

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

Planning Commission

May 5, 2014
work session

Charlotte-Mecklenburg
Government Center

Room 267
Noon

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Work Session Agenda

May 5, 2014 - Noon

CMGC - Conference Room 267

Call to Order & Introductions

Tracy Dodson

Administration

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Approve the April 7, 2014 minutes.

Attachment 1

Policy

Mecklenburg Livable Communities Plan

Heidi Pruess

Background: Heidi Pruess with Mecklenburg County will present the Draft Vision and Guiding Principles for the Mecklenburg Livable Communities Plan.

Action: For Discussion. No action required.

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Bob Cook

Background: Planning staff will provide an overview of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Action: For Discussion. No action required.

Information

Planning Director's Report

Debra Campbell

- Planning Department's Public Outreach Presentations

Attachment 2

May & June 2014 Meeting Schedules

Attachment 3

Committee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

- March 17, 2014 Approved Minutes
- Future Work Session Agenda Items

Tracy Dodson

Attachment 4

Future Work Session Agenda Item(s)	Work Session
1. Area Plan Policy Assessment Update	TBD
2. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Standards Update	TBD

- **Zoning Committee**

- Upcoming Rezoning Petitions
- Zoning Committee Public Hearings

Tracy Dodson

Tammie Keplinger

Attachment 5

- **Planning Committee**

- March 18, 2014 Approved Minutes

Tony Lathrop

Attachment 6

- **Historic District Commission (HDC)**

- April 9, 2014 Meeting Update

Karen Labovitz

Attachment 7

- **Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)**

Cozzie Watkins

- **Nominating Committee**
 - Slate of Officers

Ray Eschert

Communication from Chairperson

- Communications Committee

Tracy Dodson

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Attachment 1

April 7, 2014 - Noon

CMGC - Conference Room 267

Action Minutes

Call to Order & Introductions

Chairperson Dodson called the meeting to order at 12:09 p.m., followed by introductions.

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Tracy Dodson (Chairperson), Tony Lathrop (Vice-Chairperson), Emma Allen, Ray Eschert, Karen Labovitz, Dionne Nelson, Deb Ryan, Mike Sullivan, Cozzie Watkins and Nancy Wiggins.

Commissioners Absent: Randy Fink, Tom Low and Dwayne Walker

Commissioner Allen stepped out of the meeting from 12:40-12:56 p.m.

Commissioner Eschert stepped out of the meeting from 1:32-1:38 p.m.

Commissioner Lathrop left the meeting at 1:31 p.m.

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

Guest(s): Bill Parks, City Budget Department

Administration

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the March 3, 2014 work session minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ryan. The vote was 10-0 to approve the minutes.

Policy

Community Investment Plan

Director Campbell introduced Bill Parks and stated that he would present information about the Community Investment Plan. She explained that the Community Investment Plan was previously called the Capital Improvement Plan. In addition to the name change, there is a different approach to capital investments for our community. Staff is looking at investments from a broader perspective and considering how investments can leverage other community initiatives as well as how they can impact a much broader geography rather than one specific location. Staff is also considering ways to engage the community in the capital investment process. Ms. Campbell stated that the presentation will focus on a process update, the differences in how we think about capital investments and implementation, as well as the community engagement process.

The Planning Director informed the Commission that the presentation is for information only and no action is required. The information is being shared with the Commission because the Planning Department is heavily engaged in the Community Investment Plan process. Also, several of the projects originated from area plans that the Commission reviewed and recommended for adoption to City Council.

Mr. Parks began the presentation by explaining that the Community Investment Plan is a long-range investment program to meet the needs of our growing community. The approach being used is collaborative, forward thinking, driven by data, and allows us to emphasize the expanded scope of

projects while engaging the community. The approach also provides greater potential to leverage City investments with private investment. The overall goal of the program is to invest in projects that generate the most benefit and impact to the entire community by:

- Creating jobs and growing the tax base
- Leveraging public and private investments
- Enhancing public safety
- Enhancing transportation choices and mobility
- Ensuring housing diversity
- Providing integrated neighborhood improvements

Mr. Parks reported that projects were selected to:

- Achieve the greatest level of community impact
- Generate new residential and commercial development (\$2.2 Billion identified in demand market impact analysis by 2035)
- Stimulate job growth – estimated 18,495 new jobs over the next 20 years
- Strengthen our competitiveness regionally, nationally and globally

The Community Investment Plan consists of \$816.4 Million over four bond referenda (2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020).

2014 Bond Year Investments

- \$141 Million in Bonds
- \$103.5 Million in Certificates of Participation (COPs) debt

2016-2020 Investments

- \$486.3 Million in Bonds
- \$85.6 Million in COPs

Mr. Parks continued by sharing details about each of the proposed projects. Information about these projects and the entire presentation can be accessed by clicking on this [link](#).

Following are the next steps in the Community Investment Plan process:

April	1. Update planned for April 9 th Budget Workshop
May	2. Manager’s Recommendation, Budget Adjustments and Straw Votes Meetings
June	3. Budget Adoption
	4. Council resolutions for application to Local Government Commission
	5. Introduction of proposed bond language at Council meeting and setting of July public hearing on November 2014 bond referendum
July	6. Public Hearing and setting the bond referendum for the November 4 th ballot
November	7. November 4 th – 2014 Bond Referendum vote

Below is a summary of the questions and comments which followed the presentation.

- Commissioner Eschert asked if there is a process for relocating the south police precinct station in a more visible location. He also asked if a second division would be created in the northern portion of the south division. Mr. Parks replied yes and explained that although it is not official,

consideration is being given to dividing the south division into two divisions. The new south division station that is in the Community Improvement Plan will be generally located in the Providence/I-485 area.

