

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

Planning Commission

Nov. 1, 2010
work session

Charlotte-Mecklenburg
Government Center

Room 267
Noon



Agenda

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

November 1, 2010 - Noon

CMGC - Conference Room 267

Work Session Agenda

Call to Order & Introductions

Stephen Rosenburgh

Administration

Certificate of Appreciation

Present a Certificate of Appreciation to former Planning Commissioner Wesley Simmons.

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Approve the October 4, 2010 work session minutes

Attachment 1

Policy

Transportation Planning

Bob Cook & Norman Steinman

Background: The Commission requested information on how transportation is integrated with land use planning and the role of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization. CDOT and Planning staff will present information.

Action: Receive as information.

Text Amendments

Affordable Housing

Sandy Montgomery

Background: The purpose of this amendment is to modify the Zoning Ordinance to align with the North Carolina General Statutes regarding new regulations to make it unlawful to make land use decisions that discriminate based upon the fact that affordable housing is contained in the development.

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

Attachment 2

Third Party Rezoning Notifications

Sandy Montgomery

Background: The purpose of this amendment is to modify the Zoning Ordinance to align with the North Carolina General Statutes regarding new requirements for notice of hearings for third party rezonings.

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

Attachment 3

Information

Planning Director's Report

- Center City 2020 Vision Plan Update

November & December Meeting Schedules

Attachment 4

Planning Department's Public Outreach Presentations

Attachment 5

Committee Reports

Executive Committee

- September 20 Approved Minutes

- Future Agenda Items
 - HIRD Text Amendment
 - Capital Improvement Plan (Fall 2010)
 - Fresh Produce Markets Text Amendment
 - Food Dessert Presentation

Stephen Rosenburgh
Attachment 6

Zoning Committee

- Public Hearings
- Zoning Committee Agenda

Stephen Rosenburgh
Attachment 7
Attachment 8

Planning Committee

- September 21 Approved Minutes

Yolanda Johnson
Attachment 9

Historic District Commission

- October 13, 2010 Meeting Update

Meg Nealon
Attachment 10

Communication from Chairperson

Stephen Rosenburgh

A stylized graphic featuring the word "Administration" in a white, cursive font. The text is centered within a blue, wavy, brush-stroke-like shape. This shape is part of a larger composition that includes a green wavy shape below it and a brownish-green shape to the left. The overall effect is that of layered, torn paper or fabric.

Administration

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

DRAFT

October 4, 2010 Work Session

CMGC- Room 267

Action Minutes

Attendance

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

Commissioner Walker arrived at 12:40 pm.

Commissioners Absent: Steven Firestone

Planning Staff Present: Debra Campbell, Linda Beverly, Solomon Fortune, Shannon Frye, Laura Harmon, Sandy Montgomery, Cheryl Neely, Sandra Stewart, and Katrina Young

CDOT Staff Present: Danny Pleasant, Mike Davis, and Rick Grochoske

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 Allen to approve the September 13, 2010 Work Session Minutes. The vote was 12 to 0 to approve.

Policy

Urban Street Design Guidelines (USDG) Text Amendments Update

Mike Davis (CDOT staff) provided an update on the USDG text amendments to the Subdivision, Zoning, and Tree ordinances. He explained that the USDG policy was adopted by Council in 2007 and it identifies an action item for staff to update the impacted ordinances. To better understand how the USDG policies could be converted into regulations, staff applied the policies to the area planning process, capital improvement plan implementation, and land development processes. Staff first developed draft language and facilitated a 3-month process to allow the public to review the draft ordinance language to ensure the changes are practical and to identify and address any unintended consequences of the new language. The text amendments focus on four key topics:

1. **Street Network** – The intent is to establish a network of streets based on preferred and maximum block lengths. The street network varies based on the location and land uses. The current maximum subdivision block length is 1,000 ft. and the proposed length is 600 ft. to 1,000 ft. Current ordinance only applies to single family. The USDG has requirements for street network for other land uses. However, some uses such as cemeteries, schools and parks are exempt. Staff also has the authority to exceed the block length in certain scenarios.

2. **Local Street Design** – The purpose is to design streets with land uses in mind. For residential street setbacks the sidewalks are wider and farther from the curb. The Zoning Ordinance text amendment will allow the required setback to be measured from the back of the curb.
3. **Street Trees** – The current Tree Ordinance prohibits perimeter tree plantings in the right of way. The proposed text removes this restriction and allows more flexibility. Trees may be planted in the right of way, setback, or a combination.
4. **Traffic Calming** – Incorporate traffic calming components or treatments into the design of new or retrofitted streets. There are three ways to do so, intersection spacing, curb extensions and using staff consultation to implement devices such as chicanes, traffic circles, etc. to custom design streets.

Mike Davis continued by explaining that staff used real site plans to test the proposed language and determine the effects of the proposed amendments. Several ordinance changes were proposed as a direct result of site plan testing.

