

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

Planning Commission

Dec 2, 2013
work session

Charlotte-Mecklenburg
Government Center

Innovation Station
8th Floor

Noon

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Work Session Agenda

December 2, 2013 - Noon

CMGC - Innovation Station

Call to Order & Introductions

Tracy Dodson

Administration

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Approve the November 4, 2013 minutes.

Attachment 1

Policy

University City Area Plan – BLE Transit Station Area Plans Update

Amanda Vari

Background: Staff will provide an overview of the University City Area Plan – BLE Transit Station Area Plans Update process.

Action: None, for information only.

Midtown Morehead Cherry Pedestrian Overlay Amendment

Michelle Jones

Background: Staff will provide an update on the Midtown Morehead Cherry Pedestrian Overlay Amendment process.

Action: None, for information only.

Information

Planning Director's Report

Debra Campbell

- I-77 Noise Walls
- Planning Department's Public Outreach Presentations

Ed McKinney

Attachment 2

December 2013 & January 2014 Meeting Schedules

Attachment 3

Committee Reports

Executive Committee

Tracy Dodson

- October 21, 2013 Approved Minutes
- Future Work Session Agenda Items

Attachment 4

Future Work Session Agenda Items	Work Session
1. Area Plan Policy Assessment	January
2. Zoning Ordinance Process	February
3. Extended Planning Director's Report – City Council Retreat	February

Zoning Committee

Tracy Dodson

- Upcoming Rezoning Petitions
- Zoning Committee Agenda
- Zoning Committee Public Hearings

Tammie Keplinger

Attachment 5

Attachment 6

Planning Committee

Tony Lathrop

- October 15, 2013 Approved Minutes

Attachment 7

Historic District Commission (HDC)

Karen Labovitz

- November 13, 2013 Meeting Update

Attachment 8

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)

Andy Zoutewelle

Communication from Chairperson

Tracy Dodson

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Attachment 1

November 4, 2013 - Noon

CMGC - Conference Room 267

Action Minutes

Call to Order & Introductions

Chairperson Dodson called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m., followed by introductions.

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Tracy Dodson (Chairperson), Tony Lathrop (Vice-Chairperson), Emma Allen, Ray Eschert, Randy Fink, Steven Firestone, Karen Labovitz, Tom Low, Dionne Nelson, Greg Phipps, Deb Ryan, Michael Sullivan, Dwayne Walker and Andy Zoutewelle

Commissioner Phipps arrived at 12:21 p.m., Commissioner Walker arrived at 12:32 p.m. and Commissioner Firestone arrived at 12:41 p.m.

Commissioners Absent: None

Planning Staff Present: Pontip Aphayarath, Penny Cothran, Alan Goodwin, Laura Harmon, John Kinley, Claire Lyte-Graham, Kent Main, Melony McCullough, Ed McKinney, Cheryl Neely and Michelle Barber (temporary employee).

Administration

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Zoutewelle made a motion to approve the October 7, 2013 work session minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Allen. The vote was 11-0 to approve the minutes.

Policy

Potential Impact Areas & Impact Priorities – Rezoning Process

Chairperson Dodson reminded the Commission that they previously indicated that they wanted to have meaningful discussions about the Zoning Ordinance project and the Area Planning process. As a result, the Executive Committee thought would it be beneficial to have an overview of the current rezoning process to educate Commissioners and help them prepare for the Zoning Ordinance. However, she clarified that the purpose of this presentation is to help commissioners understand the current process.

The Chairperson introduced Tammie Keplinger who explained that the purpose of her presentation is to provide an overview of the rezoning process and receive input from the Commission. The presentation focused on the following:

- The Relationship Between Plans and Zoning
- Who is Involved in the Rezoning Process
- Steps in the Rezoning Process
- Rezoning Schedule – The rezoning process is a 4 to 6 month process.
- Other Related Activities to the Rezoning Process such as developer responses, administrative approvals, research, and data compilation.

Please click [here](#) to view the PowerPoint Presentation in its entirety.

The following is a summary of the discussion that took place after the presentation.

Commissioner Phipps asked if staff recalled a rezoning petition in the Derita community where a petitioner spent money during the rezoning process (over and beyond the rezoning fees) to enhance property to make it acceptable by staff. He noted that since the petitioner had so much invested in the property, some Zoning Committee members may have felt compelled to recommend approval of the petition. Ms. Keplinger replied that she did not recall that situation. She explained that staff would not ask a petitioner to enhance property prior to a rezoning. However, there may have been an instance where a petitioner made improvements to appease an adjacent property owner.

Ms. Harmon recalled that this was a MUDD rezoning request and she reiterated that staff would never ask a petitioner to do make improvements in order to request a rezoning. If a petitioner is going through the process, there may be things that staff thinks are important for the site. For instance, if a rezoning is located in a pedestrian oriented area that does not have sidewalks, staff may ask for a commitment that would apply if the rezoning is approved, but never in advance of a decision.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if a majority vote is required from Council to approve a rezoning petition. Ms. Keplinger explained that it is a simple majority unless a protest petition has been filed. If there a valid protest petition is filed, the affirmative votes of three-fourths of the Mayor and City Council are needed for the rezoning petition to be approved. Ms. Harmon clarified that it is a majority of the full Council and not just those in attendance. Because of this, if a protest petition is filed, the petitioner often waits until all Council members are in attendance to request a vote.

Ms. Keplinger added that Council has a written policy which indicates that if a protest petition has been submitted and the full Council is not present at the meeting where the decision is to be made, the petition will automatically rollover to the next Council meeting, unless the petitioner requests a decision.

