

*a City-County  
agency providing public Planning  
services to the City of Charlotte and  
the unincorporated areas of  
Mecklenburg County*

# Planning Commission

Sept. 13, 2010  
work session

NASCAR Hall of Fame  
Legends Conference Room  
9:30 a.m.





*Agenda*



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission Retreat

September 13, 2010 – 9:30 am

NASCAR Hall of Fame

Agenda

---

I. **Breakfast/Socialize** 9:30 – 10:00 am

II. **Welcome & Call to Order** 10:00 – 10:05 am

Stephen Rosenburgh

III. **Approval of July 19 Work Session Minutes** 10:05 – 10:10 am

Stephen Rosenburgh

*Attachment 1*

IV. **Bicycle Parking Text Amendment** 10:10 – 10:20 am

Laura Harmon

**Background:** This text amendment modifies the short-term and long-term bicycle parking requirements and standards.

**Action:** Planning staff requesting permission to file on behalf of the Planning Commission.

*Attachment 2*

V. **Information**

- September & October 2010 Meeting Schedules
- Planning Department's Public Outreach Presentations
- Executive Committee June 21, 2010 Approved Minutes
- Zoning Committee Public Hearings
- Zoning Committee Agenda
- Planning Committee June 15, 2010 Approved Minutes
- HDC July 14 & August 11, 2010 Meeting Updates

*Attachment 3*

*Attachment 4*

*Attachment 5*

*Attachment 6*

*Attachment 7*

*Attachment 8*

*Attachment 9*

VI. **Adjournment** 10:20 am





*Administration*





# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

**DRAFT**

July 19, 2010 Work Session  
Conference Room 267- Noon  
Action Minutes

---

## Attendance

**Commissioners Present:** Stephen Rosenburgh (Chairperson), Yolanda Johnson (Vice-Chairperson) Emma Allen, Tracy Finch-Dodson, Claire Green Fallon, Steven Firestone, Lucia Griffith, Nina Lipton, Eric Locher, Margaret Nealon, Greg Phipps, Joel Randolph and Andy Zoutewelle

**Commissioner(s) Absent:** Dwayne Walker

Commissioner Emma Allen arrived at 1:45 pm.

**Planning Staff Present:** Debra Campbell, Zenia Duhaney, Laura Harmon, Sandy Montgomery, Shad Spencer, and Cheryl Neely

**Others Present:** Katie McCoy, City Budget and Evaluation

## Call to Order

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 12:11 pm.

## Administration

### **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes**

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Locher to approve the June 7, 2010 Work Session Minutes. The vote was 12 to 0 to approve.

## Policy

### **Historic Signs Text Amendment**

Shad Spencer (Planning Staff) presented the Historic Signs Text Amendment and asked permission to file on behalf of the Planning Commission. He explained that the purpose of this amendment is to add a new sign type designation, "Historic Signs", with designation criteria to encourage the restoration and retention of nonconforming historically significant signs that have been moved from their original location to be reused at a new location. The Planning Director added that the origin of the proposed amendment resulted from several requests to maintain historic signage.

Commissioner Nina Lipton noted that she would follow-up with Shad Spencer "off-line" to discuss some minor concerns with the text amendment.

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Lipton to grant permission to file the Historic Signs Text Amendment on behalf of the Planning Commission. The vote was 12 to 0 to approve.

### **Tree Survey Reference Text Amendment**

A copy of the Tree Survey Reference Text Amendment was inadvertently omitted from the work session agenda packet. The Chairperson asked staff to forward the text amendment to the Commission by the end of the day.

Sandy Montgomery (Planning Staff) summarized the proposed text amendment and asked for permission to file on behalf of the Planning Commission. This text amendment updates an outdated section reference in the Zoning Ordinance that was not modified when the Tree Ordinance section numbers were reorganized in 2001.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson and seconded by Commissioner Locher to grant permission to file the Tree Survey Reference Text Amendment on behalf of the Planning Commission. The vote was 11 to 0 to approve.

Commissioner Andy Zoutewelle had a conflict of interest and refrained from voting.

### **Information**

#### **Planning Director's Extended Report**

The Planning Director's Report focused on the following items:

- **User Fees:** At the May work session, the Commission discussed asking City Council to waive user fees as a means to encourage development. In response to this discussion, Katie McCoy with the City's Budget office reviewed the City's user fee policy methodology, explaining that there are both regulatory and non-regulatory user fees. The Planning Department's fees are regulatory and are calculated to recover 100% of the fully allocated costs. Costs include staff's time, building rental, etc. To mitigate the impact of the economic downturn on the development community, the City suspended the policy to recover 100% of fully allocated cost and froze fees at the FY09 rates for both FY10 and FY11. Costs were also shifted from user fee recovery funds to the City's General Fund.

Following the presentation, the Commission acknowledged that fees are based on costs recovered. The Chairperson informed the Commission that the Planning Coordinating Committee (PCC) will discuss economic development and suggested that the PCC include fees as a part of their discussion.

- **Parking Standards Sub-Committee Recommendations:** This Sub-Committee included Commissioners Eric Locher, Tracy Finch-Dodson, Dwayne Walker, and Shad Spencer as Planning staff support. The committee was focused around responding to issues with parking standards for institutional uses in urban areas. The committee determined that there were no broad recurring issues and did not recommend any changes. They suggested that staff continue to monitor parking issues through development proposals on a case by case basis.

- **FY10 Strategic Operating Plan (SOP)/FY11 Work Program:** The Planning Director highlighted the Department's FY10 accomplishments. She also explained that the Department uses Council's Focus Areas and priorities to develop the annual SOP which in turn is used as a guide to develop the annual work program. The Director continued her presentation by reviewing the FY11 upcoming projects as well as identifying the concerns and challenges for FY11. The Chairperson asked the Director to notify the Commission if there are any areas that they should be involved in above and beyond area planning and rezoning activities. The Director also noted that the Commission didn't hold any Planning 101 meetings last year and encouraged them to organize to do so this year.

### **Committee Reports**

Below are summaries of action items from the Committee Reports:

- **Executive Committee:** The Chairperson announced that staff will present a recommendation to the Commission to allow Commissioners to call in for meetings under certain circumstances.

The Chairperson encouraged Commissioners to forward any future agenda topics to the Executive Committee for consideration.

- **Zoning Committee:** There were no action items.
- **Planning Committee:** There were no action items.
- **Historic District Commission:** The Chairperson recommended that Commissioner Meg Nealon be appointed as the Planning Commission representative on the Historic District Commission.
- **MUMPO:** Commissioner Joel Randolph was appointed as the Planning Commission representative on MUMPO.