Alternative Compliance is a new approach which allows flexibility for developers to have a “3 Door Approach” or three different ways to get approval. Two options are in the existing subdivision process and involve working with staff. The Door 1 approval process is based on the applicant meeting the prescribed standards. Door 2 approval includes staff discretion and interpretation that a site may apply a particular standard. Door 3 approval is the new Alternative Compliance process. This is a quasi judicial process which uses a development review board. The purpose of this process is to allow for the approval of innovative, quality development proposals that are not anticipated by the standards. CDOT and Planning staff anticipates that the Alternative Compliance option will constitute a low percentage of development proposals. Staff is proposing a 9 member review board appointed by the Mayor and City Council. Members would serve two-year terms and represent the following areas of expertise:

- Architect
- Transportation/Urban Planner
- Bicyclist
- Civil Engineer
- Landscape Architect
- Public Health Professional
- Real Estate Attorney
- Real Estate Development Industry Rep.
- Planning Commission Representative

The next steps in the text amendments process includes an overview for Council at a workshop tonight, a public hearing which is scheduled for November 15 followed by City Council decision on December 20, 2010.

Commissioner Locher inquired about the 9 member review board. In particular he was concerned about having only one representative for each area of expertise. He asked staff to re-consider having more than one representative for each area. He also asked if the block length averaging concept only applied to residential uses located within wedges and encouraged staff to consider expanding the block length concept outside of wedges. Mike Davis responded that others have recently expressed interest in applying the block length concept in residential areas outside of wedges.

Commissioner Lipton noted that not all wedges are created equally. Some dense wedge areas could have smaller residential areas within them. She suggested that the street network should be comparable to the network in the area. Mike Davis responded that more than likely it would be an infill area with existing street stubs. In those instances, the stubs would be extended and will determine the street network.

Commissioner Griffith asked if the residential setback requirements, as measured from back of curb, will change. Mike Davis clarified that the location of the structure should not change. Commissioner Griffith also thought that the Alternative Compliance would create a lot of proposals and asked if staff was prepared to handle this extra work. Mike Davis noted that staff would not determine whether a developer should go to the review board and thinks there is adequate flexibility in the ordinance to allow staff to work with developers to prevent many requests.

Chairperson Rosenburgh followed up on Commissioners Griffith's question and wanted to confirm that the building setback would not change. Mike Davis responded that as of now the setback would not change, however he acknowledged that there may be a scenario which has not been thought of that may possibly impact or change building setbacks. The Chairperson asked CDOT staff to come back to the Commission if there is a change in building setback requirements so that the Commission could "weigh-in" on any proposed changes. Staff agreed with this request.

Commissioner Fallon asked why have a development review board when the developer is already required to go through the Zoning and/or Planning Committee review process. Doesn't this add another layer of review? Mike Davis replied that developers would not go to the Planning and/or Zoning Committees for an Alternative Compliance review request. Another step is added, but this is a discretionary mechanism to allow developers an alternative for innovative, flexible development.

Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if the setback measured from the curb applies to on street parking when the curb is pushed back from the center line. Mike Davis responded yes, the structure would probably have to move as a consequence of the curb moving. Commissioner Zoutewelle stated that in some districts the setback would not move. Mike Davis responded that staff would research and provide a response at a future work session.

Commissioner Randolph asked staff to be cautious when determining if setbacks are measured from centerline or back of curb. He suggested that some developers may look for loopholes in these regulations. He also asked how Blakeney would change if it was developed under the proposed regulations. Mike Davis explained that the streets would shift and block lengths would change, however the uses would still be allowed.

Commissioner Phipps asked if allowing tree plantings in the right of way is in conflict with utilities. Mike Davis replied that there could be a conflict; however when it is advantageous for the developer to locate trees in the right of way, staff wants them to be able to do so.

Commissioner Locher asked if it makes sense to limit block averaging to wedges. Especially since it may encourage sprawl and increase housing costs. Danny Pleasant responded that staff looked at 40 – 50 subdivisions that had been approved in the last five years and discovered that for the most part all of them would be approved today under the proposed amendments and no housing units would be lost. Even the mixed income communities which are generally located in urban areas are using the street network guidelines. Commissioner Locher noted that he wasn't aware of any specific communities which would be impacted by the proposals. Chairperson Rosenburgh suggested that Commissioner Locher send any examples to Danny Pleasant.

Chairperson Rosenburgh mentioned that the Planning Commission represents the different areas of expertise for the Design Review Board and suggested that the Commission could possibly take on this role.

The Planning Director acknowledged and thanked both CDOT and Planning staff for the hard work they have done on this initiative. Chairperson Rosenburgh agreed and thanked staff for the presentation.

Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Text Amendment

Sandy Montgomery (Planning staff) presented the HVAC text amendment, explaining the proposed amendment came about as a result of concerns from citizens about possible violations of the Zoning Ordinance with respect to the placement of HVAC units in side yards. Typically, HVAC units were considered part of the structure, but this was not clear in the Zoning Ordinance. The definition was revised and clarifies that units are considered to be part of the structure. The amendment also revises the regulations to allow HVAC units to encroach in the required side or rear yard by not more than 50% of the required yard. The amendment also allows for nonconforming units to be replaced provided that the new unit does not increase the nonconformity or exceed 42 inches in height if it is located in the setback or side or rear required yard along a public street.

Commissioner Lipton mentioned that some of the new energy efficient units are higher than the 42 inch proposed height limitation for nonconforming units. Staff will research and respond to this issue during the Zoning Committee review process.

A motion was made by Commissioner Griffith and seconded by Commissioner Walker to grant permission to file the HVAC Text Amendment on behalf of the Planning Commission, with the understanding that staff will review the height issue and respond during the Zoning Committee review process. The vote was 13 to 0 to approve.

