal points are going to be the ingredients, if you will, of whatever it is that we're actually baking here, and if there are going to be changes to those ingredients, material changes, that should certainly come to Council, so that you've got an understanding as to what that is. I'll certainly work with the administration as we go through the process of putting this contract together. If there are some material changes that need to get to Council, there are multiple ways that we can get that information to you. If it's a substantial enough change, we can just bring it to a meeting and have you adopted whatever that particular change is. If it's relatively minor, or what have you, because you really should know, this is a huge investment and a really transformative investment in that building, and you should know what it is that we're doing, despite the fact that you've given the Manager the authority to do that. We will certainly update you, and I will certainly provide an independent update for you as we go, with the chronology and the status of the discussions as we go forward.

Ms. Watlington said thank you so much for that. The only other thing that I will add is that I know that I've asked this on a number of occasions, prior to this particular engagement, but as we look at participation, MWSBE (Minority, Women, Small

Business Enterprise), I want it to come back to us. I want us to understand what are we actually spending, because I know that we've had trouble in the past collating that information, and the information, thank you, that staff has provided. It's clear that there are some dots missing. So, while we work to get that information, I want to make sure that we start out with the end in mind on this one. So, definitely, before the contracts are executed, I want to make sure that we're clear about what that's going to look like, in terms of MWSBE tracking. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones, you've got that?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said yes.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I support the transaction. I've explained why in the past. I'm not going to repeat that, unless there's any suspense about the outcome of this vote. So, I think we should do it. Thanks.

Councilmember Graham said same here with Councilmember Driggs. Just wanted to note, there were two items that came out of the committee that we wanted to make sure that were in the deal points. One was community usage of the practice facility, and that was still noted in Item No. 23 in our package that we received on the deal points, so more activities at the practice facility itself. I thought the deal points that were laid out, that we received over the weekend were good. I think it really is a great step in the right direction, so we kind of see how these things are being laid out, and certainly, having the City Attorney come back to us once we begin to dot I's, cross T's, are extremely important. Again, the MWBE (Minority and Women Business Enterprise) participation, I think Council Watlington has already referred to it, that not only this project, but other high profile public projects that we're participating in, should be separated from all the other stuff that we do, like The Pearl, we made a number of commitments for, MWBE participation, workforce development activities, etc. We should be receiving periodical updates in reference to that, as well as any other future agreements that we would make that require a huge outlay of public funds, should be a part of it.

One of the things that I did not see, and hopefully this can be one of those deal points that are refined, was community usage of the arena itself. I know we talked about it at the Economic Development Committee, and that we've seen some language that was old language. I just wanted to make sure, again, that there's some conversation going from the City to the new ownership of the Hornets, in reference to community usage of the arena itself, understanding that there's a lot of complexities with that. Hopefully, the City Attorney is taking a look at the language, which is old language, that we revise and reflect what it is that we're trying to do in the future, in terms of the City trying to identify a wide variety of economic development opportunities for the City, where the arena may be a major factor of saying yes. I know, certainly, the arena goes beyond just MBA (Masters Basketball Association) basketball. There's concerts and a wide variety of other activities, and as we begin to grow our footprint internationally, there are a lot of people that are looking at coming to Charlotte and the arena is a part of the equation of coming or not. Thank you.

Councilmember Anderson said Mr. Graham hit on a lot of great points. I would just extend that and say, not only the community benefits that we've discussed at various meetings for the Spectrum Center, but also the new PEC, the Performance Enhancement Center, as well as an MBA-branded property, that could bring great extension to the community, as it relates to use. So, I'm glad that we're at a point where we can revise this agreement and move forward.

Councilmember Mitchell said I'm going to be very brief, like Councilmember Driggs. The dealmaker for me was the Hornets investment [inaudible] \$100 million, and Councilmember Watlington touched on it, 30 percent participation from minority small business. So, thumbs up for me.

Councilmember Johnson said I just want to be clear and transparent on the total cost. So, Mr. Jones, can you clarify for me, and for members of the public, the total cost. Do I understand it's \$30 million today for the practice facility, \$60 million that we previously approved, \$60 million for the Performance Enhancement Center, and then \$215 million for the improvements?

Mr. Jones said I'm going to have Tracy come up.

Tracy Dodson, Assistant City Manager said good evening, Council. Councilmember Johnson, just to answer your question, the previous agreement was \$215 million for the arena and \$60 million for the practice facility. What this agreement does is move \$30 million of the \$60 million from the practice facility to the arena, leaves \$30 million in the practice facility, and then the new Hornets ownership would cover the additional cost of the expanded practice facility, which is estimated to be an additional \$70 plus million.

Ms. Johnson said so, the total City investment is \$275 million?

Ms. Dodson said it's still \$275 million.

Ms. Johnson said so, the only difference is, we're just reallocating the \$30 million?

Ms. Dodson said we're reallocating the \$30 million, but then we're also talking about now, instead of 50 percent of the gravel lot, the entire gravel lot too. So, what we went through was the tradeoffs of, as we renegotiated the deal, with the Hornets alleviated from us as responsibilities, and then us allowing them to look at the other half of the gravel lot for five years.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you.