### **Communication from Chairperson**

- The Chairperson asked Commissioners to send any ideas for the retreat to the Retreat Committee.
- Chairperson Rosenburgh announced that the Vice-Chairpersons for the Planning and Zoning Committees will be elected at their July Committee meetings.
- Since Commissioner Joel Randolph was rotated to the Planning Committee, there was a vacancy on the Executive Committee. The Chairperson temporarily assigned Commissioner Tracy Finch-Dodson as the Vice-Chairperson of the Zoning Committee to attend the July 19, 2010 Executive Committee meeting.

- Several Commissioners voiced concern about the election process for committee Vice-Chairpersons, noting that the process was put in place last year. The Chairperson asked Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Johnson to review the policies and make a recommendation as to whether the Rules of Procedure should be revised.
- The Chairperson asked Commissioner Eric Locher to take the lead in organizing a Planning 101 for the Commission. Commissioner Nina Lipton will assist with planning this community outreach event.

### **Adjournment**

The work session adjourned at 2:04 pm.





**TEXT AMENDMENT SUMMARY: Bicycle Parking Requirements  
8-3-2010**

**2010-066**

**Purpose/Background: The purpose of this amendment is to modify the bicycle parking requirements. This amendment will also add a maximum cap for bicycle parking spaces required for institutional, office, and retail uses.**

<b>Current Regulations</b>	<b>Proposed Regulations</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<p>Bicycle Parking Chapter 12, Section 12.202A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides regulations for short- and long-term bicycle parking.</li> <li>Provides a list of the required number of bicycle parking spaces for each use.</li> <li>Defines lighting standards for bicycle parking areas.</li> <li>Provides no cap on the number of bicycle parking spaces required for health institutions, office, or retail uses.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Removes, relocates, and modifies bicycle parking standards:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modifies the location standard for short-term bicycle racks to be no more than 120 feet from the primary entrance instead of a 30 second walk distance requirement.</li> <li>Removes lighting standards for bicycle parking.</li> <li>Relocates the type of long-term bicycle parking spaces allowed (indoor parking, racks in covered loading dock areas, garage structures, and/or lockers) into Section 12.202A(2)(a).</li> <li>Removes bicycle maneuvering area requirements from the Ordinance since they are already in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Land Development Standards Manual, and provides flexibility to use new bicycle rack designs not in the Manual.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>TABLE 12.202 BICYCLE PARKING MODIFICATIONS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Group Homes:</u> Removes the long term bicycle parking requirement.</li> <li><u>Health Institutions:</u> Adds a cap of 50 spaces maximum for long-term bicycle parking and a cap of 30 maximum for short-term bicycle parking.</li> <li><u>Office uses:</u> Adds a cap of 50 spaces maximum for long-term bicycle parking and a cap of 30 maximum short term spaces.</li> <li><u>Wholesale Establishments:</u> Reduces the short-term parking requirement from 5% to 1% of the auto parking requirement.</li> <li><u>Jails:</u> Modifies long-term bicycle parking spaces to two or one per 20 employees by changing from a square footage requirement to a requirement per number of employees. Plus, modifies short-term bicycle requirements to two parking spaces.</li> <li><u>Nursing Homes, Retirement Homes, etc:</u> Modifies long-term bicycle parking spaces to two, or one per 20 employees, instead of using square footage.</li> <li><u>Universities, colleges, or junior colleges:</u> Modifies long-term bicycle parking requirements to 2 spaces per principal building, instead of per office building, except for dormitories which are calculated separately.</li> <li><u>Retail Establishments:</u> Adds a cap of 30 maximum long-term bicycle parking spaces, and a cap of 50 maximum short-term bicycle parking spaces. Also adds an option to provide long-term parking spaces based on one parking space per 25 employees.</li> <li><u>Outdoor Recreation Uses:</u> Adds a cap of two long-term bicycle parking spaces, and deletes the long-term parking requirement based on square footage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current regulations for the location of bicycle racks have subjective language (a 30 second walk) that is open to interpretation.</li> <li>The lighting standard requirements are proposed for removal since there is no lighting standard required for off-street parking.</li> <li>The bicycle parking and maneuvering area design standards are located in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual, so that it can easily be updated, if needed.</li> <li>This amendment would place a cap on bicycle parking for certain uses including health institutions, office, and retail uses.</li> <li>This amendment allows the flexibility to use new bicycle rack designs that are not present in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual.</li> <li>Bicycle parking was eliminated for group homes since some group home occupants cannot leave on their own free will and the current requirement does not recognize the different types of group homes.</li> <li>A bicycle parking maximum was added for institutional, office and retail uses so that expansions of existing large sites would not require bringing the whole site into compliance with respect to bicycle parking. Under the new standard if a site has provided the maximum of parking no additional spaces would be required for expansions.</li> <li>The number of short-term bicycle parking spaces were reduced for wholesale establishments since most customers would not be using a bike to visit or purchase large scale items.</li> <li>Long-term parking for jails and nursing homes was changed from a square footage requirement to a requirement of so many parking spaces per employee, because using the square footages for these uses would require a large amount of bicycle parking.</li> <li>Outdoor recreation was capped because the square footage of the uses can be very large and produce a large number of bicycle spaces.</li> </ul>





**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING APPENDIX A  
OF THE CITY CODE –ZONING ORDINANCE**

**ORDINANCE NO.**

**BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE:**

Section 1. Appendix A, "Zoning" of the Code of the City of Charlotte is hereby amended as follows:

A. CHAPTER 12: DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY

1. PART 2: OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

- a. Amend Section 12.202A, "Bicycle parking standards", subsection (1), "Short-term bicycle parking", subsection (b), "Location", by adding new language for the location of short-term parking. Delete subsections (c) through (e). The remaining subsection (a) shall remain unchanged. The revised text shall read as follows:

**Section 12.202A. Bicycle parking standards.**

(1) Short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:

- (a) Covered spaces. If twenty (20) or more short-term bicycle spaces are required, then at least fifty (50) percent of the required short-term bicycle spaces shall be covered. Coverage may be provided under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers or within or under other structures.
- (b) Location. Short-term bicycle parking should be located along a major building approach line and clearly visible from the approach. The rack area ~~should~~ shall be no more than a ~~30-second walk~~ (120 feet) from the entrance it serves, or as close as the nearest nonhandicap, off-street car parking space, whichever is farther. ~~and should preferably be within 50 feet. A rack area should be as close or closer than the nearest nonhandicap car parking space.~~ A Rack area(s) should be clearly visible from the entrance ~~it~~ they serve ~~serves~~. ~~A rack area~~ and should be provided near each actively used entrance. In general, multiple buildings should not be served with a combined, distant rack area. It is preferred to place smaller rack areas in locations that are more convenient.