Eco-Industrial Facility Text Amendment

Sandy Montgomery also presented the Eco-Industrial Facility text amendment. This text amendment adds a new use to the Zoning Ordinance. An eco-industrial facility is a community of industrial uses that locate together on a common property to exchange and make use of each other's by-products or energy. The text amendment provides a definition and determines the appropriate zoning districts. The amendment also clarifies the definition for Public Utility Structure to include ownership by a public-private partnership in addition to a publicly owned structure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Lipton and seconded by Commissioner Phipps to grant permission to file the Eco-Industrial Facility Text Amendment on behalf of the Planning Commission. The vote was 13 to 0 to approve.

Information

Planning Director's Report

HIRD Update

Katrina Young informed the Commission that a stakeholders' meeting is scheduled for October 5th in Innovation Station at 6:00 pm. Staff will present revised regulations. Commissioner Randolph asked if the information is available online. Ms. Young replied that the information is available on the Planning Department's website.

Commissioner Lipton asked when this item would come back to the full Commission for review. Katrina Young responded that tentatively this item will be placed on the November work session agenda. The Planning Director suggested that it may be later than the November work session. The Planning Director also acknowledged that staff was notified that they are to invite Planning Commissioners to attend all study group meetings.

North Carolina American Planning Association Conference

Debra Campbell shared that she attended the NC Conference last week in New Bern and that next year this annual state conference will be held in Charlotte. As a result, Planning staff worked with the City's Corporate Communications Department staff to create a video highlighting Charlotte and inviting NC Planners to next year's conference. The Commission viewed the video. Commissioner Walker and other Commissioners were impressed with the video and asked staff to forward a copy to the Commission.

Planning Committee Report

Vice-Chairperson Johnson announced that the Planning Committee was starting the review processes for the Elizabeth and Steele Creek Area Plans. The Planning Committee is touring the Elizabeth area following the meeting today at 2:00 pm.

Vice-Chairperson Johnson also reminded the Chairperson that he assigned a Commissioner to the Center City 2020 Vision Plan and asked that a plan update be added to next month's work session agenda.

Historic District Commission

Commissioner Nealon reported that at the September meeting several applicants were asking for input from the Commission, hence several project deferrals. One applicant referred to attached garages and current HDC policies don't adequately address attached garages. Commissioner Nealon anticipates that the policies will be amended to address attached garages.

Communication from Chairperson

Stakeholder Meetings

The Chairperson reminded Commissioners that they are welcome to attend stakeholder meetings, but asked them not to speak at these community meetings. He further explained that often times when Commissioners express their opinion at a community meeting the attendees misinterpret their comments as the opinion of the full Commission.

Economic Development

Chairperson Rosenburgh shared that Commissioner Griffith is assigned to Economic Development. He noted that economic development is the potential agenda topic for the Planning Coordinating Committee's Spring 2011 Joint Luncheon. The Chairperson asked the Planning Director if Commissioners can attend the joint luncheon. The Planning Director responded that they can attend as observers.

The Chairperson also encouraged Commissioners to notify him if they had any areas of interest.

Retreat Follow Up

The Chairperson announced that the Executive Committee is assembling information from the retreat facilitator. Vice-Chairperson Johnson, along with Commissioners Allen and Dodson will report back to the full Commission at a future meeting.

Rules of Procedure/Call-in Procedure

Commissioner Phipps asked about the procedure to allow Planning Commissioners to call-in for meetings. Chairperson Rosenburgh stated that staff was not prepared to discuss this item at the October work session and asked the Planning Director if staff would be ready next month. Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Johnson responded and clarified that this agenda item had been assigned to her and she is working on the amendment to the Rules of Procedure.

Adjournment

The work session adjourned at 1:47 pm.



TEXT AMENDMENT SUMMARY: <u>Discrimination Statement for Affordable Housing</u>		2010-10-12-2010
Purpose/Background: The purpose of this amendment is to modify the Zoning Ordinance to align with the North Carolina General Statutes regarding new regulations to make it unlawful to make land use decisions that discriminate based upon the fact that affordable housing is contained in the development.		
Current Regulations	Proposed Regulations	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Planning Commission has the authority to review and make recommendations to the City Council regarding amendment to the text of the Zoning Ordinance and to the Zoning Maps. Section 3.201. The Planning Commission shall make its written recommendation to the City Council. Section 6.110 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to the new North Carolina General Statute sections that require the Planning Commission, in its written recommendation, not to discriminate against affordable housing units for families or individuals with incomes below eighty percent of the area median income. However, a written recommendation based on considerations of limiting high concentrations of affordable housing is permissible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the Zoning Ordinance to conform to North Carolina General Statute requirements of G.S. 41A-4 and G.S. 41-A-5(a).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City Council action on any petition to reclassify property can consider the following (Section 6.111): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the proposed reclassification is compatible with the overall character of existing development in the immediate vicinity of the subject property; The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the property; and Whether the proposed reclassification will adversely affect a known archaeological, environmental, historical, or cultural resource. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to the new North Carolina General Statute sections that state that the City Council, in considering any petition to reclassify property, shall not discriminate against affordable housing units for families or individuals with incomes below eighty percent of the area median income. However, a reclassification of property based on considerations of limiting high concentrations of affordable housing is permissible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the Zoning Ordinance to conform to North Carolina General Statute requirements of G.S. 41A-4 and G.S. 41-A-5(a).