Commissioner Labovitz asked if it is necessary for the Zoning Committee to submit their recommendation on a rezoning petition before Council votes or can Council vote without a recommendation from the Zoning Committee. Ms. Keplinger replied that the Zoning Ordinance indicates that if the Zoning Committee has not voted and it has been more than 30 days since the public hearing, then Council may take action. Also, the Commission's Rules of Procedure state that if the Zoning Committee has met two times and does not make a recommendation, then the petition will be forwarded to the Council as "no recommendation".

Commissioner Fink asked if staff has considered sending rezoning notices to residents, in addition to property owners. Ms. Keplinger explained that the State requires notification of property owners and staff uses tax records to identify property owners. There is no official way to identify or track renters/residents so, signs are posted on the property, legal ads are placed in the newspaper and

community meetings are held to inform renters/residents. Ms. Harmon indicated that some areas in the community are changing and now have more renters, such as SouthEnd. Staff may consider addressing notices to residents.

Commissioner Nelson asked if there were exceptions to the six month timeframe for the process. Tammie Keplinger responded that there are some exceptions. City Council members may ask staff to expedite a case. Staff can also ask Council to make a decision on the same night of the public hearing.

Commissioner Zoutewelle questioned the length of the rezoning process. Since the application deadline is at the end of January and the decision is at the beginning of May, it seems like it is a four month process instead of a six month process. Ms. Keplinger replied that if a petition is deferred, the process may take longer.

Chairperson Dodson asked why is there only a 10 day period between the public hearing and the Zoning Committee meeting. This does not seem to provide enough time for site plan revisions and to get comments back to the Zoning Committee. There have been times when petitions were deferred because there was not enough time to make necessary changes. Tammie Keplinger stated the public hearing and the Zoning Committee meeting used to be within the same week and more days were added to the process. Staff has continually looked at the process to provide more time for petitioners, staff and the Zoning Committee. Unfortunately, because of how the process flows, staff has not figured out how to do this without adding more time to the process.

Commissioner Low asked if there are any other mechanisms to streamline the process, bypass the process or go through another process for a rezoning. He stated that Chapel Hill is going through an alternative process, which streamlines some things, but also adds additional checks and balances. Ms. Keplinger explained that other cities in North Carolina have received special legislation to bypass Council. For instance, in some communities the Zoning Committee can make the decision if there is no opposition. Staff has looked into some of methods to streamline the process, but have not come up with one that includes the amount of detail and input that the Zoning Committee and the Council have said they want.

Commissioner Low asked approximately how many rezoning requests are for a conventional versus a conditional classification. Ms. Keplinger responded that 80% of rezonings petitions are conditional and about 20% are for conventional cases. The number of conventional rezoning petitions has increased a little over the years with the Transit Oriented Developments.

Commissioner Low stated that is an indicator that staff is going through a Zoning Ordinance rewrite to help reduce some of those conditional rezonings to something that fits into categories that people like. Ms. Keplinger replied that it will be difficult for any zoning ordinance to cover everything, but she acknowledged that since the current ordinance was written in 1993 a new ordinance will more than likely alleviate some conditional rezonings.

Commissioner Low asked if staff seeks guidance from a developer committee during the petition review process. Ms. Keplinger clarified that is not a part of the current process. The process is internal. Petitions are sent to different state and local agencies for comment (approximately 80 people), but not to developers.

Ms. Harmon added that one exception is for text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. Often there are Citizen Advisory Groups (CAG) that include people from the development industry, as well as general citizens and people who are specifically interested. Commissioner Low asked if CAGs basically consist of people that staff invites to participate. He also asked if there is an official way to select people for CAGs. Laura Harmon explained that CAGs are open to anyone who wants to participate. Depending on the topic, staff notifies people we think are interested. Information is also posted on our website and we utilize ULI and REBIC to help get the word out. For instance, staff is looking at some changes to the Pedestrian Overlay District in the Morehead Corridor. Staff notified all of the property owners in the Morehead Corridor as well as neighborhood leaders. Sometimes participation is good and other times we do not get much response. Ms. Harmon stated it would be valuable if the Commission had any ideas how staff can get more people involved.

Commissioner Low stated that he thought if the CAG is made up of developers or business professionals, local designers should be empowered to be part of these groups too. Developers are trained more in a business model and may not be thinking in terms of how to solve problems from a design perspective or in a manner that a landscape architect, architect or urban designer would. He suggested that staff may want to explore this.

Chairperson Dodson thought it would be helpful if staff provided background or justification when staff supports petitions that are inconsistent with plans. She asked commissioners if they had other comments or questions.

Commissioner Nelson stated she previously asked about the timeline because there may be instances from a developer perspective, when a four month time frame could kill a deal and it may be a good project that we would support or want to see developed in a particular area. Ms. Keplinger understood her concern, but noted that portions of the rezoning process are required by state law and staff is working within the parameters of the dates and deadlines set through state law, particularly in relation to notifications. Council also has requirements, so staff is somewhat limited; however, staff makes every effort to work with petitioners. If petitioners inform staff that the timing may cause an issue with a deal, we will try and see if there are ways we can get them through the process on time. For example, the charter schools in North Carolina do not find out until March if they have received their charter to open their schools and they want to open in August. If a rezoning is needed, staff works with them as much as possible to make this happen, but there are constraints that we cannot change.

Commissioner Nelson suggested that staff look at the process for opportunities where Council could maybe agree that under certain circumstances the process could move forward differently. The charter school scenario is a great example. She added that she is an affordable housing developer and

once a year she can apply for funds and the rezoning must be approved before final funding decisions are made. In these instances, having a clear understanding of what types of projects could deviate from the current process would be helpful.

Commissioner Fink stated that he is aware of processes in other cities where administrative approvals are used. Maybe certain uses could be identified as high-value uses and be shepherded into an administrative process that does not have as many requirements as the rezoning process. Simplifying the code is the beginning of that so that people will know what is allowed by right or what requires an administrative approval versus a rezoning.