- Commissioner Sullivan inquired about the Applied Innovation Corridor along Graham Street. Mr. Parks responded that this initiative primarily consists of creating road connections along the corridor to encourage development and businesses to locate in the area.
- Commissioner Wiggins asked if there were plans to move the railway station back to its original location on West Trade Street. The Planning Director said there is a study which looks at creating a multi-modal station Uptown. There are concerns about the State being able to help participate in that effort and discussions are underway. She explained that the Urban Land Institute will conduct a technical assistance advisory panel effort in late April that will focus on the Applied Innovation Corridor. This effort will provide additional information about investments needed for this area. She further explained that the Applied Innovation Corridor effort came about as a recommendation from the 2020 Center City Plan (2011). Likewise, other area plan recommendations are included in the community investment strategy. Staff is trying to determine if some of the projects can leverage a private or another public entity's investment.
- Mr. Parks added that the Blue Line Extension is located northwest of the Applied Innovation Corridor, the Cross Charlotte Trail is on the other side, and the two bridges on I-85 are just north of the Cross Charlotte Trail. This will create a strong synergy around that corridor.
- Chairperson Dodson asked if the improvements for the Southeast Corridor will impact the type of transit for the Southeast Corridor. The Planning Director stated that rapid transit (rail) had been ruled out for the middle of the Southeast Corridor and staff will be looking at other alternatives. The Director did not think that any of the projects that are being recommended as part of the Community Investment Plan will conflict with the study and analysis that will be done to determine the mode and alignment for transit along the corridor. Although rail is not being recommended in the middle of the corridor, there is the potential for express or rapid bus.
- Commissioner Nelson asked if the North Tryon Corridor is an active part of the Applied Innovation Corridor. The Planning Director stated that a portion of North Tryon is included. However, there is a new Center City initiative underway for North Tryon which does not go as far north as the Applied Innovation Corridor.
- Commissioner Eschert asked if consideration had been given for public/private investment in the two bridges at I-85. Mr. Parks said not initially, but the State has started a new program whereby local governments can submit a city project that has connection to and can support state infrastructure projects, and if it qualifies, the State will support some of the funding. He thought the City had submitted a request for the State to consider partnering with the City on funding one of the bridges.

The Chairperson thanked Mr. Parks for the presentation.

Planning Commission Involvement in Public Input Processes

Chairperson Dodson asked if there were any questions, comments or concerns about the proposed changes to the Planning Commission Involvement in Public Input Processes document.

- Commissioner Ryan expressed concern with the role of the Commissioners as listed in the last paragraph on page 3. She does not think there is an opportunity for Commissioners to engage in a discussion with constituents about the meetings she attends. She stated that she felt as though she is being “muzzled.” In particular, she does not like going to public meetings and not being able to participate like a normal citizen. She acknowledged that she is not familiar with the history of how this role came about, but she would like to be able to speak to constituents and meeting attendees to discuss and explain planning issues. She is very concerned about the inability to have an opportunity to discuss what happens in public meetings. If the Commissioner’s role is listen and report back to the Commission, she thinks that staff already does a terrific job of this. It is not a good use of her time to duplicate the information that staff is already providing. Commissioner Ryan stated that she would like to be “un-muzzled” so that she can communicate at public meetings. She asked the Commission to consider and discuss her concern.
- Commissioner Allen understood Commissioner Ryan’s concern and frustration, but explained that in the past there were times when Commissioners spoke at meetings and the community thought the Commission had already made a decision based on the conversation/dialogue at the meeting. This caused issues for the Commission. Commissioners are to be neutral listeners as opposed to participating in conversations. She also stated that although staff provides updates of a process and shares information with the Commission about public meetings, Commissioners provide a different perspective and thinks that it is beneficial for Commissioners to report back to the Commission.
- Commissioner Nelson asked Commissioner Ryan to clarify what she meant by “un-muzzled” and to describe how she would like to interact with constituents. Commissioner Ryan said that when she currently participates in group break-out discussions, she sits at the table and listens and is not able to speak. As a citizen, she would like to provide her opinion on the issues. Commissioner Allen reminded Commissioner Ryan that when she is attending public meetings, she is attending as a Commissioner, not a citizen. Commissioner Nelson said that when attending meetings as a Commissioner she looks at issues from a different perspective. She puts her personal opinion as a citizen aside and wears her Commissioner hat when observing and considering issues since she will make a decision as a Commissioner. Commissioner Ryan said that she thinks personal and professional opinions are interlinked. Her concern is that Commissioners do not have opportunities to have conversations with the public throughout the process.
- Commissioner Labovitz said when attending meetings, Commissioners are not private citizens, they are attending on behalf of the Commission and it can be misinterpreted that a decision has been made if a Commissioner speaks to an issue. There are other opportunities to discuss concerns with the public such as when responding to emails, phone calls, etc. This is when it is appropriate to speak one-on-one with citizens who have reached out to you. Commissioner Ryan stated that private communication with a citizen is not the same as public dialogue. Even in those type situations, Commissioners have been instructed to refer citizens to the process and not to communicate our opinions.

- Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked when it is appropriate for the Commission to interact/have discussions with the public during the various processes. Chairperson Dodson replied that it depends on the process. During the rezoning process there intentionally is not an opportunity for formal dialogue with the public. However, there is nothing that prevents Commissioners from reaching out to citizens and having one-on-one dialogue. During the area plan process citizens provide public comments at the Planning Committee meeting. It is appropriate for Commissioners to communicate with the public at that time. This type of communication is very different than communicating with the public in masses versus gathering information and having dialogue so that the Commission can make a recommendation. In instances where Commissioners are at small table/breakout discussions and someone asks for your input, you do not have to be muzzled, but you have to understand this is a fine line and a gray area when providing input.
- Commissioner Wiggins stated that she had reviewed the rules because she has not been on the Commission for 15 years. It appeared to her that staff's role is a facilitator and note-taker while the Commission's role is to talk to the public, interact with the public and be an advisor. When attending meetings, citizens understand that you are a Commissioner and do not think that individual Commissioners represent every idea on the Commission. The public realizes that information will be taken back to the full Commission for consideration when making decisions. Commissioner Wiggins thinks that Commissioners have the right to ask questions and perhaps make some public comments; even if it is just within Committee meetings.
- Commissioner Labovitz stated that the Commission is an advisory board, not a quasi-judicial board which makes decisions. Since decisions are made by City Council, Commissioners have to be very careful in expressing our opinion. Commissioners should listen and communicate information to each other at work sessions and communicate to City Council. She does not think it is appropriate for Commissioners to discuss their opinions with the public, especially since the public may perceive an opinion as a decision when in fact the Commission is not a decision making board.
- Commissioner Watkins said that if a citizen sees a Commissioner at a public meeting, their perception is that a Commissioner has full authority in their role. Regardless of what a Commissioner thinks their role is, if a Commissioner is involved in the discussion, all eyes are going to be on the Commissioner because the public perceives Commissioners as representing the Planning Commission. Commissioner Watkins thinks that the role of the Commission is to observe. If she is involved in the conversation, she cannot observe objectively. Her job is to watch body language and maybe have one-on-one conversations with individuals after the meeting.
- Commissioner Eschert stated that he usually listens to comments, but informs citizens that he is not making a commitment. He thinks Commissioners should remain impartial, listen to citizens' perspective, gather facts and bring the information back to the Commission.
- Commissioner Sullivan said that he agreed with Commissioner Ryan on one point. When he first became a Commissioner it was difficult to observe and not speak at meetings. He has attended many PED Overlay District meetings for his neighborhood and he informs everyone that he is not attending as a Commissioner. He thinks that if a Commissioner is passionate about a planning initiative, they should attend the meeting as a citizen. However, when attending for the Commission it is important to observe and not get involved in the discussion.

- Chairperson Dodson reminded the Commission that Commissioners were assigned to track the area plans and report back to the full Commission so that Commissioners would be kept informed of any issues (from a Commissioner perspective) prior to the start of the adoption process. She stated that she understood Commissioner Ryan's concern and recognized that it is a struggle between the citizen and Commissioner's role and how they are perceived. She asked the Planning Director to provide comments from staff's perspective.
- The Planning Director stated that she agrees with everything that has been said. It is very difficult to attend some of these meetings, particularly with a background like Commissioner Ryan and those that are passionate about a subject matter and not to be able to express opinions in a public setting. However, Commissioners do not make individual recommendations. When a Commissioner provides comments at meetings, it could be perceived as the Commission's perspective, not the individual Commissioner's perspective. The Planning Director does not think it is fair to the rest of the Committee for Commissioners to express their personal opinion when it is not necessarily the Committee's perspective.
- Director Campbell acknowledged the need for Commissioners to have dialogue. Staff can offer more opportunities for dialogue through the area plan processes at Planning Committee meetings. Staff also acknowledged that staff needs to do a better job of providing opportunities for Commissioners to debrief from public meetings, especially if there were lots of concerns expressed at a meeting. She suggested that when Commissioners are in break-out groups, it is appropriate for them to ask citizens to elaborate or further express their concerns, if needed, and inform citizens that you will report back to staff or the appropriate Committee.
- Commissioner Nelson agreed with the Planning Director. As a new Zoning Committee member, it will be difficult for her to respond to all of the phone calls and emails. She wants to hear feedback and citizens' perspective. She will read the emails and listen to the voicemails, but she is not going to engage in lots of one-on-one conversations, because it is not fair to do it for some and not others. She thinks that it is best to observe, listen, review comments and share any necessary feedback with staff. She noted that staff has been very receptive to receiving feedback.
- Commissioner Ryan stated that she attended the noise wall public meeting as a citizen; however she was recognized as a Commissioner. She would have preferred that she had not been recognized as a Commissioner so that she could have been a member of the public and voiced her concerns. She suggested that Commissioners communicate with staff and inform them as to whether or not they want to be recognized. She also said she did not want citizens to think that as she sits at the table in silence, as a Commissioner, that she is agreement with their comments.
- Commissioner Wiggins stated that she understands Commissioner Ryan's concerns. She thought it would be helpful if all Planning Committee members attend area plan meetings so that everyone could hear the discussion and then have a discussion with staff and the Planning Committee.
- Commissioner Watkins stated that sometimes citizens may not necessarily want an answer; they just want to be heard. She thinks that providing an opinion in is not always the wisest position and maybe not even be what citizens are seeking.

- Vice-Chairperson Lathrop said he thought the discussion was very thoughtful and positive. He understood all the points of view that were mentioned. The Vice-Chairperson also appreciated the time that staff had spent working with the Executive Committee to revise the document. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop stated that it is a very thoughtful document and indicated that there are really good reasons for a document of this type. He made a motion to approve the document. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion to approve the document.
- Chairperson Dodson stated that she asked Vice-Chairperson Lathrop, our in-house attorney, if the document needed to be revised to provide a distinction between the roles of attending meetings as a Commissioner versus a citizen. They both agreed that the document implies that this applies to the role of attending meetings as a Commissioner. The Chairperson suggested that the discussion can continue with how to handle situations when a Commissioner attends meetings as a citizen. The Planning Director suggested that it can be done more procedurally rather than as a policy.