~~(c) The requirements of Section 12.202A(3) shall be met.~~

- ~~(d) Lighting. Lighting in the bicycle parking area shall meet the IESNA recommended maintained minimum horizontal and vertical illumination values and the recommended maximum to minimum uniformity ratios.~~
- ~~(e) Design. Bicycle parking areas shall meet the design specifications in the Charlotte Mecklenburg Land Development Standards Manual Chapter. Other designs and manufacturers may be deemed acceptable by the Plans Review staff.~~

b. Amend Section 12.202A, “Bicycle parking standards”, subsection (2), “Long-term bicycle parking”, subsection (a), “Covered spaces”, by adding language to allow long-term parking in parking decks, or loading docks to count as covered spaces, and subsection (b), “Location”, by defining the maximum distance long-term spaces can be located from an entrance. Delete subsections (c) through (e). The revised text shall read as follows:

(2) Long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:

- (a) Covered spaces. All spaces shall be fully covered from inclement weather. Long-term bicycle parking may consist of indoor parking, racks in covered loading dock areas, racks in garage structures, and/or bicycle lockers or other means which provide coverage to the bicycle.
- (b) Location. Long-term bicycle parking shall be located no more than 500 feet from a primary an entrance of the use they are intended to serve. ~~Long term bicycle parking may consist of indoor parking, racks in covered loading dock areas, racks in garage structures, bicycle lockers or other means which provide coverage to the bicycle.~~ Such parking may be restricted to use only by employees, tenants, residents or others at the discretion of the property owner or management.
- ~~(c) Lighting. Lighting in the bicycle room, compound or locker area shall meet the IESNA recommended maintained minimum horizontal and vertical illumination values and the recommended maximum to minimum uniformity ratios.~~
- ~~(d) Design. Bicycle parking areas shall meet the design specifications in the Charlotte Mecklenburg Land Development Standards Manual. Other designs and manufacturers may be deemed acceptable by the Plans Review staff.~~
- ~~(e) The standards of Section 12.202A(3) shall be met.~~

- c. Amend Section 12.202A, “Bicycle parking standards”, subsection (3), “General standards for all bicycle parking”, subsection (b), “Maneuvering areas”, by removing existing maneuvering language and adding language that maneuvering must meet the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual. Add a new subsection (e), titled, “Design” that references the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual. Modify the table titled, “Minimum Required Off-Street Parking Spaces by Use” to reflect updated bicycle parking requirements. The remaining subsection (a), (c), and (d) shall remain unchanged. The revised text shall read as follows:

(3) General standards for all bicycle parking areas:

- (a) Secured. Bike lockers and racks shall be securely anchored to the ground and on a hard surface.
  - (b) Maneuvering areas. Each required bicycle parking space shall be accessible without moving another bicycle. All bicycle parking spaces and areas shall be designed to meet the standards of the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual. An aisle at least five (5) feet wide is required between the building wall and the bicycle parking rack to allow room for bicycle maneuvering, unless specified otherwise in the Charlotte Mecklenburg Land Development Standards Manual. Bicycle parking spaces should provide a clearance of at least four (4) feet on adjacent sidewalks. Bicycle lockers should be situated so there are no obstructions within 5 feet of the entry door(s) of the locker.
  - (c) Signs. If required bicycle parking is not clearly visible from the entrance to the building, parking structure, transit station, or lot, a sign shall be posted at the primary entrances indicating the location of the parking.
  - (d) Use. Required bicycle parking spaces shall be available for residents, visitors, customers and/or employees of the use.
  - (e) Design. Bicycle parking areas shall meet the design specifications in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual. Other designs and manufacturers may be deemed acceptable by the Plan Review Staff.
- d) Amend Section 12.202, “ Required Number of Off-Street Parking and Bicycle Spaces, Table 12.202, “Minimum Required Off-Street Parking Spaces by Use” to reflect updated bicycle parking rates, and to bold and shade headings, and merge cells. In addition, relocate Table 12.202 before Section 12.202A. The revised Table shall read as follows:

**Table 12.202**  
**MINIMUM REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES BY USE\***

<b><u>Permitted Uses</u></b>	<b><u>Number of Auto Parking Spaces Required</u></b>	<b><u>Long-term Bicycle Parking Spaces Required</u></b>	<b><u>Short-term Bicycle Parking Spaces Required</u></b>
<b><u>RESIDENTIAL USES:</u></b>			
Bed & Breakfasts (B & B's)	1 additional space per guest room	n/a	n/a
Boarding houses	1 additional space per boarding room	n/a	n/a
Dormitories	1 space per 2 residents	1 space per 2 residents	1 space per 8 units; min. 4
Dwellings, detached	2 spaces per unit	n/a	n/a
Dwellings, duplex	2 spaces per unit	n/a	n/a
Dwellings, triplex	1.5 spaces per unit	none	none
Dwellings, quadraplex	1.5 spaces per unit	none	none
Dwellings, attached	1.5 spaces per unit	n/a	n/a
Dwellings, multi-family	1.5 spaces per unit	none	2, or 1space per 20 units
Dwellings, multi-family elderly or disabled	.25 spaces per unit	n/a	n/a
Dwellings, accessory elderly or disabled	1 space per unit	n/a	n/a
Dwellings, low income	1 space per unit	n/a	n/a
Dwellings, mixed use	1 space per unit	none	2, or 1space per 20 units
Manufactured housing	2 spaces per unit	n/a	n/a
<b><u>INSTITUTIONAL USES:</u></b>			
Adult care centers	1 space per employee, plus 1 space per 6 adults	2, or 1 per 20 employees	2
Child care centers	1 space per employee, plus 1 space per 10 children	2, or 1 per 20 employees	2
Civic, social service or fraternal facilities	1 space per 250 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Cultural facilities	1 space per 4 seats	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	2, or 1 space per 20 seats
Elementary, middle or junior high schools	1 space per classroom	none	1 space per classroom
Fire stations	1 space per 300 square feet excluding apparatus room	2 per station	none
Government buildings	1 space per 300 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Group homes	2 spaces per unit	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet  None	None
Health institutions	1.2 spaces per bed	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet or a maximum of 50 spaces	5% of auto parking or a maximum of 30 spaces
<b><u>Permitted Uses</u></b>	<b><u>Number of Auto</u></b>	<b><u>Long-term Bicycle</u></b>	<b><u>Short-term Bicycle</u></b>