Commissioner Low noted that when he is going through a process and interpreting the small detail comments to make adjustments such as tweaking a setback, façade treatment or sidewalk connectivity, it may be beneficial to know staff's thought process. Visualization tools would be helpful.

Commissioner Firestone stated that in the last couple of years, as the City continues to grow, there continue to be increasing traffic problems and transportation related issues. He understands staff is doing a lot to mitigate traffic related issues, but it would be helpful if Commissioners could receive more information on the traffic impacts of a site. There have not been a lot of applications that trigger a traffic study and as Charlotte continues to grow with multi-family housing on already congested roads, it would be more helpful to see traffic impacts with a lot more of these applications. Commissioner Firestone acknowledged that he looks at the whole picture and takes traffic into consideration when making decisions on a rezoning petition.

Chairperson Dodson agreed with Commissioner Firestone's comment because the Zoning Committee has struggled a lot with making recommendations based on land use and all of these other factors that play into it. She noted that the Commission does not always discuss traffic impacts and when they do it is very basic. She asked if any thought has been given to making traffic analyses a routine part of the rezoning process. Ms. Harmon explained that traffic analyses are required at certain thresholds. For instance, in an urban area such as SouthEnd, CDOT is less likely to ask for a vehicular analysis, but may suggest a pedestrian or bicycle analysis. Ms. Harmon thought it may be helpful for CDOT staff to present information about traffic and transportation in relation to rezonings to the Zoning Committee or full Commission.

Commissioner Phipps shared that he attended a presentation at the Urban Planning Institute at UNCC where they were evaluating projects based on economic impact. He asked if staff is considering adding a section in the staff analysis that might evaluate a project's economic impact. Ms. Harmon explained that staff struggles with this because a project may be good for the economy, but inconsistent with the vision for an area. Likewise, there are uses that do not have great economic impact, but are necessary for our community.

Commissioners Labovitz and Low agreed with Commissioner Phipps' concern. Commissioner Labovitz stated that decisions often impact real estate, but Commissioners are not supposed to take that into consideration when making decisions. However, she has a real estate background and thinks it should be taken into consideration because Commissioners are representing citizens. Commissioner Low agreed and added that it is important, especially when millions of dollars are spent on public infrastructure. Ms. Harmon responded that staff tries to look at this from a plan perspective, rather than on a site by site basis.

Chairperson Dodson thanked Tammie Keplinger for the presentation and asked Commissioners to forward any additional comments or thoughts to her or staff.

Prosperity Hucks Area Plan

The Chairperson introduced Kent Main who presented an update on the Prosperity Hucks Area Plan. The *Prosperity Church Road Villages Plan* (1999) set forth a vision for a different type of interchange to support a mixed used pedestrian oriented village in this area around I-485.

A plan is being done for this area because there was a significant amount of recent development which was inconsistent with adopted plans; lots of development pressure; several transportation projects planned for the area; and poor connectivity. Revisiting the area plan provides an opportunity to better integrate transportation and land use planning.

Mr. Main provided background on the plan development process and stated that the final public meeting was held on August 8, 2013. Since that time, staff has been working on refinement of design standards in preparation of taking the draft plan back to the community and then moving forward with review and adoption of the plan in the winter of 2014.

A major issue at the community meeting included a discussion about a proposal to name a street after a retired City Manager. This was not well received by the community and the original naming of the street will now be used.

Next steps in the process include holding public comment with the Planning Committee in January, 2014.

Please click [here](#) to view the PowerPoint Presentation in its entirety.

The Chairperson asked if there were any questions or comments for Mr. Main.

Commissioner Fink stated that he was surprised to hear that staff is forecasting crime statistics. He asked Mr. Main to discuss this in more detail. Kent Main explained that staff is trying to deal with the crime concern in a way that will resonate with people and present some information, so when we

compare crime statistics they do not feel that crime is going to get significantly worse. Staff has worked with the Police Department to identify an area along Pineville-Matthews Road that has a golf course and higher density residential. The crime statistics there are very comparable.

Chairperson Dodson asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Commissioner Low asked if the Zoning Committee could receive the same information that will be provided to the Planning Committee. Mr. Main replied yes and indicated that the information is posted on the department's web site for access by everyone.

Chairperson Dodson thanked Kent Main for the presentation.

Information

Planning Director's Report

Laura Harmon reported that the Planning Director was absent because she was at the City Budget Retreat. She also directed the Commission to Attachment 2, Public Outreach Presentations.

November & December 2013 Meeting Schedules

The Chairperson noted that a revised December meeting schedule was distributed.

Tammie Keplinger informed Zoning Committee members that there were not any agenda items for the November meeting, which was rescheduled to December 4th because of the Thanksgiving holiday. She noted that there was a special called Zoning Committee meeting on December 2nd.

Chairperson Dodson clarified that the December 2nd meeting is not reflected on the December meeting schedule. She further explained that at the October Zoning Committee meeting one of the petitions was deferred and since there are no items for the November meeting, this petition was deferred to a special called meeting immediately following the full work session on December 2nd at 2:00 p.m.

Cheryl Neely indicated that staff will email a revised December meeting calendar which will include all of the recent changes to the schedule.

Chairperson Dodson reiterated that there is not a November meeting, but there is a November Council meeting. Ms. Keplinger noted that the meeting after the Council dinner meeting will be for decisions only. Usually a representative from the Zoning Committee attends that meeting just in case there are any questions about the recommendation.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee

The Chairperson directed Commissioners to the Executive Committee's September minutes and the future work session agenda items. She asked staff if the discussion on the Area Plan Process Assessment will be similar to the Rezoning Process discussion. Cheryl Neely explained that the presentation will be more interactive and will engage the Commission.