The Commission voted to adopt the revised changes to the document. The vote was as follows:

Yeas: Allen, Dodson, Eschert, Labovitz, Lathrop, Nelson, Sullivan, and Watkins

Nays: Ryan

Commissioner Wiggins abstained from voting.

Information

Planning Director's Report

Director Campbell directed the Commissioner's attention to the Public Outreach and Presentations attachment and the May meeting schedule.

She stated that in terms of the department's budget request, she wanted to bring the Committee up to date on what has been requested, because there has been a lot of conversation around the process to update the Zoning Ordinance. Staff needs more resources to complete this project. In next year's budget, we requested an additional staff position to manage the update of the Zoning Ordinance. We also requested an additional \$300,000 to hire a consultant to begin the update of the Zoning Ordinance.

As Bill Parks stated, we are in the budget process now. He presented the capital side of the budget. This is our operating budget request and we are waiting on a decision on the City Manager's Operating Budget. That will not happen until May or June. The two previously mentioned items are considered "service level changes". We generally do not make many service level requests and try to operate within the resources that we are allocated.

The Planning Director clarified that the department is asking for additional funding to help with the update of the Zoning Ordinance. This is a continuation of phase one, which was the Zoning Ordinance Assessment. This process could range from a two to five year process. It will include an extensive public outreach component, including lots of community meetings.

Chairperson Dodson reminded Zoning Committee members to make note of the changes to their meeting schedules.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee

The Chairperson referred the Commission to the February minutes and the future agenda items list.

Zoning Committee

Ms. Keplinger reported that there are six public hearings scheduled for April. She reminded the Commission that the combined zoning/business meeting is scheduled for April 28. The dinner meeting starts at 4:00 p.m. The Zoning Committee portion will start at 6:00 p.m.

There is a special Zoning Committee meeting on May 5 at 2:00 p.m. There is one case going for decision on April 14 and Chairperson Dodson has agreed to attend that Council meeting for a special request for a rezoning in Dilworth.

Commissioner Labovitz asked for clarification on times of the April 28 meeting. Ms. Keplinger explained that the dinner meeting is from 4:00-5:30 p.m. in room 267 and the Citizen's Forum is at 5:30 p.m. in the meeting chamber, followed by the Zoning hearings at 6:00 p.m. Commissioner Nelson asked if Zoning Committee members should arrive at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Keplinger stated that if you plan to come at 6:00 p.m., report to the Chamber.

The Planning Director added that the Council business meeting and the zoning meeting are combined on April 28 because of the religious holiday.

Planning Committee

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop left the meeting early, so Chairperson Dodson reported on his behalf. She reported that there are four mandatory referrals and a discussion of the Area Planning Policy Assessment project on the April meeting agenda.

Historic District Commission (HDC)

Commissioner Labovitz reported that the March HDC meeting was very contentious. The Dilworth Community Development Association (DCDA) is a very passionate group of people, and on a positive side she respects their passion. They are very concerned about keeping Dilworth a truly historic district. Most of the concerns at the meeting related to a case in Dilworth where the owner was extending his house and the DCDA thought he was building too close to the street. Technically he could do this from a zoning standpoint, but DCDA did not like the appearance from the street. They generally harassed the property owner to the point where there was a lawsuit. Commissioner Labovitz stated that there was so much shouting and contentiousness at the meeting that it was embarrassing. She did not think anything was accomplished and does not know how the situation can be improved.

The Planning Director stated that Commissioner Labovitz is exactly right in terms of the energy in the room at the Historic District Commission meetings. The meetings are very divisive, confrontational and adversarial. She wanted to clarify that there are two groups that represent Dilworth who attend these meetings. The other group is Preserve Historic Dilworth. She also shared that several months ago she and the newly hired HDC Coordinator, John Howard, met with the Historic District Commission. They discussed how to better operate and facilitate the meetings. They also discussed a longer term process staff has underway to improve how we manage local historic districts. This will involve revising the guidelines and unfortunately will be a very time consuming process. Staff will engage a consultant to assist with this process. Staff also met with the State Historic Preservation Office to discuss best practices in quasi-judicial meeting procedures.

Director Campbell explained that Dilworth is dealing with preservation, redevelopment pressure and transit oriented development. There are a lot of things going on that are creating lots of stress and tension in that community, which is manifesting itself with some bad behavior. In some instances staff needs to do a better job and enforcement needs to do a better job of making sure that only what the HDC approved actually gets done to the unit. Staff is working to address these issues, but unfortunately we cannot do it fast enough to respond to the concerns of Preserve Historic Dilworth as well as the DCDA.

In May staff will provide an update to City Council on the process and our discussions with the State Historic Preservation office. Preserve Historic Dilworth is saying that the actual designation of Dilworth as an historic district is being jeopardized or compromised. Staff wants to make sure that we clarify, and provide an update on the information and work that we have done with the State. The update will probably be at a workshop because we want to allow time for dialogue. The HDC members will be invited to attend the meeting.

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)

Chairperson Dodson announced that Commissioner Zoutewelle was appointed to the North Carolina Board of Engineers and Land Surveyors and resigned from the Commission last week. The Executive Team will work with staff to make an appointment to CRTPO.

Communication from Chairperson

Nominating Committee

Chairperson Dodson stated that Commissioner Eschert is the Chairperson of the Nominating Committee. Other committee members are Commissioners Labovitz and Walker. The Nominating Committee will present a slate of officers at the May work session and elections will occur in June.