Non-Discrimination Statement for Affordable Housing Text Amendment

5-24-10

Petition No. 2010-

Petitioner: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

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 6: AMENDMENTS

1. PART 1: Provisions of General Applicability

- a. Modify Section 6.110, "Hearing", by modifying subsection (3) to add regulations that make it unlawful to make land use decisions that discriminate based upon the fact that affordable housing is contained in the development. All other subsections remain unchanged. The revised subsection shall read as follows:

Section 6.110. Hearing.

- (1) No amendment shall be adopted until after the City Council has held a public hearing on the proposed amendment.
- (2) The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with rules and procedures adopted by City Council.
- (3) No proposed amendment shall be approved until the Planning Commission has made its written recommendations, or 30 days after the public hearing, whichever shall first occur. If the Planning Commission does not make a recommendation within 30 days after the petition has been referred to it, then the Planning Commission shall be considered to have made a favorable recommendation, unless action was taken to defer.

In making its written recommendation, the Planning Commission shall also advise and comment on whether the rezoning petition is consistent with the purposes, goals, and objectives and policies of the adopted "Generalized Land Plan" and any amendment to that plan through an adopted district or area plan covering the subject property.

Per G.S. 41A-4 and G.S 41-A-5(a), the Planning Commission, in making its written recommendation, shall not discriminate against affordable housing units for families or individuals with incomes below eighty percent (80%) of area median income. A written recommendation by the Planning Commission based on considerations of limiting high concentrations of affordable housing is permissible.

- b. Modify Section 6.111, “Action by City Council”, by adding a new subsection (4) and renumbering the remaining subsections. The new subsection will add regulations that make it unlawful to make land use decisions that discriminate based upon the fact that affordable housing is contained in the development. All other subsections remain unchanged. The revised subsection shall read as follows:

Section 6.111. Action by City Council.

- (1) The City Council, after receiving the report and recommendation of the Planning Commission, shall consider the reports and recommendations of the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission staff, and other departments. Within a reasonable time the City Council shall either reject the proposed amendment or adopt an ordinance enacting the proposed amendment with or without modifications.
- (2) In considering any petition to reclassify property, the City Council shall consider the following items:
 - (a) Whether the proposed reclassification is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted "Generalized Land Plan" and any amendment to that plan through an adopted district or area plan covering the subject property;
- (3) In considering any petition to reclassify property, the City Council may consider, although is not required to, the following:

(Petition No. 2006-16 §6.111(3), 03/20/06)

 - (a) Whether the proposed reclassification is compatible with the overall character of existing development in the immediate vicinity of the subject property;
 - (b) The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including but not limited to roadways, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater treatment and garbage services; and
 - (c) Whether the proposed reclassification will adversely affect a known archaeological, environmental, historical, or cultural resource.
- (4) Per G.S. 41A-4 and G.S 41-A-5(a), the City Council, in considering any petition to reclassify property, shall not discriminate against affordable

housing units for families or individuals with incomes below eighty percent (80%) of area median income. Reclassification of property by the City Council based on considerations of limiting high concentrations of affordable housing is permissible.

- (45) In approving an amendment to reclassify property to a district other than a conditional zoning district, or with the consent of the petitioner in the reclassification to a conditional zoning district, the City Council may change the existing classification of the property, or any part of the property covered by the petition, to the classification requested, to a classification or classifications between the existing and the requested classifications, or to any higher classification in the hierarchy of zoning districts established in Section 9.102. This action may occur without the withdrawal or modification of the petition or further public hearings. In the case where a petitioner requests a text amendment, the City Council may modify any proposed text amendment upon adoption of an ordinance enacting the amendment without the withdrawal or modification of the petition or further public hearings.
- (56) In approving a rezoning petition, the City Council shall adopt a statement describing whether its action is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted "Generalized Land Plan" and any amendment to that plan through an adopted district or area plan covering the subject property, and provide an explanation why the action taken is reasonable and in the public interest. This statement shall not be subject to judicial review.

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.

TEXT AMENDMENT SUMMARY: <u>Third Party Rezoning</u>		2010-10-12-2010
Purpose/Background: The purpose of this amendment is to modify the Zoning Ordinance to align with the North Carolina General Statutes regarding new requirements for notice of hearings for third party rezonings.		
Current Regulations	Proposed Regulations	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of all public hearings shall be in accordance with the North Carolina General Statutes and rules and procedures adopted by City Council. Section 6.109 • There are no different regulations for notices of public hearings for third party rezoning petitions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to the new North Carolina General Statutes regarding notice of hearings for third party rezonings: “Except for a city-initiated zoning map amendment, when a rezoning application is not filed by the owner of the subject parcel of land to which the proposed change would apply, the petitioner shall certify to the City Council that the property owner of the parcel of land as identified on the County tax listing has received actual notice of the proposed rezoning and a copy of the public hearing.” • A certification form will be available to the petitioner by the Planning Department. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the Zoning Ordinance to conform to North Carolina General Statute requirements.

NOTICE OF THIRD PARTY REZONING TEXT AMENDMENT

Petition No: 2010-

Petitioner: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

10/13/2010

ORDINANCE NO. _____

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

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 6: AMENDMENTS

1. PART 1: PROVISIONS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY

- a. Amend Section 6.109, "Notice of hearings" by adding language as per Session Law 2009-178 (Senate Bill 1027) amending North Carolina General Statutes (N.C.G.S.) 160A-384 regarding notice of hearings for third party rezonings. Added language shall read as follows:

(1) Notice of all public hearings required under this Chapter shall be in accordance with the North Carolina General Statutes and rules and procedures adopted by the City Council.