Planning Committee

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop noted the October meeting agenda primarily consisted of mandatory referrals and the November agenda would also probably have several mandatory referrals.

The Vice-Chairperson stated that volunteers are needed to represent the Commission on the Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plan. He asked that interested Commissioners contact him. Lastly, he informed the Commission that some Planning Committee members toured the Prosperity Hucks Area Plan prior to the work session. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop thanked staff for the tour, which was very educational, especially since there are several major road alignments underway in the area.

Zoning Committee

Chairperson Dodson acknowledged that staff did a great job last week with the Auto Mall rezoning petition. Providing the background and detail information was very helpful for Zoning Committee members.

Historic District Commission (HDC)

Commissioner Labovitz stated that the Commission and staff are working very hard to streamline the lengthy meetings. She noted that in the past a major portion of the meeting was utilized to help applicants design projects. The preliminary process has been revamped to allow for this on the front end and the meetings are more productive. She thought the changes made the process more user friendly and anticipates additional improvements over the next year.

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)

Commissioner Phipps reported that he was not able to attend the October CRTPO meeting. Commissioner Zoutewelle attended the meeting and he reported that the Monroe Bypass environmental impact study is nearing completion.

Communication from Chairperson

The Chairperson informed the Commission that Commissioner Assignments are needed for the Midtown · Morehead · Cherry Pedscape Amendment, which kicks off on November 6th. The Executive Committee would like to have representatives from both the Zoning and Planning committees assigned to this initiative. Commissioner Eschert has volunteered to be the Planning Committee representative. Chairperson Dodson asked Zoning Committee members to let her know if they are interested in participating.

Chairperson Dodson reminded Commissioners that when they are assigned to an area plan or CAG, their role is to listen and observe at the CAG meetings, not provide input. They are to report back from the CAG meetings to the full Commission. The time for input is when there is dialogue with staff. She also advised that the Operating Agreement incorporated a policy which mandates that kick-off meetings for area plans are mandatory for all Planning Committee members. She indicated if this is an issue, the Commission can discuss revising the policy.

The Chairperson wished Commissioner Phipps good luck in the City Council election. Commissioner Phipps thanked her for the support and encouragement.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:41 p.m.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

Community Outreach Presentations

#	Date	Presentation	Staff
1	09/12/13	UNCC Master of Science in Real Estate Program - Planning 101	T. Keplinger
2	09/20/13	NCAPA Annual Conference - BLE Station Area Plan	K. Cornett
3	09/27/13	Regional Transportation Committee - Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development	N. Landa
4	09/27/13	S. E. Society of Architectural Historians Conference - Mid Century African American Neighborhoods	J. Howard
5	10/08/13	Knight Foundation - Bus Tour, <i>Charlotte in Black and White...and More</i>	J. Howard
6	10/22/13	Charlotte Regional Realtor's Association - Bus Tour, <i>Charlotte in Black and White...and More</i>	J. Howard
7	10/24/13	Neighborhood Leadership Awards - Planning	M. McCullough/K. Young/ J. Howard/M. Sigmon/ S. Kennedy
8	11/12/13	Cherry Neighborhood - Local Historic District Designation	J. Howard/W. Birmingham
9	11/14/13	Statesville Airport Commission - CRTPO 101	R. Cook
10	11/19/13	Davidson Town Council - Enlarging their Local Historic District	J. Howard/W. Birmingham
11	11/20/13	General Public - GIS Day Booth	M. Sigmon/P. Aphayath/Z. Duhaney/J. Kinley/C. Lyte- Graham/J. Prescott/C. Stutts/J. Taylor
12	11/21/13	Town of Mooresville Board of Commissioners - CRTPO 101	R. Cook

Meeting Schedule

December 2013

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
12-02-13	Noon	Work Session	Innovation Station 8 th Floor - CMGC
Executive Committee			
12-16-13	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
12-02-13	10:00 a.m.	University City Area Plan Blue Line Extension Station Area Plans Update Tour	CMGC – Lobby
12-17-13	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Zoning Committee			
12-02-13	2:00 p.m.	Special Called Meeting ¹	Innovation Station 8 th Floor - CMGC
12-16-13	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
12-16-13	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
01-06-14	9:00 a.m.	Work Session ²	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committee(s)			
12-11-13	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Innovation Station 8 th Floor – CMGC

¹ The Zoning Committee will make a recommendation on rezoning petition 2013-82 at this special called meeting.

² Due to the Christmas Holiday, the regularly scheduled December 25, 2013 Zoning Committee Work Session was rescheduled to January 6, 2014.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings

I-77 Noise Walls

12-11-13	6:00 p.m.	Community Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC
12-17-13	6:00 p.m.	Community Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC

University City Area Plan (UCAP) Blue Line Extension (BLE) Transit Station Area Plans Update

12-05-13	4:30 p.m.	Informational Meeting	Sugaw Creek Baptist Church 101 West Sugar Creek Rd
12-10-13	4:30 p.m.	Public Kick-off Meeting and Workshop	Oasis Shriner's Temple 604 Doug Mayes Place

Midtown · Morehead · Cherry Pedestrian Overlay Amendment

12-12-13	9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	PED Workshop	Covenant Presbyterian Church 1000 E. Morehead Street
12-12-13	6:00 p.m.	Public Meeting	Covenant Presbyterian Church 1000 E. Morehead Street
12-13-13	9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	PED Workshop	Covenant Presbyterian Church 1000 E. Morehead Street

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Meeting Schedule

January 2014

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
01-06-14	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Executive Committee			
01-21-14	4:00 p.m.	Work Session ¹	Conference Room 266 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
01-21-14	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Zoning Committee			
01-06-14	9:00 a.m.	Work Session ²	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
01-21-14	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
01-21-14	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
01-29-14	4:30 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committee(s)			
01-08-14		Historic District Commission ³	
01-08-14	TBD	CRTPO New Member's Orientation	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC
01-15-14	7:00 p.m.	CRTPO Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings

There are no Planning Department meetings scheduled at this time.