	<b><u>Parking Spaces Required</u></b>	<b><u>Parking Spaces Required</u></b>	<b><u>Parking Spaces Required</u></b>
High schools	1 space per classroom, plus 1 space per 5 students	none	1 space per classroom
Jails	1 space per 2 employees	<del>2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet</del>  <u>2, or 1 per 20 employees</u>	<del>5% of auto parking</del> 2 spaces
Nursing homes, retirement homes, etc. Dependent living facility, Independent living facility	1 space per 3 beds 1.5 spaces per unit	<del>2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet</del>  <u>2, or 1 per 20 employees</u>	5% of auto parking
Religious institutions	1 space per 4 seats	none	2% of auto parking
Stadiums, arenas or coliseums	1 space per 3 seats	none	2% of seats or per CMPC review
Universities, colleges or junior colleges	1 space per 2 students	<del>2 spaces per office building, except for dormitories, above</del>  <u>2 spaces per principal building except for dormitories</u>	10% of auto parking
Rail or bus stations, transit centers without parking lots		A minimum of 8 or per CDOT review	A minimum of 8 or per CDOT review
Park and Ride Lots <del>with parking lots</del> (rail or bus)		4% of auto spaces for lots < 400 auto spaces or a minimum of 8 3% of auto spaces of lots of 400-800 auto spaces 2% of auto spaces of lots > 800 auto spaces or per CDOT review.	<i>A minimum of 6 or per CDOT review</i>
Other institutional uses	1 space per 250 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
<b><u>OFFICE AND BUSINESS USES:</u></b>			
Bus terminals and train stations	1 space per 4 seats in the terminal	5 % of auto parking or a minimum of 8 or per CDOT review	A minimum of 6 or per CDOT review
Clinics	1 space per 200 square feet	2, or 1 per 70,000 square feet or per CMPC review*	5% of auto parking
Financial institutions	1 space per 200 sq ft	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Showrooms	1 space per 1000 sq ft	2, or 1 per 20,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Hotels/motels (a) Per room for rent (b) Per meeting room capacity (c) Restaurant/entertainment facility (d)	1 space per room or suite, plus 1 space per 4 seats, plus 1 space per 250 square feet	1 space per 20 rentable rooms	None
<b><u>Permitted Uses</u></b>	<b><u>Number of Auto</u></b>	<b><u>Long-term Bicycle</u></b>	<b><u>Short-term Bicycle</u></b>

	<b><u>Parking Spaces Required</u></b>	<b><u>Parking Spaces Required</u></b>	<b><u>Parking Spaces Required</u></b>
Indoor recreation - Swimming pool - Tennis or racquet court - Other indoor recreation	1 space per 75 square feet of water 3 spaces per court 1 space per 200 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet, or per CMPC review	5% of auto parking
Laboratories	1 space per 400 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet, or per CMPC review*	5% of auto parking
Marinas	1 space per boat slip	1 per 20 berths	5% of auto parking
Offices	1 space per 300 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet, <u>or 50 maximum spaces</u>	2, or 1 per 40,000 square feet, <u>or 30 maximum spaces</u>
Medical offices	1 space per 200 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Neighborhood food and beverage service	1 space per 175 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Nightclubs, lounges and bars	1 space per 75 square feet	None	5% of auto parking
Outdoor recreation (See specific district for location) -Driving range -Golf Course (9 and 18 holes) - Par 3 golf course - Riding academy - Swimming pool  - Swimming pool (as part of planned dev.) - Tennis or racquet court - Tennis courts (as part of planned dev.)	1.2 spaces per tee 90 spaces per 9 holes 40 spaces per 9 holes 1 space per horse stall 1 space per 75 square feet of water 1 space per 100 square feet of water 3 spaces per court 2 spaces per court	<del>2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet (for employees)</del>	None for Golf Course (9 and 18 holes) and Par 3 golf course. 5% of auto parking for all other uses.
Post offices	1 space per 400 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Restaurants	1 space per 75 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Retail establishments - Motion Picture Theatres - Retail Establishments over 100,000 square feet - Other retail establishments	1 space per 3 seats 1 space per 330 square feet 1 space per 250 square feet	2 <u>minimum</u> , or 1 per 12,000 square feet, <u>or 1 per 25 employees, or 30 maximum spaces</u>	5% of auto parking <u>or maximum of 50 spaces</u>
Shopping centers, greater than 50,000 square feet	1 space per 250 square feet	2, or 1 per 12,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
Wholesale establishments	.25 space per 1,000 square feet for the <u>wholesale</u> <del>wholesaling</del> portion plus 1 space per 400 square feet for any accessory office	2, or 1 per 40,000 square feet	<del>5% of auto parking</del> 1% of auto parking
Other business uses	1 space per 250 square feet	2, or 1 per 10,000 square feet	5% of auto parking
<b><u>Permitted Uses</u></b>	<b><u>Number of Auto</u></b>	<b><u>Long-term Bicycle</u></b>	<b><u>Short-term Bicycle</u></b>

	<u>Parking Spaces Required</u>	<u>Parking Spaces Required</u>	<u>Parking Spaces Required</u>
<b><u>INDUSTRIAL USES:</u></b>			
Airports	1 space per 4 seats in the terminal	Per CMPC review*	Per CMPC review
Manufacturers and warehouses	.25 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the manufacturing or warehousing portion plus 1 space per 400 square feet for any accessory office	2, or 1 per 40,000 square feet	1% of auto parking
Other industrial uses	1 space per 400 sq feet	2, or 1 per 40,000 square feet	1% of auto parking

*(Petition 2005-013, § 12.209, 3/21/05), (Petition 2005-047, §12.203(Table 12.202), 01/17/06)*

Planning Commission staff in conjunction with CDOT may waive or reduce bicycle parking depending on the surrounding land uses of a particular development, and the accessibility of a site by bicycle. One example of a location where less bicycle parking would be required is at a freeway interchange with no connection to the surrounding neighborhoods.

- - All square footage is gross footage.

Section 2. That this ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption.

Approved as to form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney

I, \_\_\_\_\_, City Clerk of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and exact copy of an Ordinance adopted by the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, in regular session convened on the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 2010, the reference having been made in Minute Book \_\_\_\_, and recorded in full in Ordinance Book \_\_\_\_\_, Page(s)\_\_\_\_\_.

