

Legislation Text

File #: 15-5539, Version: 1

Public Hearing on a Resolution to Close a Portion of an Alleyway off of Keeter Drive

Action:

- A. Conduct a public hearing to close a portion of an alleyway off of Keeter Drive, and**
- B. Adopt a resolution to close a portion of an alleyway off of Keeter Drive.**

Staff Resource(s):

Danny Pleasant, Transportation
Jeff Boenisch, Transportation

Explanation

- North Carolina General Statute 160A-299 outlines the procedures for permanently closing streets and alleys.
- The Charlotte Department of Transportation received a petition to abandon public right-of-way and requests this City Council action in accordance with the statute.
- The action removes land from public right-of-way status and attaches it to the adjacent property.
- The attached resolution refers to exhibits and metes and bounds descriptions that are available in the City Clerk's Office.
- A portion of an alleyway off of Keeter Drive is located in Council District 3.

Petitioners

TPS Charlotte, LLC - Braden L. Rudolph

Right-of-Way to be Abandoned

The portion of an alleyway off of Keeter Drive is located north of Wilkinson Boulevard, South of I-85, and west of Little Rock Road.

Reason

The petitioner owns property that abuts the alleyway and intends to reassemble all or parts of their property in order to accommodate the development of a future parking facility.

Notification

As part of the City's notification process, and in compliance with North Carolina General Statute 160A-299, the Charlotte Department of Transportation submitted this abandonment petition for review by the public and City Departments.

Adjoining property owner(s)

DSA Holdings, LLC- No objections

SMA Property Holdings, LLC - No objections

DTJT Properties, LLC - No objections

Neighborhood/Business Association(s) - There are no known neighborhood/business associations affiliated with this site.

Private Utility Companies - No objections

City Departments

Review by City departments identified no apparent reason this closing would:

- Be contrary to the public interest;
- Deprive any individual(s) owning property in the vicinity of reasonable means of ingress and egress to his property as outlined in the statutes; and
- Be contrary to the adopted policy to preserve existing rights-of-way for connectivity.

Attachment(s)

Map

Resolution