¹ Due to the MLK Holiday, the January 20, 2014 Executive Committee meeting was changed to January 21, 2014.

² Due to the Christmas Holiday, the regularly scheduled December 25, 2013 Zoning Committee Work Session was rescheduled to January 6, 2014.

³ The regularly scheduled January 8, 2014 Historic District Commission meeting was cancelled.

Executive Committee

Approved

October 21, 2013 - 4:00 pm

November 18, 2013

CMGC - Conference Room 266

Minutes

Call to Order & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Tracy Dodson (Chairperson), Emma Allen and Ray Eschert.

Commissioners Absent: Tony Lathrop (Vice-Chairperson)

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop participated in a portion of the meeting by phone.

Planning Staff Present: Debra Campbell (Director), Garet Johnson, Cheryl Neely and Michelle Barber

Cheryl Neely informed the Committee that the Planning Director will not be attending the November work session and Garet Johnson will be attending for her. Ms. Johnson was invited to today's meeting to prepare for the November work session.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Allen and seconded by Commissioner Eschert to approve the September 16, 2013 Executive Committee minutes. The vote was 3 to 0 to approve the minutes.

Follow-up Assignments – October 7, 2013 Work Session

Planning Commission Potential Impact Areas & Impact Priorities

Chairperson Dodson stated that following the October work session, she and Vice-Chairperson Lathrop continued to discuss ways the Commission could have meaningful discussions. As a result, they developed a three year work plan outline for the Commission to provide a framework for upcoming meeting agendas. The Chairperson distributed the work plan to the Committee. The work plan focused on three areas:

1. How can the Commission help the Department further their agenda?

The Chairperson suggested that the Planning Director present information of interest to the Commission twice a year (winter and spring), including initiatives that may not necessarily be on the Department's work program. Director Campbell explained that she could possibly share information on projects or trends. She also indicated that since there is a new City Manager, the Council's retreat and the direction they take to identify their priorities may be different this year. She suggested that she could share information from Council's retreat with the Commission as part of the winter presentation. Chairperson Dodson thought it was a good idea to discuss Council's priorities as identified at their retreat.

2. What is the scope of what the Commission wants to accomplish and can accomplish in relation to the Zoning Ordinance Assessment and the Area Planning Process?

Chairperson Dodson reiterated that the Commission previously indicated that they want to have meaningful discussions, especially in relation to the Zoning Ordinance assessment and the Area Planning process. She acknowledged that although staff is not ready to move

forward with bringing the Zoning Ordinance process project to the Commission, she was concerned that some Commissioners may feel that they met with the Zoning Ordinance consultant in July; however, there has not been any discussion about the process since then.

Director Campbell stated that staff is challenged with how to build a conversation around a subject matter and engage the Commission in presentations; especially since Commissioners have previously indicated that they were not interested in “talking head” presentations. Commissioner Allen clarified that the Commission feels differently about staff presentations, which are more relevant to the Commission. Their concern was applicable to guest speakers.

The Chairperson asked if it would be appropriate for the Commission to discuss the current rezoning process at their November work session. The Planning Director asked for clarification. Chairperson Dodson responded that the discussion should focus on the current process as well as include dialogue from a Commission perspective as to what is working, what is not working and ideas for improvements. She stated that the Rezoning Process presentation in November, followed by an Area Planning discussion in December will allow opportunities for Commissioners to provide input that staff can use in their path forward and at the very least serve as education sessions for the Commission. Director Campbell asked if these would be informational discussions or discussions with dialogue around how to improve these processes. Chairperson Dodson replied it should address both. The Planning Director indicated that staff should be able to arrange for the Rezoning process presentation in November and the Area Planning discussion in December.

The Chairperson asked Commissioner Eschert to share his thoughts about the Commission’s proposed work plan. Commissioner Eschert thought it was a good idea for the Planning Director to share information from the Council retreat because new Council members may look at what that they are responsible for in the planning and zoning processes differently than previous Council members. It will be helpful for the Commission to gauge where their emphasis or concerns may be.

Chairperson Dodson agreed that it would be appropriate for the Planning Director to share this information in the winter; however, they would need to identify presentation topics for the spring Planning Director presentation. Ms. Campbell suggested that her spring presentation could possibly be a follow-up from the Planning Coordinating Committee’s Spring Joint Luncheon discussion, which will focus on the Community Investment Plan. The presentation could include any concerns, issues and information about how we are moving forward from the City’s perspective in a collaborative way with the other municipalities.

Commissioner Dodson agreed this could potentially be an appropriate spring topic, but suggested that the Committee take time to digest this information. She reminded the Committee that at the retreat the Commission stated that they wanted to have more dialogue at their monthly meetings; however it is challenging to get the Commission engaged in dialogue since there are only a couple of hours scheduled for the monthly meetings. The Executive Committee needs to figure out ways to encourage dialogue at these meetings. Commissioner Allen agreed that Commissioners should be engaged in dialogue, but cautioned that the discussion should be productive.

Commissioner Eschert stated that he found it beneficial when Commissioners stayed after Zoning Committee meetings to get a sense of how everyone felt about an issue - the pros and

cons. Commissioner Allen agreed this was especially beneficial for new committee members. Commissioner Eschert suggested that this be considered for full Commission meetings. Commissioners could discuss interesting situations that occurred at Zoning and Planning committee meetings with the full Commission. Chairperson Dodson acknowledged that the Committee was getting off topic, but noted that side conversations are taking place during the Zoning Committee meetings and maybe these discussions should take place prior to or after the meeting. Commissioner Allen agreed. The Chairperson also suggested that there needs to be a parking lot list for items which may be inappropriate for committee discussion, but appropriate for full Commission dialogue.