The Chairperson encouraged Commissioners to contact the Nominating Committee if they are interested in serving as the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson of the Commission in FY15. Commissioner Allen added that interested Commissioners should submit their platforms to the Nominating Committee for review.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the Nominating Committee could provide criteria of what is involved and if the Chairperson needs to have participated on both the Zoning and Planning committees for a certain time period. Chairperson Dodson responded that may have been a perceived rule, but it is not a requirement. However, the Nominating Committee does consider experience. Commissioner Allen added that it is not a mandate. They have really been more “nice to haves” and an unwritten rule when they have made their decisions on the Nominating Committee.

Commissioner Watkins asked if members of the Nominating Committee can submit their own names on the slate. Commissioner Allen stated that would be inappropriate and could create a conflict.

Communications Committee

The Chairperson reminded the Commission that the Communications Committee is responsible for providing a mid-year report to City Council. She reported that Vice-Chairperson Lathrop is leading this effort and had drafted a report, however the Council is really busy and the Commission may hold off on submitting a report to Council at this time.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

Community Outreach Presentations

#	Date	Presentation	Staff
1	02/19/14	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Academic Internship Day	Basham
2	02/19/14	Home Builders Association Land Development Council - The Planning Department and Development Approvals	Harmon/Weaver
3			
4	03/03/14	Mecklenburg County Chapter of the North Carolina Surveyors Association - Digital Review of Subdivision Submittals & Proposed Text Amendment for Setback Measurements	Weaver
5	03/03/14	Graham Heights Neighborhood Association - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Cook
6	03/04/14	Radio Interview on 102.3 - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Gonzalez
7	03/04/14	Public Meeting (Charlotte) - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Cook/Bridges/Burke
8	03/06/14	Public Meeting (Indian Trail) - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Cook/Bridges/Burke/ Basham
9	03/07/14	Public Meeting (Charlotte) - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Cook/Burke
10	03/17/14	Environmental Justice Communities (Statesville) - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Bridges
11	03/18/14	Mecklenburg Livable Communities-Built Environment Work Group - 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Cook
12	03/20/14	New City of Charlotte Council Members - Blue Line Extension Tour	Campbell/Cornett
13	03/27/14	Mallard Creek Community Organization - Prosperity Hucks Area Plan	Main
14	04/08/14	North Carolina Public Transportation Association - South Corridor Light Rail Tour	Main
15	04/09/14	Lake Norman Transportation Commission - Update on CRTPO's Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the NCDOT Project Prioritization Process (P3.0)	Burke
16	04/09/14	Charlotte Career Discovery Day - Charlotte: Past, Present & Future & Planning Information	McCullough/Neely/Prescott
17	04/10/14	Coulwood Middle School Career Fair - Charlotte: Past, Present & Future & Planning Information	Aphayarath/Fortune/ McCullough/Quinn
18	04/11/14	Clemson Urban Design Class - South Park Development Tour	Main
19	04/15/14	News 13 Central Orlando - What Light Rail Has Done for Charlotte	Campbell
20	04/16/14	ENLACE (Latino Community Outreach Organization) - Mecklenburg Livable Communities Plan	Gonzalez
21	04/17/14	State Historic Preservation Office and Raleigh Historic Development Commission - Status of the Charlotte Historic District Commission: What's Working and What's Not	Howard/Birmingham
22	04/22/14	For Investors By Investors - Working in Local Historic Districts	Howard
23	04/28/14	University of North Carolina at Charlotte's Transportation Engineering Students - CRTPO 101	Cook

Meeting Schedule

May 2014

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
05-05-14	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Executive Committee			
05-19-14	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
05-05-14	10:00 a.m.	Blue Line Extension Station Plan Area Tour ¹	Lobby - CMGC
05-20-14	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Zoning Committee			
05-05-14	2:00 p.m.	Work Session ²	Conference Room CH-14 2 nd Floor - CMGC
05-19-14	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
05-19-14	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
05-28-14	4:30 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committee(s)			
05-21-14	2:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission Informational Meeting ³	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
05-21-14	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission ⁴	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
05-21-14	6:00 p.m.	CRTPO Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings

PED Text Amendment (Formerly Midtown Morehead Cherry Pedestrian Overlay)

05-01-14	6:00 p.m.	Public Meeting	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
----------	-----------	----------------	---

¹ The Blue Line Extension Station Plan Area tour is optional.

² The regularly scheduled April Zoning Committee work session was rescheduled to May 5, 2014.

³ This is a Historic District Commission informational meeting to discuss staff updates.

⁴ The regularly scheduled May 14th Historic District Commission meeting was rescheduled to May 21st at 3:00 pm.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Meeting Schedule

June 2014

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
06-02-14	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Executive Committee			
06-16-14	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
06-17-14	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Zoning Committee			
06-16-14	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
06-16-14	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
06-25-14	4:30 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committee(s)			
06-11-14	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
06-18-14	5:00 p.m.	MPO Education Session	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC
06-18-14	6:00 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.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Attachment 4

Executive Committee Meeting

Approved

March 17, 2014 - 4:00 p.m.

April 28, 2014

CMGC - Conference Room 266

Minutes

Call to Order & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 4:22 p.m.

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Tony Lathrop (Vice-Chairperson), Emma Allen and Ray Eschert

Commissioner(s) Absent: Tracy Dodson (Chairperson)

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

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Allen and seconded by Commissioner Eschert to approve the February 17, 2014 Executive Committee minutes. The vote was 3 to 0 to approve the minutes.