(2) Notice of hearings for third party rezoning, pursuant to G.S. 160A-384 as amended and G.S. 1A-1, Rule 4(j).

a) Except for a city-initiated zoning map amendment, when a rezoning application is not filed by the owner of the subject parcel of land to which the proposed change would apply, the petitioner shall certify to the City Council that the property owner of the parcel of land as identified on the County tax listing has received actual notice of the proposed rezoning petition and a copy of the notice of public hearing.

b) A certification form shall be made available to the petitioner by the Planning Department.

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

November 2010

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
11-01-10	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
11-01-10	2:00 p.m.	Independence Blvd. Area Plan ¹ Discussion & Tour	Conference Room 267 2nd Floor – CMGC
11-16-10	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
Zoning Committee			
11-15-10	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
11-15-10	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
11-23-10	Noon	Zoning Work Session ²	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
Executive Committee			
11-23-10	11:00 a.m.	Work Session ³	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committees			
11-10-10	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
11-17-10	7:00 p.m.	MUMPO	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC

¹ The previously scheduled Steele Creek Area Plan tour on November 1, 2010 was cancelled and replaced with the Independence Boulevard Area Plan discussion and tour.

² Due to the Thanksgiving Holiday, the regularly scheduled November 24, 2010 Zoning Committee work session has been rescheduled to Tuesday, November 23, 2010 at Noon.

³ The regularly scheduled November 15, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting has been rescheduled to Tuesday, November 23, 2010 at 11:00 a.m.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Meeting Schedule

December 2010

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
12-06-10	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
12-14-10	5:00 p.m.	Work Session - Tentative ¹	Innovation Station 8 th Floor - CMGC
Zoning Committee			
12-20-10	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
12-20-10	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
01-10-11	10:00 a.m.	Zoning Work Session ²	Conference Room 280 2nd Floor – CMGC
Executive Committee			
12-20-10	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committees			
12-08-10	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 267 2nd Floor – CMGC

¹ Due to the holiday, the regularly scheduled December 21, 2010 Planning Committee work session has been cancelled and the Committee will meet on December 14, 2010 if necessary.

² Due to the holiday, the regularly scheduled December 29, 2010 Zoning Committee work session has been rescheduled to January 10, 2011 at 10:00 am.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

FY2010 Community Outreach Presentations

#	Date	Presentation	Staff
1	07/19/10	Sharon Towers Board of Directors: South Park Area Planning Activities and Parameters	K. Main
2	07/24/10	City Council District 3 Meeting	D. Campbell
3	08/04-06/10	Mayor's Institute on City Design	D. Campbell
4	08/05/10	Annexation Public Information Meeting	J. Wells
5	08/17/10	Eastland Area Strategies Team: Eastland Mall Redevelopment Issues and Opportunities	K. Main
6	09/02/10	St. Petersburg Times Presentation	D. Campbell
7	09/13/10	Guest Lecture at UNCC	D. Campbell
8	09/13/10	Clemson University Landscape Architecture Class - TOD Background and Class Project Site Discussion	Kent Main/Alan Goodwin
9	09/16/10	Leadership Charlotte Presentation on Planning	D. Campbell
10	09/17/10	North Carolina Arc Users Group (NCAUG)	L. Quinn
11	09/24/10	UNCC Seminar Class	L. Quinn
12	10/07/10	Ace Mentoring Program - Eastland Mall Presentation	L. Harmon
13	10/07-09/10	MTA Mini Revolution Conference - Baltimore, MD	D. Campbell
14	10/12/10	Waxhaw Board of Commissioners - Waxhaw Parkway Project	B. Cook
15	10/14-15/10	ULI Panel - Washington, DC	D. Campbell
16	10/19/10	Coventry Woods Neighborhood Meeting - Independence Area Plan	G. Johnson
17	10/27-28/10	ULI Hampton Roads Keynote Speaker - Norfolk, VA	D. Campbell

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Executive Committee Meeting

September 20, 2010 - 4:00 pm

Action Minutes

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Stephen Rosenburgh (Chairperson), Yolanda Johnson (Vice-Chairperson), Tracy Finch-Dodson, and Andy Zoutewelle

Planning Staff Present: Debra Campbell, Linda Beverly, Sandy Montgomery, and Cheryl Neely

Call to Order

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Finch-Dodson and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve the July 19, 2010 meeting minutes. The vote was 4 to 0 to approve the minutes.

Follow-up Assignments from the July 19, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting

Amendment to the Rules of Procedure for Call-in Procedures

Chairperson Rosenburgh asked about the status of the amendment to the Rules of Procedure. Cheryl Neely responded that she had made the recommended changes to the proposed call in-procedures and forwarded to Vice-Chairperson Johnson for review. Vice-Chairperson Johnson acknowledged that some Commissioners had concerns about the proposed call-in procedures. She suggested that the administrative burden outweighs the intent of establishing call-in procedures and recommended removing this item from the Planning Commission's October 4, 2010 work session agenda to allow additional time for review/consideration. The Committee agreed with the recommendation.