3. What education does the Commission need and how can they assist with educating elected officials and the public/stakeholders?

Commissioner Dodson explained that this area is really not something that is going to be discussed this year. It will most likely roll over to next year's agenda.

Chairperson Dodson asked the Committee and staff to review the draft work plan outline in detail and forward any comments to her or Vice-Chairperson Lathrop.

Commissioner Assignments

The Chairperson stated that Commissioner assignments are needed for the University City Area Plan – Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plans Update and the Midtown·Morehead·Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Text Amendment. Commissioner Eschert volunteered to be the representative for the Midtown·Morehead·Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Text Amendment. Chairperson Dodson decided that she would like to have a representative from both the Zoning Committee and the Planning Committee assigned to these initiatives. The Chairperson stated that she would get a Zoning Committee representative assigned.

The Planning Director stated Commissioners need to have a good understanding of the attendance requirements when volunteering for these roles. Chairperson Dodson asked how the attendance was counted last year. Cheryl Neely replied that attendance at Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meetings did not count towards attendance. The Planning Director was concerned that Commissioners may not be committed if it does not count towards their attendance. Cheryl Neely explained that there was not an issue with attendance because Commissioners were required to report back from the CAG meetings. Chairperson Dodson would like to continue the Commissioner reports.

Garet Johnson added that in the past only the attendance at the public meetings (kick-off and wrap-up), not the stakeholder meetings, was counted towards the Commissioner's overall attendance. However, there were not stakeholder groups for the Blue Line Extension (BLE) and Prosperity Hucks Area Plan processes. There were a few workshops, rather than a series of stakeholder meetings. The Planning Director suggested that the attendance policy be reviewed with the Commission, as it relates to stakeholder groups. Commissioner Allen noted that it would be important to assign a Commissioner to BLE rather quickly because the workshops will begin in December.

Commissioner Eschert asked if Commissioners could attend meetings if they were not assigned to the initiative, but were just interested. The Planning Director replied yes. Chairperson Dodson stated that a Zoning Committee representative does not necessarily need to be assigned to the BLE project. Commissioner Allen did not agree, she thought it would be a good idea to assign representatives from both committees so that when Commissioners rotate, maybe they can still have a Commissioner from each committee assigned to the initiative. The Chairperson agreed and stated that she would ask

Commissioner Ryan to serve on the BLE project, although she is now on the Zoning Committee. Chairperson Dodson asked Vice-Chairperson Lathrop to assign a Commissioner from the Planning Committee to BLE. The Vice-Chairperson asked if it mattered if it is one of the new Commissioners. The Chairperson replied no. The most important consideration is that it be an area of interest for whoever is assigned, so they will actually go to the meetings and be attentive.

The Planning Director suggested that Commissioners be reminded of their roles at the November or December meeting. It may be a good idea to handout the policy which defines the scope of the Commissioner's responsibilities, particularly if there is an outline or schedule for the process. The Chairperson agreed and thought it would be a good idea to provide a general schedule of the projects so they could review the policy and expectations with everyone. Commissioner Allen stated that the policy includes information about the role. Commissioner Lathrop especially wanted to make sure the new Commissioners understand their roles. The Planning Director agreed that it would be a good reminder while assignments are being made.

Future Work Session Agenda Items

The Committee reviewed the future work session agenda items list. Commissioner Dodson noted that the Zoning Ordinance process is scheduled for the January work session. The Planning Director explained that staff should be able to bring more complete information about definitive next steps, the process forward and the schedule by January. She stated that in the meantime, staff can present information about the current rezoning process in November.

The Chairperson asked if would be best if both the rezoning process discussion and the Zoning Ordinance process discussion take place at the January work session. Director Campbell replied that one discussion will focus on how to move forward with a change to the Zoning Ordinance and the other is about how we address some of the existing issues, which is mainly about the process. A portion of the moving forward discussion is also about the process because the type of ordinance will dictate the process. Commissioner Allen stated that the discussions on the current state and future state would be helpful because it is important to have a good understanding of the current process before moving forward with the future state conversations. There may be an issue with a big learning curve if these discussions are held at the same time.

The Chairperson stated that it would be good to have an update on the University City Area Plan – Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plans because there seems to be confusion about the project in respect to the relationship of the UCP Area Plan, the recently adopted BLE Plans and the new BLE Plans. Garett Johnson agreed it may be confusing because we just completed the BLE Station Area Plans; however we are starting plans for a different set of transit stations.

Approval of the November 4, 2013 Work Session Agenda

Cheryl Neely stated that former Commissioners Johnson, Nealon and Griffith may attend the November work session to receive their certificates of appreciation from the Commission, depending on whether or not the certificates are ready prior to the meeting.

November and December 2013 Meeting Schedules

The Committee reviewed the November and December meeting schedules and noted the November Zoning Committee work session was rescheduled to December 4th due to the Thanksgiving Holiday.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

AGENDA
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
ZONING COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, Innovation Station
December 2, 2013
2:00 P.M.

1. [Petition No. 2013-082](#) (Council District 6 – Dulin) by **Grubb Properties, Inc.** for a change in zoning for approximately 7.95 acres located on the west side of Sharon Road between Morrocroft Lane and Sharon Township Lane from MUDD(O) (mixed use development district, optional).to MUDD(O) SPA (mixed use development district, optional, site plan amendment).

**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 16th day of December, 2013** on the following petitions that propose changes to the Official Zoning Maps of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina:

Petition No. 2013-017 by NCDG, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 5.27 acres located on the east side of Little Rock Road and north of the intersection at Little Rock Road and Tuckaseegee Road from R-3 to B-1(CD).