Follow-up Assignments

Communication Committee/Communication Statement to City Council

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop stated that his big picture idea is to mention that the priority of the Commission is providing support and input as we ramp up to a possible rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance, and as we assess our area planning processes. Beyond that, the Commission has been spending time bringing on new members and orienting them. Director Campbell stated that the Planning Department can provide the Communication Committee with some additional information from the actual budget request. She mentioned that Chairperson Dodson had also wanted her to talk about the budget request. Cheryl Neely noted that the item is under the Director's Report on the draft agenda.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if the Communication Statement is supposed to be from both the Commission and staff. Director Campbell stated that it is supposed to be just from the Commission. She said that Planning staff will provide information from the budget request so that it can be specifically referenced as to the specifics of the request and the dollar amount.

Future Work Session Agenda Items

Community Investment Plan

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked where Director Campbell sees the Community Investment Plan fitting. Director Campbell stated that the Planning Department is highly involved in the process. She and Randy Harrington, Budget Director for the City of Charlotte, co-chair this initiative. They want to inform the Commission of the long term plan, the projects that are being recommended for the 2014 bond package, how staff is gearing up to accomplish the work, and the community engagement activities that will begin over the next couple of months. Staff's role in the community engagement will not be one of advocacy. Staff will be in an information mode: "Here is what we are planning and here is why we are planning this." The Chamber's role is advocacy, staff's role is to inform people about the projects.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked about the kinds of projects included in the Community Investment Plan. Director Campbell said it mainly includes infrastructure, streetscape, new roads, widening of roads, bridges and the Cross Charlotte Trail.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if the Cross Charlotte Trail was like the Carolina Thread Trail. Director Campbell responded that it is similar and is coordinated with the Thread Trail. Not only will the Cross Charlotte Trail project help link existing and planned trails and greenways, it will also try to accelerate those efforts and provide some overland connections using streets and sidewalks.

Commissioner Eschert asked if there are specific communities that have been targeted. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop wanted to clarify whether Commissioner Eschert was asking about the Trail itself or the investment potential. Commissioner Eschert stated that he was asking about the investment potential. Director Campbell stated that the Community Investment Plan covers the entire City, and there are projects proposed in every part of the community.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if there were designated areas that the City has identified as areas, for example, that need streetscapes more than others. Director Campbell said yes and she thinks the relevancy for the Planning Commission is the Community Investment Plan has a very strong linkage to our area plans. Director Campbell explained that in selecting projects for the Community Investment Plan, we looked at area plans and recommendations for infrastructure and we are following that very closely.

Commissioner Eschert wanted to know how the Community Investment Plan work will dovetail when looking ahead and addressing the rewriting of some of the area plans. Director Campbell stated that she does not think there will be a conflict with the process.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop wanted to know if there was anything required of the Commission. Director Campbell stated that there is no action required; it is just for information. Because there is a lot of planning resources going into this effort, she wants to keep the Commission informed.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop wanted to know if a nexus had occurred with doing these kinds of physical investments and the plans. Director Campbell said she thinks that the nexus is that to achieve the vision that we have for the Community, it is not enough for us to rely on the private sector development process, we need to manage the public sector investment process, which happens with the Community Investment Plan. We are also working collaboratively with the County, the Park and Recreation Department, and the Library to make a much stronger linkage between public investments and to help leverage private sector investments. The Planning Coordinating Committee (PCC), which was formerly the Planning Liaison Committee, has asked for an update by both the City Manager and the County Manager regarding the Community Investment Plan. The managers will be doing a presentation on collaborative planning and investments at that April 4th PCC meeting.

Commissioner Eschert asked how a community investment plan for a specific area is presented to that community. Director Campbell explained that staff will be going through a community engagement process in the next month or so. The City has a Community Investment Plan that was adopted last year by City Council, and we just want to reaffirm that there are no adjustments or changes to that plan that will be presented to Council in May.

Commissioner Eschert asked if there was a need for involvement from the Planning Commission. Director Campbell stated that the only involvement would be through the area planning processes.

Commissioner Allen suggested mentioning early on that the presentation is for information only. Director Campbell said that she would speak with Chairperson Dodson about allowing her to have an introduction to the presentation. Ms. Campbell will explain that this initiative is staff-driven and that there is no official need to adopt or endorse the Community Investment Plan. Director Campbell informed the Committee that Bill Parks will present to the Commission because the Budget Director, Randy Harrington has a conflict.

Planning Commission Involvement in Public Input Processes

Director Campbell asked if the Planning Commission Involvement in Public Input Processes spoke to how the Commission is supposed to behave, be engaged or involved in the process. Cheryl Neely noted that item number three on the second page states that the role of the Commission will be to attend the meetings, listen to the discussion and keep the full Commission apprised of the progress, but it does not say they cannot speak. Item number five on the third page indicates that Commissioners are present to hear the discussion and gain a better understanding of the issues and concerns and not to influence the outcome.

Commissioner Allen stated that sometimes we all just need reminders, so maybe this is just a good reminder time. Director Campbell asked if the issue is about the Planning Commission having enough involvement and opportunity to express issues and concerns, or if it is about the Commissioners' role at public meetings. These are totally different issues. Director Campbell said we can address the question of whether the Commissioners have enough opportunity for input. That should happen at the Commission meetings so the full Commission can hear the concerns versus doing it at a public meeting.

Mecklenburg Livable Communities Plan

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked about the Livable Communities Plan. Director Campbell stated that it is a City-County initiative and it is akin to what a lot of communities call a sustainability plan. It addresses economic, environment, and social issues. This plan is underway and it would be an opportunity to get some information about its scope, vision, process to date and next steps.