Councilmember Molina said I'm brief. Actually, I'm a little distracted. A few of our ceasefire friends found my personal page and started sending me threats. So, it's pretty unfortunate, like constantly back-to-back threatening me. Don't know why they picked me, but totally outside of the scope of what we're talking about. My dealmaker was Councilmember Driggs. It was his comparative, his mathematics and [inaudible] and calculations in comparison to what we had versus what we're gaining, as far as fiduciary responsibility is concerned. So, I'm really excited to see this go forward. Staff, I thank you guys for your work on this, and I look forward to supporting it.

Councilmember Ajmera said so, for me, it was that private sector was bringing \$70 million to \$100 million investment that we didn't have before. So, that's a big commitment in our Center City. In addition to that, I will echo Councilmember Molina, that it was Mr. Driggs' mathematical calculations, because in fact, I had expressed concerns about investing \$30 million towards the facility that we do not own. When you add up all the numbers about maintaining the facility, when you look at other construction delays, and we would have to pay the penalty, when you add up all those numbers, it makes sense. So, I think, Mr. Driggs, you should have your reconciliation spreadsheet in the records, because that's the kind of details I think staff should be preparing for us as we make these important decisions. Also, I wanted to follow up on something Dr. Watlington had raised about MWSBE program. Ms. Dodson, if you can just share with us, are there any program audits being done to ensure there is compliance with MWSBE commitments that are being made?

Ms. Dodson said for this particular project and the arena project so far, we are trying to track that, and Renee, keep me honest here, but if we've had questions about various projects, we have found some gaps in the tracking and we're working now to fix that for all projects going forward, so that we can better track everything as needed.

Ms. Ajmera said so, that's helpful. I think moving forward, we need to have a policy in place, or some sort of audit being done, to ensure that there is compliance with the commitment. For example, if there is a commitment being made of 30 percent, we need to go back before the project is complete, to ensure that the 30 percent commitment

was fulfilled, just like we do with other City commitments, to ensure the integrity of and for transparency as well. That's all I have. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said thank you. Since I've been pointed at as the numbers guy, I want to clarify, we had a \$275 million commitment in 2022, and we have one now. There were other obligations that we went through item by item, that we would incur in relation to the 2022 in addition, and now under the 2024 we have different ones, and the balance on the whole is just about flat. I did want to take this opportunity also to just thank the owners of the team for their investment in Charlotte, and hope they appreciate our investment and the partnership we have with you. Look forward to some winning seasons.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much, and we very much appreciate the opportunity to have this team continue to be a part of the City, because those kinds of things do make a difference in a city's ability to attract and also engage and encourage people. So, thank you very much.

Ms. Watlington said I just wanted, while you were there, I absolutely support the idea of a policy for tracking. I was just speaking with the Attorney in regards to, I'd love us to understand, as we're putting together that kind of policy, what is our leverage as the City? I see we're participating in selections, if you will, or at least interviews for a construction manager. What I don't see is participating and design team interviews. I know that we've had a lot of conversations about what we can do at the city to make sure that we're filling that pipeline and that there is capacity there. I want to see us take a much more active role in that, because I think it would be a menace if we ended up in a situation where good faith efforts were executed, but we didn't hit our goals or even get anywhere near them, and we not find that out until the back end of the tracking piece.

Ms. Dodson said and I'll just say that on large projects like this, we actually, I work closely with General Services and that team to advocate to have a seat at the table as early as possible, as often as possible, just because there's so much benefit of us collaborating and working together. Sometimes we're in there on design team, sometimes we're not, sometimes it's just the CMAR (Construction Manager at Risk). It varies, but we do advocate to get in there as early as possible and keep a seat at the table through the whole process, so we can ensure things just like this.

Ms. Watlington said absolutely, and I would even lean in beyond the advocating. If we're putting public dollars towards it, we demand a seat at the table, because I don't see a situation in which we're putting up \$270 some odd million dollars, and we don't have a seat at the table at all places. So, definitely want to follow up on that one and make sure that that one shows up. Thank you.

Mr. Jones said so, I just wanted to take this opportunity, Mayor and members of Council, one to thank the team for being able to pull together the deal, I think that's very important, but also to highlight that earlier last year, 2023, Council moved up small minority women owned businesses as one of the strategic initiatives. So, we as an organization, ED (Economic Development), CBI (Charlotte Business INClusion), General Services, Finance, have been taking a stronger, more focused look at what we're doing. So, when you do things like that, you will find mistakes and gaps, so we're going to own those mistakes and gaps as a team, and close those, because again, you lifted this up over a year ago, and we're making progress. We'd like to go faster, but we are doing this through a collaborative approach.

Ms. Ajmera said is that Internal Audit doing it? Who is tracking?

Ms. Jones said Internal Audit, we're all looking at this, and we're starting to see opportunities for improvement.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmember Johnson

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 67, at Page(s) 057-058.

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Lyles explained the rules and procedures of the appointment process.

ITEM NO. 14: NOMINATIONS TO THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Certified SBE-Hispanic Contractors Association beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning April 29, 2024, and ending April 28, 2027:

- Lindsey Haaser-Braciale, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Lindsey Haaser-Braciale by acclamation.