Regionalism / Planning Coordinating Committee (PCC) Meeting

The Chairperson and Planning Director discussed the purpose of the fall PCC meeting. The Director clarified that the fall meeting is to prepare for the Spring Joint Luncheon. She informed the Committee that the Planning Directors are meeting on September 22, 2010 to prepare for the fall meeting. The Chairperson suggested that the Secretary of Commerce or representatives from the local banking industry, such as Wachovia be invited to the Spring Joint Luncheon to participate in the economic development discussion. The Planning Director responded that guest speakers may be invited after the agenda topic is confirmed.

Planning Commission Annual Report

Chairperson Rosenburgh thanked Commissioner Finch-Dodson for working with Planning staff to create the City Council annual report and acknowledged her willingness to provide assistance. Commissioner Finch-Dodson responded by suggesting that she and other veteran Commissioners would like to further assist the Commission by providing informal orientation to new Commissioners. For instance, experienced Commissioners will follow up with new Commissioners from time to time and sit next to them in meetings to provide support. The Committee agreed with Commissioner Finch-Dodson's proposal.

Follow up Assignments from the September 13, 2010 Work Session/Retreat

Bicycle Text Amendment

The Planning Director reminded the Committee that staff will provide an explanation on covered space requirements, define short term and long term parking and explain rational for long and short term parking for dwelling units during the Zoning Committee review process. Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if there are surveys that indicate how many bicycle commuters are in Charlotte. Debra Campbell responded that staff did not have this information. Commissioner Finch-Dodson noted that Center City Partners recently completed a transportation study and she will find out if the study included information about bicycle commuters. Other questions included, why were percentage ratios for the number of vehicle parking spaces used to determine the number of bicycle parking spaces be provided; how can a buyer do due diligence to determine if an existing development is in compliance regarding bike parking; and how are these regulations enforced. Planning staff will follow up with CDOT staff and respond at the October Executive Committee meeting.

2010 Planning Commission Retreat

The Executive Committee agreed that the discussion from the retreat needed to continue. The Chairperson suggested that he, Planning Director Campbell, Vice-Chairperson Johnson, and Commissioner Finch-Dodson follow up with Whitehead Associates to discuss how to move forward and report back at the October Executive Committee Meeting. The Chairperson asked Cheryl Neely to inform the Planning Department Leadership Team that the Planning Commission was not satisfied with the retreat results and will continue to work with the facilitator and staff to establish stronger operating agreements. The Chairperson will provide an update to the full Commission at the October work session.

October 4, 2010 Work Session Agenda Item(s)

Rules of Procedure Call-in Procedures

This item was removed from the October 4, 2010 work session agenda.

Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Text Amendment

Sandy Montgomery presented the HVAC text amendment. She shared that this amendment was drafted as a result of concerns raised by citizens about the placement of HVAC units. The units were being placed in side yards, which created nonconforming uses. The text amendment clarifies that the unit is part of the structure and allows encroachment into the required side or rear yard by no more than 50% of the required yard.

Fresh Produce Markets Text Amendment

Sandy Montgomery explained that there has been growing interest in fresh produce markets. The current regulations are extensive and the proposed regulations would allow fresh produce markets in all districts with new and flexible requirements. This amendment was initiated by Carolinas Medical Center. Commissioner Finch-Dodson asked if the market on Kings Drive a fresh produce or farmer's market. Chairperson Rosenburgh asked if this amendment would impact the larger market on Yorkmont Road. He was concerned that the larger market is not thriving and asked staff to reconsider the amendment and research how the ordinance can enhance the Yorkmont Road market to make it more viable. The Chairperson asked staff to remove this item from the October work session agenda.

Eco-Industrial Facility Text Amendment

Sandy Montgomery also presented the Eco-Industrial Facility text amendment. An eco-industrial facility is a community of industrial establishments that locate together on a common property to exchange and make use of each other's by-products or energy. The text amendment provides a definition, and determines the appropriate zoning districts.

Urban Street Design Guidelines (USDG) Text Amendments Update

The Planning Director announced that Planning and CDOT staff will present an update of the USDG text amendments at the work session. This item will go to public hearing and City Council will hold a workshop to discuss the proposed changes. The update will highlight the proposed changes to the Subdivision Ordinance.

2010 Retreat Follow-up

The Chairperson will inform the Commission that members of the Executive Committee and staff will work with Whitehead Associates, Inc. to determine how to proceed with follow-up, including establishing stronger operating agreements.

Future Work Session Agenda Items

The Chairperson asked that the Transportation Planning (MUMPO) presentation be placed on the November work session agenda. The presentation would allow for the Commission to understand the linkages between transportation planning as well as the Planning Commission's role in the process.

Approval of the October 4, 2010 Work Session Agenda

The Executive Committee reviewed the October 4, 2010 work session agenda. Vice-Chairperson Johnson made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Finch-Dodson. The vote was 4 to 0 to approve the agenda as modified.

Approval of the November 2010 Meeting Schedule

A motion was made by Vice-Chairperson Johnson and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve the November 2010 meeting schedule as submitted. The vote was 4 to 0 to approve.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.

**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 15th day of November, 2010** on the following petitions that propose changes to the Official Zoning Maps of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina:

Petition 2010-050 Change in zoning from B-D to I-1 for approximately 1.95 acres located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Interstate 485 and Interstate 77 and to the west of Statesville Road.

Petitioner: DavidLand, LLC.

Petition 2010-051 Change in zoning from I-2 to UR-2(CD) for approximately 3.629 acres located on the west side of Bingham Drive near North Tryon Street.