Commissioner Eschert asked if the intent is to address overall quality as it encompasses the different parts that contribute to the plan. Director Campbell stated that it is and the intent is also to develop vision, goals and metrics (how we measure whether we are achieving the things we say we want to achieve within our community). Director Campbell said she was not sure if we will get to the metrics phase.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if there was going to be a task force of people from the towns, the County and the City. Director Campbell said there is and the process is underway.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop then asked who is staffing the initiative. Director Campbell said that Neighborhood and Business Services is involved, with Rob Phocas of the City, Heidi Pruess of the County and other staff. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop wanted to know if anyone from Planning was assisting. Director Campbell said that no one from Planning was assisting directly, but within the City of Charlotte, there is an Environment Cabinet that we provide input to.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked the Director if she wanted to think about this topic for May. Director Campbell said yes and that Livable Communities is actually giving an update to Council in May, so it may be a good time.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked about the timing of the rewrite of the Transit Oriented Development districts. Director Campbell stated that they had just hired the consultant to help with the effort, so it would be late summer or early fall before we have any recommendations.

Future Work Session Agenda Items	Work Session
1. Community Investment Plan	April
2. Planning Commission Involvement In Public Input Processes	April
3. Mecklenburg Livable Communities Plan	May

Approval of the April 7 Work Session Agenda

The Committee reviewed the April work session draft agenda. Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the work session agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eschert. The vote was 3 to 0 to approve.

Approval of the April and May 2014 Meeting Schedules

The Committee reviewed the April and May meeting schedules. Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the April and May 2014 meeting schedules. Cheryl Neely noted that there was one change to the April calendar. The HDC's April 9th meeting start time should be 3:00 p.m., instead of 7:00 p.m.

The Vice-Chairperson asked for a motion to approve the meeting schedules as modified. Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the April and May 2014 meeting schedules. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairperson Lathrop. The vote was 3 to 0 to approve.

Adjournment

Commissioner Allen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

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

NOTICE is hereby given that public hearings will be held by the City Council in the Meeting Chamber located in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, 600 East Fourth Street beginning at 6:00 P.M. on **Monday, the 19th day of May, 2014** on the following petitions that propose changes to the Official Zoning Maps of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina:

Petition No. 2013-094 by Halvorsen Development Corporation for a change in zoning for approximately 38.05 acres located on the west side of Prosperity Church Road across from Ridge Road from R-3 & CC to CC & CC SPA with five-year vested rights.

Petition No. 2014-029 by Kyle Short for a change in zoning for approximately 1.58 acres located on the south side of E. Woodlawn Road between Old Woods Road and Fairbluff Place from R-4 to UR-2(CD).

Petition No. 2014-033 by Colony at Piper Glen for a change in zoning for approximately 1.72 acres located on the east side of Rea Road between Piper Station Drive and Ballantyne Commons Parkway from NS to NS SPA.

Petition No. 2014-034 by Mason Kazel for a change in zoning for approximately 0.61 acres located on the east side of Seigle Avenue between East 10th Street and Otts Street across from Green Trail Lane from I-2 to MUDD(CD).

Petition No. 2014-036 by City of Charlotte for a change in zoning for approximately 5.18 acres located on the north side of West Blvd. and generally surrounded by Old Steele Creek Road, Elmin St., Walter St. and West Blvd. from O-1(CD) & R-5 to NS.

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, May 14th, 2014**.

**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 19th day of May, 2014** on the following petition that propose changes to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance:

Petition No. 2012-90 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to 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), 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 Transit Oriented Development district (TOD) or Pedestrian Oriented District (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 1) add new definitions; 2) clarify the residential density in the Pedestrian Overlay district (PED); 3) add new parking requirements for multi-family units located in the Midtown, Morehead, Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District and the East Boulevard Pedestrian Overlay District; and 4) add new supplemental design standards for the Midtown, Morehead, Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District and the East Boulevard Pedestrian Overlay District.

Petition No. 2014-037 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance 1) clarify the screening and buffer requirements for lots abutting recreational facilities, and 2) add a footnote describing how the separation distance is measured.

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
March 18, 2014 - 5:00 p.m.
CMGC - 2nd Floor, Room 280

Attachment 6
Approved
April 15, 2014

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Tony Lathrop, Vice-Chairperson Raymond Eschert, Randy Fink, Thomas Low, Cozzie Watkins and Andy Zoutewelle

Planning Staff Present: Kathy Cornett, Garet Johnson, Sonda Kennedy, Melony McCullough, Catherine Stutts, Bryman Suttle, Amanda Vari and Jonathan Wells

Other Staff Present: Katie Daughtry and Jacqueline O'Neil (County Asset and Facility Management), David Love (Storm Water Services) and Ben Miller (CDOT)

Call to Order and Introductions

Chairperson Lathrop called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. and everyone introduced themselves.

Approve February 18, 2014 Minutes

A motion was made by Vice-Chairperson Eschert and seconded by Commissioner Watkins to approve the February 18, 2014 minutes. The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes.

M.R. #14-07: Proposal by the City of Charlotte to Transfer 0.33 acres of Land to the Town of Matthews

Jonathan Wells (Planning) presented the proposal from the City of Charlotte to transfer 0.33 acres of land located on the northeast corner of Matthews-Mint Hill Road and Independence Pointe Parkway (PID 193-294-04) to the Town of Matthews. Mr. Wells shared background information about this transaction and explained the Mandatory Referral for Central Piedmont Community College from several years ago. He noted that during that process, the transportation network was reviewed and the decision was made to shift the Independence Pointe intersection out of the right-of-way for the power lines. He further explained that the land was formerly used as a water tower site for Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department (CMUD). Since the water tower was removed and the site is now vacant, the City of Charlotte no longer needs the property. The Town of Matthews originally deeded the land to the City of Charlotte and is now requesting that the land be returned. The Town of Matthews would like to create an open space use (possibly a mini-park or mini-playground) on the property.