WITNESS my hand and the corporate seal of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_









# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

## Meeting Schedule

### September 2010

---

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
<b>Full Planning Commission</b>			
09-13-10	9:30 a.m.	*Work Session/Retreat	NASCAR Hall of Fame Legends Conference Room
<b>Planning Committee</b>			
09-21-10	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Zoning Committee</b>			
09-13-10	5:00 p.m.	**Zoning Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor-CMGC
09-20-10	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
09-20-10	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
09-29-10	4:30 p.m.	Zoning Work Session	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Executive Committee</b>			
09-20-10	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Other Committees</b>			
09-08-10	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
09-15-10	7:00 p.m.	MUMPO	Conference Room 267 2nd Floor – CMGC

\* Due to the Labor Day holiday, the September 6 Planning Commission work session has been rescheduled to **Monday, September 13, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. at the NASCAR Hall of Fame.**

\*\* This special Zoning Committee work session is for the Committee to make a recommendation on Rezoning Petition No. 2010-022.



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

## Meeting Schedule

October 2010

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Full Planning Commission</b>			
10-04-10	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Planning Committee</b>			
10-19-10	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Zoning Committee</b>			
10-18-10	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
10-18-10	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
10-27-10	4:30 p.m.	Zoning Work Session	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Executive Committee</b>			
10-18-10	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2nd Floor – CMGC
<b>Other Committees</b>			
10-13-10	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

## FY2010 Community Outreach Presentations

#	Date	Presentation	Staff
1	05/02/10	MUMPO Information Booth Fanta Festival at McAlpine Park	B. Cook
2	05/17/10	Hartwell Neighborhood Association - Water Overlay Requirements	L. Beverly
3	05/25/10	Plaza Central Business Association - Plan Amendment Process and Streetscape Project Briefing	K. Main
4	05/27/10	Charlotte Realtors Association Leadership Class on "Planning for Sustainability"	J. Garet
5	06/09/10	Urban Land Institute Panel Work Session	D. Campbell
6	06/10/10	Urban Land Institute Panel Report to Community	D. Campbell
7	06/15/10	Preserving Charlotte's Past - WFAE FM Public Conversation Community Forum	J. Rogers
8	06/17/10	Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools - Academic Internship Program - Engineering Career Day Presentation	S. Basham
9	06/22/10	WSBTV - History of the 2030 Plan - Planning and Land Use Component	D. Campbell
10	06/24/10	Community Conversation: Can We Talk about Affordable Housing - Harrison United Methodist - Pineville	D. Campbell
11	06/29/10	Planning 101 - Environmental Law Class - Central Piedmont Community College	T. Drake/Tammy Keplinger
12	06/29/10	Charlotte East Community Partners/East Meeting, Eastland Streetscape Project Update	K. Main
13	06/30/10	Community Conversation: Can We Talk About Affordable Housing: Fears, Facts and the Future - Covenant Presbyterian Church - East Moorehead	D. Campbell
14	07/19/10	Sharon Towers Board of Directors: South Park Area Planning activities and parameters	K. Main
15	07/24/10	City Council District 3 Meeting	D. Campbell
16	08/04-06/10	Mayor's Institute on City Design	D. Campbell
17	08/05/10	Annexation Public Information Meeting	J. Wells
18	08/17/10	Eastland Area Strategies Team: Eastland Mall Redevelopment Issues and Opportunities	K. Main





**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Commission  
Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
June 21, 2010 4:00 p.m.  
Room 266**

**Commissioners Present:** Stephen Rosenburgh (Chairperson), Eric Locher and Joel Randolph

**Commissioner Absent:** Yolanda Johnson (Vice Chairperson) – Called in via telephone

**Planning Staff Present:** Debra Campbell (Planning Director), Crissy Huffstickler, Cheryl Neely and Shad Spencer

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m.

**Approval of the May 17, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

Commissioner Locher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Randolph to approve the May 17, 2010 Executive Committee minutes. The vote was 3-0 to approve.

**Follow-Up Assignments**

**Planning Commission Retreat**

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if staff has finalized the location for the retreat. Cheryl Neely answered that the location and date are confirmed. The annual retreat will be held on September 13, 2010. The Director reported that she has retained an outside consultant Mike Whitehead to facilitate the meeting.

Chairperson Rosenburgh and the Director Campbell agreed that the facilitator should meet with staff and Commissioners prior to the retreat. This will enable him to gain understanding of the issues. Chairperson Rosenburgh discussed this plan of action with Mr. Whitehead. Mr. Whitehead will meet with senior staff and Commissioners individually before the retreat.

The Chairperson asked if the retreat would be open to the press. Planning Director Campbell answered only the business portion of the work session. The retreat is not a public meeting.

Chairperson Rosenburgh explained that the work session would follow the following order: the business portion of meeting, the retreat (facilitator portion) and the tour. Planning Director Campbell questioned having all of these segments at the retreat including having a guest speaker. The amount of time that can be devoted to working on the Commissioners and staffs roles and relationships would be minimal. She recommended having the facilitator portion the retreat at a special meeting. Staff could schedule a special meeting where the facilitator could focus on analyzing his findings and presenting information.

Commissioner Randolph agreed. He noted that usually at a retreat people bond and inter act to develop relationships. Chairperson Rosenburgh stated that he would rather take the tour first and give Commissioners the option of staying to participate in that portion of the meeting.

He asked if staff could provide a copy of the lists of staff members to Mr. Whitehead so that he may contact staff. Planning Director Campbell asked to meet with the Chairperson prior to submitting a list.

The Committee decided on the following schedule for the retreat.

<b>TIME</b>	<b>Segment</b>
<b>10:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.</b>	Business
<b>11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.</b>	Set Up – Guest Speaker
<b>12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.</b>	Lunch
<b>1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.</b>	Meeting & Tours

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if the Commission would consider planning a bonding exercise the night before the retreat or dinner afterwards. Planning Director Campbell indicated that schedules should be checked prior to making that determination. Chairperson Rosenburgh suggested that maybe types of facilities should be looked for availability if Commissioners want to do a tour and have light refreshments prior to retreat.

Commissioner Locher asked where Commissioners should park their vehicles. Director Campbell answered that Commissioners can park in the parking garage and walk over.

### **Land Mark and Historic Signs**

Staff met with Diane Althouse from the non-profit Historic Charlotte Inc. The purpose of the sign ordinance text amendment is to encourage the restoration and retention of both on-premise nonconforming historically significant signs and historically significant signs that are nonconforming, have been removed from their original location within Mecklenburg County, and are proposed to be relocated within the community.

Commissioner Locher asked what the criteria were in 1996. Shad Spencer explained that the existing sign ordinance includes a landmark sign designation for historic on-premise signs, but the designation period expired one year after the original adoption date of the ordinance, which occurred in 1996. The amendment would eliminate the designation time limit and modify the designation criteria.