Ms. Haaser-Braciale was reappointed.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Latin American Chamber of Commerce beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026:

- Christian Gallardo, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Christian Gallardo by acclamation.

Mr. Gallardo was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term recommended by the LGBT+ Chamber of Commerce beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

ITEM NO. 15: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE BUSINESS INCLUSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending February 28, 2025:

pti:pk

The following nominations were made for two appointments for a two-year term beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026:

- Jerell Collins, nominated by Councilmember Graham
- Mark Deloach, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera
- Melanie Dunston, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera
- Cherri Flinn, nominated by Councilmembers Anderson and Driggs
- Candice Gaddy, nominated by Councilmembers Brown and Mayfield
- Sharon Geter, nominated by Councilmember Graham
- Calvin Johnson Sr., nominated by Councilmember Anderson
- Jamaica Kersey, nominated by Councilmember Anderson
- Raghunadha Kotha, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, and Johnson
- Dianna Nicolas, nominated by Councilmember Mayfield
- Raymond Palma, nominated by Councilmember Brown
- Zahn Patin, nominated by Councilmember Johnson
- Jacqueline Roseboro, nominated by Councilmembers Brown and Mayfield
- Anthony Ross, nominated by Councilmember Graham
- Lakesha Womack, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Molina
- Lucas Young, nominated by Councilmember Johnson

The appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a two-year term for an At-Large Representing Prime Construction Company category representative beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026:

- Gary Beal, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Molina
- Kimberlyn Gardner, nominated by Councilmember Brown

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Gary Beal by acclamation.

Mr. Beal was reappointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a two-year term for a Black Chamber of Commerce representative beginning May 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a two-year term for a Carolinas Asian-American Chamber of Commerce representative beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a two-year term for a Hispanic Contractors Association of the Carolinas representative beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026:

- Carolina Shoffner, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Carolina Shoffner by acclamation.

Ms. Shoffner was reappointed.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a two-year term for a Latin American Chamber of Commerce representative beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026:

- Pacino Mancillas, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Pacino Mancillas by acclamation.

Mr. Mancillas was reappointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a two-year term recommended by the Metrolina Minority Contractors Association beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a two-year term for a Metrolina Native American Association representative beginning March 1, 2024, and ending February 28, 2026:

- Rebecca LaClaire, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Rebecca LaClaire by acclamation.

Ms. LaClaire was reappointed.

ITEM NO. 16: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG PUBLIC ACCESS CORPORATION

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2026:

- Cedric Dean, nominated by Councilmember Brown

The appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2026:

- Christopher Allred, nominated by Councilmember Graham
- Sean Sullivan, Nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington
- Karen Vasko, nominated by Councilmember Brown

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Sean Sullivan by acclamation.

Mr. Sullivan was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term for a Resident Owner of Fourth Ward beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2025.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term for a Resident Owner of Hermitage Court beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2024, and a three-year term beginning July 1, 2024, and ending June 30, 2027.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

ITEM NO. 18: NOMINATIONS TO THE INLIVIAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending December 17, 2024:

- Angela Ambroise, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Angela Ambroise by acclamation.

Ms. Ambroise was appointed.

ITEM NO. 19: NOMINATIONS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING GRANTS FUND

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a Business Representative for a two-year term beginning April 16, 2024, and ending April 15, 2026:

- Anthony Chadwick, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington
- Sheila Ledbetter, nominated by Councilmember Brown

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Anthony Chadwick by acclamation.

Mr. Chadwick was reappointed.

The following nominations were made for four appointments for a Neighborhood Representative from within Program Boundaries for a two-year term beginning April 16, 2024, and ending April 15, 2026:

- Phyllis Barnette, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington
- Jeffrey Simpson, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington
- Jonathan Utrup, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown,

Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington
- Jason Wager, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Phyllis Barnette, Jeffrey Simpson, Jonathan Utrup, and Jason Wager by acclamation.

Ms. Barnette and Mr. Wager were appointed.

Mr. Simpson and Mr. Utrup were reappointed.

The following nominations were made for two appointments for a Non-profit Sector Representative for a two-year term beginning April 16, 2024, and ending April 15, 2026:

- Rhonda Dean, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington
- Phillip Gussman, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Rhonda Dean and Phillip Gussman by acclamation.

Ms. Dean and Mr. Gussman were reappointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a two-year term Recommended by School Superintendent beginning April 16, 2024, and ending April 15, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: NOMINATIONS TO THE PASSENGER VEHICLE FOR HIRE BOARD

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Hospitality / Tourism Industry category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2024.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: NOMINATIONS TO THE TRANSIT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nomination was made for one appointment for an Express Service Passenger category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending January 31, 2026:

- Juan Contreras Juarez, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Brown, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Juan Contreras Juarez by acclamation.

Mr. Contreras Juarez was appointed.

There were no nominations for one appointment for a Vanpool Rider category representative for a three-year term beginning February 1, 2022, and ending January 31, 2025.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.


Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 1 Minutes
Minutes completed: November 11, 2024