Petition No. 2013-069 by The Ryland Group, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 5.0 acres located on the north side of Providence Road West near the intersection of Tolliver Drive and Providence Road West from R-3 to UR-1(CD).

Petition No. 2013-071 by The Presbyterian Home of Charlotte, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 24.80 acres located on the west side of Sharon Road between Eastburn Road and Hazelton Drive from R-3 & INST(CD) to INST(CD) & INST(CD) SPA.

Petition No. 2013-079 by Joseph Okoye & Sylvia Okoye for a change in zoning for approximately 1.59 acres located on the west side of Eastway Drive near the intersection of Audrey Street and Eastway Drive from R-17MF to INST(CD).

Petition No. 2013-084 by Charles C. Davis, Jr. for a change in zoning for approximately 1.54 acres located on the south side of The Plaza near the intersection of East W.T. Harris Boulevard and The Plaza from R-3 to B-1(CD).

Petition No. 2013-091 by Shea Anniston, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 11.38 acres located on the north side of Marvin Road, east of Johnston Road, between Donnington Drive and Wilklee Drive from R-3 to MX-1.

Petition No. 2013-092 by FMF Morehead, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 2.77 acres located on the north side of East Morehead Street and south side of Kenilworth Avenue, between East Morehead and Harding Place Circle from MUDD-O(PED), MUDD(CD) (PED) & O-2(PED) to MUDD-O SPA (PED) & MUDD-O (PED).

Petition No. 2013-093 by Laurel Oak Farm, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 1.23 acres located on the south side of Youngblood Road between McKee Road and Watermelon Lane from R-3 to MUDD-O.

Petition No. 2013-095 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership for a change in zoning for approximately 7.23 acres located on the west side of Weddington Road between Simfield Church Road and Portstewart Lane from INST(CD) to R-12MF(CD).

Petition No. 2013-096 by Second Harvest Food Bank of Metrolina, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 15.13 acres located on the west side of North Graham Street and Spratt Street between Music Factory Boulevard and Oliver Street from I-1 & I-1(CD) to I-1(CD) & I-1(CD) SPA.

Petition No. 2013-097 by Sugar Creek Charter School, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 15.16 acres located on the south side of Glory Street and Hunslet Circle and generally surrounded by West Craighead Road, Glory Street, West Sugar Creek Road, and North Tryon Street from R-12MF & B-2(CD) to B-2(CD) & B-2(CD) SPA.

Petition No. 2013-099 by Michael T. Whitehead & Elizabeth M. Whitehead for a change in zoning for approximately 2.70 acres located on the southeast corner of the intersection at Rama Road and Sardis Road from INST(CD) to INST(CD) SPA.

Petition No. 2013-100 by SMA Carolina, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 1.20 acres located on the south side of Central Avenue between Rosehaven Drive and Winterfield Place from R-22MF to O-1(CD).

Petition No. 2013-102 by Wajahat & Ferah Syed for a change in zoning for two parcels approximately 2.13 acres in total located on the south side of North Davidson Street between East 33rd Street and East 35th Street from R-5 to TOD-M and MUDD-O to MUDD-O SPA.

Petition No. 2013-103 by Thomas Keith for a change in zoning for approximately 5.02 acres located on the north side of Old Statesville Road across from Spring Trace Drive from R-17MF to I-1.

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, December 11th, 2013**.

**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 16th day of December, 2013** on the following petition that propose changes to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance:

Petition No. 2012-090 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to 1) allow the Zoning Board of Adjustment to have jurisdiction to grant variances on certain standards within the Transit Oriented Development districts (TOD), the Pedestrian Overlay district (PED), Mixed Use Development district (MUDD), and Uptown Mixed Use district (UMUD), and Transit Supportive Overlay District (TS), 2) allow the Board of Adjustment to have authority to consider variances related to the number of, or size of, permissible signs in a conditional district, and 3) allow the Board of Adjustment to have jurisdiction with respect to an interpretation of, or decision about the TOD or PED development or urban design standards.

Petition No. 2013-026 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to modify the Pedestrian Overlay District development and urban design standards.

Petition No. 2013-061 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to add conference centers, convention centers and halls, exhibit halls, merchandise marts and similar uses as a use permitted under prescribed conditions in B-2 and I-1 zoning districts.

Petition No. 2013-090 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to create new definitions and regulations for eating, drinking and entertainment establishments by replacing definitions and regulations for restaurants, nightclubs, bars and lounges. Allows eating, drinking and entertainment establishments by right or with prescribed conditions in the following zoning districts: multi-family, UR-2, UR-3, UR-C, institutional,

research, office, business, MX-1, MX-2, MX-3, MUDD, UMUD, CC, NS, TOD, U-I, industrial, PED and TS.

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

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission
Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
October 15, 2013 – 5:00 p.m.
CMGC – Second Floor, Room 280

Attachment 7

APPROVED

November 19, 2013

Attendance:

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Tony Lathrop, Vice-Chairperson Raymond Eschert, Randy Fink, Dionne Nelson, Greg Phipps, Michael Sullivan and Andy Zoutewelle

Planning Staff Present: Sonda Kennedy, Melony McCullough, Bryman Suttle, Catherine Stutts and Jonathan Wells

Other Staff Present: Timothy J. O'Brien (City Real Estate) and Denice Beteta (Neighborhood & Business Services)

Call to Order and Introductions

Chairperson Tony Lathrop called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. He welcomed everyone and introductions were held. Chairperson Lathrop explained that this is not a public hearing and that the Committee will follow the meeting rules. However, the Committee may vote to suspend the rules to ask specific questions, if necessary.

Approve September 17, 2013 Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Phipps to approve the September 17, 2013 minutes. The vote was 7-0 to approve the minutes.