An additional sign type designation, historic signs, would be added to the sign ordinance to allow historically significant signs that have been removed from their original locations within Mecklenburg County to be restored and relocated to another location within the community and maintain certain nonconforming aspects. The amendment would establish designation criteria for historic signs similar to the criteria for landmark signs.

Commissioner Randolph asked if a property is purchased and major work is done on the building, does the sign have to be torn down. Shad Spencer answered that staff would help with this issue as long as the signs meet the criterion that has been established.

### **Building Permit Process**

Planning Director Campbell indicated that they should focus on the issue raised by a number of Commissioners at the May work session regarding reducing or eliminating user fees.

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if this should be a topic at the work session. Director Campbell answered that is the issue. How does the Commission want staff to deliver the information? Should it be brought to the Executive Committee or should it be added to the work session agenda.

Chairperson Rosenburgh answered that it should be brought back to the full Commission. He noted before the Commission can talk about fees they should learn about the process. Commissioner Randolph stated that it seems that the issue is outside of the Commission's scope of work. Chairperson Rosenburgh answered that it is for information purposes only not for decision-making. The Chairperson asked Vice-Chairperson Johnson for her input. Vice-Chairperson Johnson answered that it appeared that a number of Commissioners did not understand the fee process when the issue was raised.

Planning Director Campbell explained that City and County recently went through the process of responding to concerns raised by the private sector regarding the permitting process. Staff could bring back the information regarding those recommendations and provide an update on the implementation of those changes. Commissioner Randolph asked if the committee is looking at the issue from a viewpoint of a citizen wanting to add, for example, a deck. Chairperson Rosenburgh answered no, that Commissioner Griffith's point was if fees were lowered that maybe, it would stimulate more mid-level development.

Vice-Chairperson Johnson asked Director Campbell if a flowchart exists that staff can provide as they go through the process. Director Campbell answered yes. Chairperson Rosenburgh stated a process flow would be very helpful for people to look at. It would show what staff and the City have been working on as well as the fees. Commissioners could then determine if they want to address a recommendation on the fee structure, but first they need to know the process and the fees.

Planning Director Campbell explained that it is a good idea to examine why the fees are set up the way that they are. Planning might charge a fee of \$4,000 to \$5,000 for a conditional site plan and most people may believe that the entire fee is going to Planning. However, the Planning Department has a residential fee that ranges from \$900 to \$1200 dollars for a conditional rezoning. There are other fees charged for this process, including an Engineering fee, and a CDOT fee, etc. Everyone is trying to recover 100% recovery cost. Planning does not charge a 100% recovery fee because the fees would be astronomical.

### **Telephone Call In-System**

The committee discussed having a process that covers Commissioners calling into meetings. Chairperson Rosenburgh recommended that Commissioners call in three times yearly. Chairpersons or Vice-Chairpersons cannot call in. Commissioners can call in if they are incapacitated or outside of the City.

Director Campbell indicated that the Committee should be extremely careful as it relates to the Zoning Committee because of the possibility of litigation. The Committee also discussed having a limit on a certain number of people calling in. Committee members agreed that the limit should be set at two. Commissioner Johnson recommended looking at the Historic Landmark Committee's call-in policy as an example.

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if the committee should file a motion. Cheryl Nelly answered that it needs to be taken to the full Commission.

### **Planning Coordinating Committee**

The Chairperson noted that the City is part of a region and staff should invite a regional representative to the next Planning Coordinating Committee meeting. Chairperson Rosenburgh recommended having the Secretary of Commerce speak at the upcoming meeting.

The Committee approved the meeting schedules for July, August, and September 2010.

### **July 19, 2010 Work Session Agenda Items**

The Planning Director explained that user fees were added to the July work session agenda. She asked if the Committee would like to discuss the user fees in July or change it to another month. Chairperson Rosenburgh recommended leaving user fees as a topic for discussion in July.

The Commission will discuss the historic district signs, tree ordinance reference text amendment, and have a Planning Director's extended report. Chairperson Rosenburgh suggested having a brief presentation on the suggested topics. For example, if there has been some change to documents to be presented, only highlight what has changed. Planning Director Campbell agreed and noted that staff tries to include as part of the minutes proposed changes made to documents that have been discussed.

### **New Commissioner Orientation**

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if a new commissioner orientation has been set up for the Commissioner Nealon. Staff answered an orientation would be scheduled.

### **Meeting Schedule**

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if the meeting scheduled has been adjusted for the July 28 Zoning Committee meeting. Planning Director Campbell suggested rescheduling the meeting date to Wednesday, August 4, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. The Committee agreed to change the date.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PETITIONS****FOR ZONING CHANGES BY CITY COUNCIL****OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, N.C.**

NOTICE is hereby given that public hearings will be held by the City Council in the Meeting Chamber located in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, 600 East Fourth Street beginning at 6:00 P.M. on **Monday, the 20th day of September, 2010** on the following petitions that propose changes to the Official Zoning Maps of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina:

**Petition 2010-032** Change in zoning from R-4 to UR-C(CD) for approximately 1.59 acres located at the intersection of Fordham Road and West Boulevard. **Petitioner: The Rock Worship Center.**

**Petition 2010-040** Change in zoning from O-2 and B-1 to and B-2(CD) for approximately 1.52 acres located along Wilson Lane and West Sugar Creek near Interstate 85. **Petitioner: Grady Parker Jr.**

**Petition 2010-047** Change in zoning from CC to CC(SPA) and UR-C(CD) 5 Year Vested Rights for approximately 68.90 acres located on the south side of US Highway 29 across from the intersection of Caprington Avenue and US Highway 29. **Petitioner: Trevi Partners, LLC.**

**Petition 2010-048** Change in zoning from R-3 to INST(CD) for approximately 5.00 acres located along the south side of Shopton Road near the intersection of Lebanon Drive and Shopton Road. **Petitioner: William B Cashion Jr. and William B Wise.**

**Petition 2010-052** Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to add new regulations for historic signs in order to preserve both on-premise nonconforming historically significant signs and historically significant nonconforming signs that have been removed from their original location and proposed for relocation in Mecklenburg County. Also modify and clarify the regulations for landmark signs. **Petitioner: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission.**

**Petition 2010-053** Change in zoning from O-2 to MUDD-O for approximately 2.27 acres located along the east side of Sharon Road between Morrison Boulevard and Coltsgate Road. **Petitioner: The Bissell Companies, Inc.**