Petitioner: Habitat for Humanity of Charlotte, Inc.

Petition 2010-069 Change in zoning from R-3 to INST(CD) for approximately 13.98 acres located on the east side of the intersection of Mallard Creek Road and Penninger Circle and located across from Mason Drive.

Petitioner: Patrick N. Dillon.

Petition 2010-070 Change in zoning from MUDD(CD) to MUDD-O for approximately 1.06 acres located on the south side of Fairview Road between Park South Drive and Piedmont Row Drive.

Petitioner: Fairview Plaza Associates Limited Partnership.

Petition 2010-071 Change in zoning from R-4(HD-O) to UR-C(CD)(HD-O) for approximately .324 acres located on the north side of Arosa Avenue between East Morehead Street and Dilworth Road.

Petitioner: Covenant Presbyterian Church.

Petition 2010-072 CC site plan amendment for approximately 14.40 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Park Road and Sharon Road West.

Petitioner: Quail Corners Associates, LLC.

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

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, November 10, 2010.**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PETITIONS
FOR ZONING ORDINANCE 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 15th day of November, 2010** on the following petitions that propose changes to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance:

Petition 2010-045 Text Amendment to modify and clarify the regulations for pedestrian oriented information pillars and information pillar signs.

Petitioner: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission.

Petition 2010-073 Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to implement the Urban Street Design Guidelines.

Petitioner: Charlotte Department of Transportation.

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

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PETITIONS
FOR SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE 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 15th day of November, 2010** on the following petitions that propose change to the City of Charlotte Subdivision Ordinance:

Petition 2010-074Sub Text Amendment to Chapter 20 of the City of Charlotte Subdivision Ordinance to implement the Urban Street Design Guidelines.

Petitioner: Charlotte Department of Transportation.

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

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PETITIONS
FOR TREE ORDINANCE 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 15th day of November, 2010** on the following petitions that propose change to the City of Charlotte Tree Ordinance:

Text Amendment to Chapter 21, Sect 21-94(c)(2) of the City of Charlotte Tree Ordinance to allow trees to be planted in public right-of-way.

Petitioner: Charlotte Department of Transportation.

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

AGENDA
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
ZONING COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, Rm 280
October 27, 2010
4:30 P.M.

- | |
|--|
| <p>1. Petition No. 2010-056 by Childress Klein Properties for a change in zoning of approximately 13.15 acres bounded by Carnegie Boulevard and Congress Street near Barclay Downs Drive from O-1 to MUDD-O.</p> |
| <p>2. Petition No. 2010-059 by Jeff Short for a change in zoning of approximately 0.365 acres located on the east corner of the intersection of Holt Street and Herrin Avenue from R-5 to R-12MF(CD).</p> |
| <p>3. Petition No. 2010-062 by Allen Tate, Jr. for a change in zoning of approximately 1.3 acres located on the northeast corner of Pineville-Matthews Road (Hwy 51) and Johnston Road from O-1 to NS.</p> |
| <p>4. Petition No. 2010-063 by Richard Latorre for a change in zoning of approximately 0.512 acres located along the north side of Monroe Road between Ashmore Drive and Glendora Drive from R-4 to O-1(CD).</p> |
| <p>5. Petition No. 2010-064 by Greater Galilee Baptist Church for a change in zoning of approximately 2.86 acres located at the intersection of Spruce Street, South Mint Street, and West Park Avenue generally bounded on the north side by Wilmore Drive from R-5(HD-O) to MUDD-O(HD-O).</p> |
| <p>6. Petition No. 2010-065 by Levine Properties, Inc. for a change in zoning of approximately 10.90 acres generally surrounded by North College Street, East 9th Street, North Brevard Street and East 7th Street from UMUD and UMUD-O to UMUD-O and UMUD-O SPA.</p> |
| <p>7. Petition No. 2010-066 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission for the adoption of a text amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to modify the regulations for bicycle parking.</p> |

**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission
Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
CMGC – Conference Room 280, 2nd Floor
September 21, 2010**

Commissioners Present: Yolanda Johnson (Chairperson), Andy Zoutewelle (Vice-Chairperson), Emma Allen, Eric Locher, and Margaret Nealon

Commissioners Absent: Lucia Griffith and Joel Randolph

Planning Staff Present: Karen Chavis, Alan Goodwin, Michelle Jones, Kent Main, Melony McCullough, and Jan Whitesell

Call to Order

Chairperson Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:01pm.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Allen and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve the July 20, 2010 meeting minutes. The vote was unanimous (5-0) to approve the minutes.

Plaza-Central Plan Amendment Overview

Michelle Jones (Planning staff) explained that the property owner at 1508 Central Avenue is requesting an amendment to the *Plaza-Central Pedscape Plan* (2003). She gave an overview of the proposed amendment to allow a reduction in the 400-foot separation required between residential uses and nightclubs to 225 feet within the plan area.

She explained that the plan guides land use, public investment and other decisions focused on enhancing the pedestrian environment. Ms. Jones also explained the Pedestrian Overlay Zoning District (PED) which provides standards for form and design but does not change land use.

Commissioner Locher asked how the 400' distance requirement came about. Kent Main (Planning staff) explained that the 400' distance is standard in the Zoning Ordinance. He also stated that a property owner cannot apply for a variance in PED and that staff does not support PED-O (Optional) for this request.