Chairperson Lathrop stated that at the last Committee meeting Jonathan Wells presented information about the mandatory referral process. He reiterated that the Committee's scope of review is advisory. The factors that are to be considered are land use related factors such as consistency with adopted land use policies, compatibility with surrounding land uses, impact on infrastructure and opportunities for joint use. Factors that cannot be considered include costs and alternative locations.

Commissioner Fink stated that as a new member, he was grateful to staff for their responsiveness to his inquiries, and he especially thanked Ms. McCullough and Ms. Beteta for responding to questions he asked outside the meeting.

M.R. #13-18: Proposal by the City Of Charlotte's Neighborhood and Business Services Department (NBS) to Transfer Five (5) Residential Properties for Rehabilitation and Re-Occupancy

Alberto Gonzalez (Planning staff) presented Mandatory Referral #13-18, a proposal by the City to transfer five city-owned residential properties scattered throughout the City to nonprofit development organizations and Community Development Corporations (CDC) for rehabilitation and re-occupancy. The properties are located in the Belmont, Villa Heights, Smallwood, Grier Heights and Reid Park neighborhoods. These properties are vacant residential structures that came to the City as a result of mortgage foreclosures. The organizations will be provided with a list of these properties to solicit their interest in acquiring the properties. If these organizations are not interested in acquiring the properties, the properties will be offered for public sale.

Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if these are single family houses. Chairperson Lathrop asked if the City was the first lien holder. Denice Beteta (Neighborhood & Business Services) answered yes to both questions. Commissioner Phipps asked if these five dwellings are considered affordable housing because they meet the City's locational policies. Ms. Beteta said that affordability applies to the person and their income more than the neighborhood. Commissioner Phipps also asked if the properties are not acquired by non-profit organizations, can they be sold to others. Ms. Beteta replied yes.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairperson Eschert and seconded by Commissioner Nelson to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-18. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-18.

M.R. #13-20: Proposal by the City of Charlotte to Acquire a Strip of Land for Fire Station #20 Expansion

Catherine Stutts (Planning staff) presented Mandatory Referral #13-20, a proposal by the City to purchase a strip of land (50' x 200') from Central Piedmont Community College - Harper Campus to allow for Fire Station #20 building renovations and expansion. The fire station property is located in an area with vacant land and institutional uses. Central Piedmont Community College (CPCC) owns the adjoining vacant property, a portion of which is proposed to be transferred to the City for expansion of the fire station. The proposed land use is consistent with the adopted land use plan. Commissioner Fink asked if they are expanding to accommodate additional fire engines. Ms. Stutts stated that the building was built in the 1970's and additional space as well as improvements are needed. Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if Hebron Street is considered a thoroughfare and how it is classified. Bryman Suttle (Planning staff) said it is a thoroughfare but the map does not indicate the street classification.

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Sullivan to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-20. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-20.

M.R. #13-21: Proposal by Central Piedmont Community College to Acquire Land located on Morris Field Drive to Expand the Harris Campus

Mr. Gonzalez presented Mandatory Referral #13-21, a proposal to purchase approximately 13.5 acres located on the south side of Morris Field Drive between CPCC - Harris Campus and Capitol Drive. This acquisition will provide land for the long term expansion of the Harris Campus. CPCC will develop the property in accordance with the approved conditional rezoning, Petition 2013-058. Commissioner Sullivan asked if this Mandatory Referral is connected to the previous agenda item. Mr. Gonzalez said the agenda items are not connected. Commissioner Zoutewelle stated that he is excited about this opportunity for CPCC. Chairperson Lathrop noted that this is a nice corridor that has good synergy with the airport.

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Phipps to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-21. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-21.

Area Plan Status and Meeting Report

Commissioner Phipps gave an update on the Prosperity Hucks planning process. He reported that he has been in contact with stakeholders in the area who are concerned about the street name changes, particularly Curt Walton Way. He stated that Doreen Szymanski, Charlotte Department of Transportation, informed him it may be too late to make changes to some of the street names. Commissioner Phipps said he was told that North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) held meetings in the area and has time lines that have to be met for address changes. However, Ms. Szymanski will check on this.

A public meeting has not been scheduled to discuss the draft plan. Commissioner Fink stated that the final plan has not been posted and asked if there are any updates. He also asked if there will be a public hearing before the document is available. Ms. McCullough said that Mr. Main can provide a brief update next month. She also said a date has not been set for public comment on the plan. Staff is still working on the revisions to the draft plan. Commissioner Zoutewelle asked about planned improvements to Hucks Road. Commissioner Phipps answered that he is not aware of any updates on this road project. A tour of the plan area is scheduled for Monday, November 4th at 10 a.m.

Meeting Adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING AGENDANOVEMBER 13, 20133:00 PM**Applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness**

- | | | | |
|----|---|------------------------------|----------|
| A. | 1611 Mimosa Avenue, Plaza Midwood Local Historic District
Rear Addition
Peter Brooks, Applicant | HDC 2013-150 | Approved |
| B. | 405 East Tremont Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
Demolition/New Construction
Osama Esmail, Applicant | HDC 2013-130 | Approved |
| C. | 323 Rensselaer Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
Renovation
Adam Getchell, Applicant | HDC 2013-151 | Denied |
| D. | 1701 Park Road, Dilworth Local Historic District
Demolition/New Construction
Connie & Frank Reed, Applicant | HDC 2013-154 | Denied |

NOTE: *The cases listed below will not be heard prior to 5:00 PM*

- | | | | |
|----|---|------------------------------|----------|
| E. | 601 Mount Vernon Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
Rear Addition
Ray Sheedy, Applicant | HDC 2013-168 | Approved |
| F. | 2309 Dilworth Road West, Dilworth Local Historic District
Second Story Addition
Megan Barnes, Applicant | HDC 2013-169 | Denied |