**Petition 2010-054** Change in zoning from O-1(CD) to MUDD-O for approximately 2.96 acres located along the east side of Sharon Road between Morrison Boulevard and Coltsgate Road extending to abut Coltsgate Road. **Petitioner: The Bissell Companies, Inc.**

**Petition 2010-055** R-12MF(CD)(SPA) (site plan amendment) for approximately 43.41 acres located along the east side of Reames Road across from Secretariat Drive and Prestbury Boulevard. **Petitioner: Charter Properties, Inc.**

**Petition 2010-058** Change in zoning from B-D(CD) to O-1 for approximately 15.59 acres located at the intersection of Forest Point Boulevard and Forest Point Circle near Arrowood Road. **Petitioner: Cardinal Real Estate Partners.**

**Petition 2010-060** Text Amendment to update a cross-reference in the Zoning Ordinance that refers to an incorrect section in the Tree Ordinance. **Petitioner: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission.**

**Petition 2010-061** Change in zoning from O-1 and O-15(CD) to I-1(CD) for Approximately 57.91 acres located at the intersection of Pine Oaks Drive and Beam Road and bounded on the north by Westoak Drive. **Petitioner: South36LR, LLC and City of Charlotte.**

The City Council may change the existing zoning classification of the entire area covered by each petition, or any part or parts of such area, to the classification requested, or to a higher classification or classifications without withdrawing or modifying the petition.

Interested parties and citizens have an opportunity to be heard and may obtain further information on the proposed changes from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Office, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, 600 East Fourth Street, 704-336-2205. [www.rezoning.org](http://www.rezoning.org)

To file a written petition of protest which if valid will invoke the 3/4 majority vote rule (General Statute 160A-385) the petition must be filed with the City Clerk no later than the close of business on **Wednesday, September 15, 2010.**

**AGENDA**  
**CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**ZONING COMMITTEE WORK SESSION**  
**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center – Room 280**  
**August 4, 2010**  
**4:30 p.m.**

<p><b>1. Petition No. 2010-022 by Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 16.70 acres located south of the intersection of South Boulevard and South Caldwell Street and bounded by Templeton Avenue and Euclid Avenue from TOD-M(CD) and R-22MF to TOD-MO and TOD-RO.</p>
<p><b>2. Petition No. 2010-032 by The Rock Worship Center</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 1.59 acres located at the intersection of Fordham Road and West Boulevard from R-4 to O-1(CD).</p>
<p><b>3. Petition No. 2010-034 by RED Partners</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 0.36 acres located along the east side of North Davidson Street between Charles Avenue and East 32<sup>nd</sup> Street from R-5 to UR-2(CD).</p>
<p><b>4. Petition No. 2010-039 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 0.056 acres located on the northeast corner of West Bland Street and Winnifred Street from I-2 to TOD-M.</p>
<p><b>5. Petition No. 2010-041 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission</b> for a change in zoning of two parcels with an approximate total of 0.31 acres: one located at the intersection of South Tryon Street and Camden Road and the second located along Camden Road between South Tryon Street and Park Avenue from I-2 to TOD-M.</p>
<p><b>6. Petition No. 2010-042 by David R. Krug Associates, Inc.</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 18.20 acres located off Monroe Road and generally bounded by Shade Valley Road, Cateret Street, and Chippendale Road from I-2, R-17MF and R-5 to NS with five year vested rights.</p>
<p><b>7. Petition No. 2010-044 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission</b> for the adoption of a text amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to modify the regulations related to household pet services and the zoning districts in which they are permitted.</p>
<p><b>8. Petition No. 2010-046 by JNC Properties, LLC</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 1.01 acres located at the west corner of the intersection of Scott Avenue and East Boulevard from NS to B-1(PED-O).</p>
<p><b>9. Petition No. 2010-047 by Trevi Partners, LLC</b> for a change in zoning of approximately 68.90 acres located on the south side of US Highway 29 across from the intersection of Caprington Avenue and US Highway 29 from CC to CC(SPA) and INST(CD) with five year vested rights.</p>
<p><b>10. Zoning Committee Work Session Holiday Schedules</b> – Review the dates for the November and December Zoning Committee Worksessions currently scheduled. (Calendars attached)</p>





**APPROVED**  
July 20, 2010

**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission  
Planning Committee Meeting Minutes  
CMGC – Innovation Station, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
June 15, 2010 – 5:00 p.m.**

**Commissioners Present:** Yolanda Johnson (Chairperson), Eric Locher (Vice-Chairperson), Claire Fallon, Steve Firestone, Nina Lipton, Greg Phipps, and Andrew Zoutewelle

**Planning Staff Present:** Kathy Cornett, Sonda Kennedy, Melony McCullough, Bryman Suttle, and Jonathan Wells

**Other Staff Present:** Robert Drayton (City Real Estate), Tim O'Brien (City Real Estate), Susan DeSoto (Real Estate), and Denice Beteta (Neighborhood and Business Services)

**Call to Order**

Chairperson Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

***A motion was made by Commissioner Firestone and seconded by Commissioner Locher to approve the May 18, 2010 meeting minutes with the following changes to the draft Independence Boulevard Area Plan (IBAP) discussion:***

- (1) Correct the spelling of Chris Bakis' name, change Backus to Bakis.
- (2) Clarify comments made by Councilmember Nancy Carter about the transitional setback to read "We looked at transitional setbacks; we've deleted 150 feet within a certain parameter in the Conference Drive area so that businesses can develop using that designated setback for undesignated parking"; and
- (3) Clarify that Ron and Kathy McManus do not own the Olive Garden Restaurant but own a building on Independence Boulevard which is leased to the Olive Garden Restaurant.

***The vote was unanimous (7-0) to approve the minutes with the changes noted above.***

**University Research Park Area Plan**

Kathy Cornett (Planning Staff) stated that City Council received public comments on the draft *University Research Park Area Plan* at their May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting and the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on the draft plan. Ms. Cornett explained that the "Errata Sheet" correcting minor typographical errors in the draft plan that do not impact the intent of the plan. Ms. Mary Hopper was present to show her support of the plan.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Lipton and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve the University Research Park Area Plan with the changes noted on the Errata sheet and any future typographical errors. The vote was unanimous (7-0) to approve with noted changes.***

**M.R. #10-08: Proposed Transfer of Three Parcels and a House to the Belmont Community Development Corporation**

Melony McCullough (*Planning Staff*) presented the mandatory referral for the proposed transfer of three vacant parcels and one property with a vacant house to the Belmont Community Development Corporation (Belmont CDC). The Belmont CDC Foundation will construct affordable houses on the vacant lots; renovate the house, if feasible; and sale them to qualified buyers.