Commissioner Zoutewelle shared his concerns about the underlying zoning districts and what may happen in the future. Committee members were also concerned about the maximum number of bars that would be allowed to sale alcohol in the area and if property owners will be notified of any request to sale alcohol. Staff responded that there is no limitation on the number of bars that the amendment allows; however, notification of all requests will be sent to property owners within 400' and neighborhood leaders within a one-mile radius.

Staff shared with the Committee concerns heard during the public meeting. Approximately 15 persons attended and expressed concern about parking as well as drinking and driving through the neighborhood. Most of those in attendance support the plan amendment if bars and nightclubs are to be mainly located along Central Avenue and away from single family neighborhoods.

Staff highlighted the next steps in the process which include holding a final public meeting on September 23 and the Planning Committee receiving public comments on October 19.

FY2011 Area Plan Assessment Results

Ms. McCullough and Jan Whitesell (Planning staff) shared results of the FY2011 Area Plan Assessment Process. Ms. McCullough explained that this is a comprehensive process that involves analyzing a large amount of data and assessing planning needs throughout Charlotte's extraterritorial jurisdiction.

Ms. McCullough explained that the plan assessment takes into considerations over 35 factors that can be grouped in the following categories: development pressure, environmental features, and transportation/infrastructure factors. Ms. Whitesell presented several maps showing the application of data and data sources. Some of the data sources are building permits, quality of life index, rezoning petitions, transportation and infrastructure projects, and environmental features.

The results of the FY2011 Area Plan Assessment Process were shared and the following areas scored highest: Prosperity Church Road, Ballantyne, Cotswold, Central/Albemarle/Lawyers Road, Park Road, and I-85/Sugar Creek/North Tryon/North Graham.

Commissioner Zoutewelle stated that he would like all Planning Committee members to be included in meeting notices for all area plan Citizen Advisory Groups (CAG's), text amendment CAG's, pedscape CAG's, etc. The Committee agreed that they would like staff to include all Planning Committee members on these notices. Although, all Committee members will be notified of meetings, a commissioner and a substitute will still be assigned to each area plan.

Chairperson Johnson was interested in who determines the type of planning process needed. For example, is it a plan amendment or an area plan. Staff responded that the Planning Director decides if a plan amendment is appropriate depending upon the request.

Chairperson Johnson also informed the Committee members that the Independence Boulevard Area Plan is on hold while discussions regarding the transitional setback continue.

Area Plan Status and Meeting Report

Elizabeth Area Plan - Commissioner Zoutewelle reported that he attended some of the area plan meetings as a stakeholder. Alan Goodwin (Planning staff) reported that the next steps include staff finalizing the plan recommendations and meeting with the stakeholders to share the details of the plan recommendations.

Steele Creek Area Plan – Commissioner Zoutewelle reported there were no updates and the next CAG meeting is scheduled for October 7, 2010.

Chairperson Johnson assigned the following commissioners to the following plans:

Elizabeth – Commissioners Johnson and Griffith

Midtown – Commissioners Locher and Zoutewelle

Plaza-Central Pedscape Plan – Commissioner Nealon

Area Plan Tours

Ms. McCullough presented options to the Committee for tours of the Elizabeth and Steele Creek plan areas. The Committee will tour the Elizabeth plan area on Monday, October 4 at 2:00 p.m. and the Steele Creek plan area on Monday, November 1 at 2:00 p.m. following the full Planning Commission meetings.

Planning Commission Retreat

The Planning Committee briefly discussed the Planning Commission Retreat. Chairperson Johnson stated that there are unfinished items that need to be addressed. She indicated that Chairman Rosenburgh asked her and Commissioner Dodson to draft what they would like to see in an operating agreement. This information will be shared with Chairman Rosenburgh, the Planning Director, and the facilitator. Chairperson Johnson is soliciting thoughts from committee members. Commissioner Allen suggested the Commission develop four to five bullets that communicate how the Commission gets their work done. The next steps are to finalize the operating agreement and meet with the Retreat Committee, Planning Director and facilitator to complete unfinished items from the retreat.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:03pm.

Charlotte Historic District Commission Update

October 27, 2010

At their October 13, 2010 meeting, the Charlotte Historic District Commission made the following rulings on Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness.

A.	1920 South Mint Street, Wilmore Local Historic District Second Floor Addition Daimean & Jennifer Fludd, Applicants	HDC 2010-107	Approved
B.	235 West Park Avenue, Wilmore Local Historic District Construction of New House Collin & Kevin Walsh, Applicants	HDC 2010-089	Approved with conditions
C.	723 Mt Vernon Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Construction of New Single Family House Harry Schrader, Applicant	HDC 2010-097	Approved
D.	201 West Park Avenue, Wilmore Local Historic District Painting of Brick Building Bradley Saunders, Applicant	HDC 2010-100	Approved
E.	429 East Boulevard, Dilworth Local Historic District Glass Enclosure of Front Porch Tonya Reid, Applicant	HDC 2010-102	Approved
F.	1824 South Mint Street, Wilmore Local Historic District Renovation Mark & Kristin Santo, Applicants	HDC 2010-104	Deferred
G.	615 Mt Vernon Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Conversion of Side Room to Sun Room Christine Bonner, Applicant	HDC 2010-105	Approved
H.	1560 Merriman Avenue, Wilmore Local Historic District Repair of Vinyl Siding & Windows, Elimination of One Façade Entrance Charles Dibiazue, Applicant	HDC 2010-098	Deferred