Commissioner Locher asked if it is typical for a CDC to own property outside of their community. Denise Beteta (*Neighborhood and Business Services Staff*) replied that the Belmont CDC received permission from the State to build in other neighborhoods. Commissioner Firestone asked who grants this authority. Ms. Beteta answered the State Treasurer's office. Commissioner Phipps asked if this is the first time that the Belmont CDC has developed housing outside of their area. Ms. Beteta replied yes. Chairperson Johnson asked the number of years that the property would have to remain affordable and Ms. Beteta replied ten. Commissioner Fallon asked how many houses will be constructed and what will be the price points. Ms. Beteta said one house will be constructed on each lot and the houses will cost less than \$120,000. She added that the Belmont CDC has buyers for three of the four houses.

Because one of the lots is located adjacent to the Belmont Center, Commissioner Zoutewelle asked who manages the Belmont Center and if there will be any possible changes to the Center, such as an expansion. He also asked if adjacent property owners have been notified. Ms. Beteta stated that this is City-owned property, managed by City staff. The building houses the Belmont Center administrative offices as well as meeting and recreational spaces. Robert Drayton (City Real Estate) said there are no plans for expansion of the Belmont Center. Commissioner Zoutewelle requested that staff make sure that the appropriate staff is aware of plans to sale the parcel adjacent to the Belmont Center.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Lipton and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #10-08. The vote was 7-0 to approve staff's recommendation for the mandatory referral.***

**M.R. #10-10: Proposed Sale of City Owned Property Located on W. Todd Lane**

Jonathan Wells (Planning Staff) presented the mandatory referral for the proposed sale of an 8,000 square foot parcel located on West Todd Lane to New Zion Baptist Church. Mr. Drayton explained to the group that the City originally acquired the property for construction of the Southwest Water Main project. There was lengthy discussion on how the property could be used and the conditions that the church needs to meet. Planning Committee members were concerned about the church's use of the parcel as a parking lot and zoning issues.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Fallon and seconded by Commissioner Firestone to defer making a recommendation on Mandatory Referral #10-10 until City Real Estate notifies the church that the property has to be rezoned in order to be used as a parking lot. The vote was 7- 0 to defer the Mandatory Referral.***

**M.R. #10-11: Proposed Sale of City Owned Property Located at 750 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street**

Jonathan Wells, (Planning Staff) presented the mandatory referral for the proposed sale of two parcels located at 750 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street to Trinity Episcopal School (TES). Staff recommends approval of the proposed sale, subject to TES granting the City a permanent easement for pedestrian access on the eastern portion of the parcel.

Commissioner Zoutewelle revealed that he has done surveys for the school and Commissioner Locher revealed that he is a former Trinity board member. Chairperson Johnson asked committee members were concerned since neither of them have financial ties. Committee members agreed that Commissioners Locher and Zoutewelle did not have a conflict and could hear the plan.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Lipton and seconded by Commissioner Firestone to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #10-11. The vote was 7-0 to approve staff's recommendation for the mandatory referral.***

**M.R. #10-12: Proposed Land Exchange for Future School Site on Fred Brown Road in Huntersville**

Jonathan Wells, (Planning Staff) presented the mandatory referral for the proposed exchange of a 1.7 acre vacant parcel for a 2.1 acre vacant parcel located off Fred Brown Road with the developer of an adjacent subdivision, Centennial Subdivision, in the Town of Huntersville. The developer plans to construct ten single family homes on the property.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Lipton and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #10-12. The vote was 7-0 to approve staff's recommendation for the mandatory referral.***

**Area Plan Status and Meeting Report**

**Elizabeth Area Plan**

Commissioner Lipton stated that there was a public meeting in the Elizabeth Area on June 9 to update the community about transportation options and specifically on Seventh Street. The next meeting will be on June 23, 2010 to discuss the details that CDOT is contemplating. Commissioner Zoutewelle stated that transportation is a big concern.

**Steele Creek Area Plan**

The last Citizen's Advisory Group meeting was May 20<sup>th</sup>.

### **Draft Independence Boulevard Area Plan**

This item was removed from the agenda and will appear on a future agenda. However, the Committee discussed this item at length. The bullets below provide a general summary of the Committee's discussion.

- Compensation of property owners for loss of use of their property along Independence Boulevard
- Concern that the area plan pushes traffic onto neighborhood streets.
- Timetable for the Independence Boulevard road project, funding for construction of the overpass, linking it with other transportation projects and how the road will look upon completion?
- Lack of a "bold" vision statement in the plan.
- Need for two plans or to divide the plan into phases: Phase 1 to deal with present issues and Phase 2 to deal with economic development in the short term.
- Transit stations areas along Independence Boulevard should be planned separately.
- The size of the plan area and its many issues.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

**Charlotte Historic District Commission Update****July, 2010**

---

At their July 14, 2010 meeting, the Charlotte Historic District Commission made a ruling on only one Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

---

2101 Dilworth Road East, Dilworth Local Historic District  
Renovation & Addition  
Terry Kerr, Applicant

**Deferred for Additional  
Design Work**

The July meeting was also the first Commission Meeting for three newly appointed members of the Historic District Commission. All three were appointed by City Council.

Mr. Roger Dahnert                      Dilworth Resident

Mr. Don Duffy                              At large

Mr. Tom Egan                              Plaza Midwood Resident

Two seats remain vacant, pending appointments by the Mayor.

Wilmore Resident

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission Representative



## Charlotte Historic District Commission Update

August, 2010

---

At their August 11, 2010 meeting, the Charlotte Historic District Commission made the following rulings on Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness.

---

A.	2101 Dilworth Road East, Dilworth Local Historic District Renovation & Addition Terry Kerr, Applicant	HDC 2010-072	<b>Approved</b>
B.	1721 The Plaza, Plaza Midwood Local Historic District Window Replacement Curtis Tutt, Applicant	HDC 2010-070	<b>Approved</b>
C.	1600 Wilmore Drive, Wilmore Local Historic District Renovations/Additions Diana Ramirez, Applicant	HDC 2010-075	<b>Approved with Conditions</b>
D.	612 Mt Vernon Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Enclosure of Side Porch Jay Patrick, Applicant	HDC 2010-073	<b>Approved</b>
E.	1114 Belgrave Place, Dilworth Local Historic District Rear Porch Addition John Friday, Applicant	HDC 2010-081	<b>Approved with Conditions</b>
F.	1200-A Myrtle Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Off Street Parking Area Brittany & Stephen Clyne, Applicants	HDC 2010-079	<b>Deferred, Subsequently Withdrawn</b>