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Eschert to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #14-07. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #14-07.

M.R. #14-08: Proposal by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation to Accept the Donation of 2.5 acres of Land Located off Carolyn Court Adjacent to David B. Waymer Community Park

Commissioner Zoutewelle disclosed that his firm does work for the County and the Committee ruled that he did not have a conflict of interest. Jonathan Wells (Planning) presented the proposal from Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation to accept the donation of two parcels of land located on Carolyn Court (PIDs 019-091-11 and 12) in the Town of Huntersville to allow for the expansion of David B. Waymer Community Park. Acceptance of this donation allows for the expansion of the park, increases and preserves buffers in this location and potentially provides an additional/alternate access point to the park off Carolyn Court. This donation is consistent with the County's 2008 Parks Master Plan which encourages the expansion and construction of community parks. Chairperson Lathrop asked how the road will impact the park. Mr. Wells answered that the road issue will be worked out during the development process.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairperson Eschert and seconded by Commissioner Fink to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #14-08. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #14-08.

M.R. #14-09: Proposal by Mecklenburg County Storm Water Services Program to Acquire 12 Properties along Stewart Creek

Catherine Stutts (Planning) presented a proposal by Mecklenburg County's Storm Water Services Program to acquire 12 parcels located on Barlowe Road, Dewolfe Street and Gallagher Street along Stewart Creek. These parcels are improved with single family homes and are located in flood prone areas. The proposed acquisitions are intended to eliminate potential future losses by removing the improvements. Additionally, acquisition of these parcels will add to greenway connectivity and assemblage along each of the creeks. The owners will need to express a willingness to participate in the program (participation in the program is voluntary).

Commissioner Low asked if a master plan design has been created for this site. Ms. Stutts said there has to be an agreement from the owners to participate. Once this is done, the structures are removed and the site can be identified as future greenway. Vice-Chairperson Eschert asked about the potential impact on the greenway if owners do not participate. Ms. Stutts replied that the primary focus is flood prevention. Mr. David Love (Storm Water Services – County Flood Mitigation Program) stated that the project is funded by storm water and the land will be preserved for greenway. Vice-Chairperson Eschert asked about the mitigation plan and the problems with the water. Mr. Love stated that demolishing the houses will help solve the problem. Commissioner Fink asked if there is a time limit for the owners to accept the offer. Mr. Love said that there is a time limit. Chairperson Lathrop asked if the 12 owners have accepted. Mr. Love replied no and added that they are in the early stages of the process.

A motion was made by Commissioner Watkins and seconded by Vice-Chairperson Eschert to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #14-09. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #14-09.

Area Plan Status and Meeting Report - Update on the Planning Process for the University City Area Plan - Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plans

Amanda Vari (Planning) gave an overview and update on the Planning Process for the *University City Area Plan - Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plans*. She stated that the *Blue Line Extension (BLE) Transit Station Area Plans* for the first six stations (Parkwood to Tom Hunter) were adopted last year. Transit station area plans were completed for four BLE stations as part of the *University City Area Plan (UCAP)* in 2007. However, as a part of the preliminary engineering work, some of the stations were renamed and combined.

The planning process to update the *UCAP* and incorporate these changes began last fall. Three public workshops were held in the community. A public workshop to receive public comment on the draft plan recommendations was March 11. This was previously scheduled to be the final workshop; however, staff has decided to extend the process to allow additional time to address public concerns. The final public meeting will likely be this summer.

Commissioner Zoutewelle asked how ridership is defined. Ms. Kathy Cornett (Planning) stated that it is a single trip from one station to another. Chairperson Lathrop thanked staff for the informative tour of the area. He asked Ms. Vari where the park and ride lots will be located. She said there will be park and ride lots at two (2) stations, University City Boulevard and J. W. Clay Boulevard.

Commissioner Low stated that the plan was very well thought out and noted some of the key design elements that it addresses such as walkability, compact, human scale, design guidelines and building types. He wanted to know how the development community is responding and if there is a lot of pressure. Ms. Vari stated that the current zoning pattern allows a development pattern that is inconsistent with transit. She added that there has not been a lot of development pressure to date.

Commissioner Fink asked about the retaining walls along North Tryon Street and how they will affect development fronting on North Tryon Street. He also mentioned that the sidewalks to the library along W.T. Harris Boulevard are very difficult to access. Ms. Vari informed the Committee that a couple of interdepartmental teams have met to discuss what development could be like adjacent to these properties. There is no intent to ignore this section of North Tryon because it is possible for buildings to front on secondary streets. Mr. Ben Miller (CDOT) stated that there is no recommendation for sidewalks along W. T. Harris Boulevard. There are recommendations for a path further outside of the right-of-way via Hospital Drive and J. W. Clay Boulevard. Commissioner Fink asked if anyone has engaged the hospital for their input and Mr. Miller responded not at this time.

Chairperson Lathrop stated that there may be a need to more formally assign a committee member to this area and he will wait until a new commissioner is appointed. Commissioner Zoutewelle stated that in the meantime, Commissioner Fink and Commissioner Deborah Ryan as well as himself, are representing the Committee by attending the area plan meetings.

Adjourn 6:00 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION AGENDA

- | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|----------|
| 1. | 401 East Worthington Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
New Construction
Angie Lauer, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-054</u> | Deferred |
| 2. | 1003 Romany Road, Dilworth Local Historic District
Windows Brick Molding
Angie Lauer, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-053</u> | Approved |
| 3. | 1701 Merriman Avenue, Wilmore Local Historic District
Replace Siding/Gable Front Porch
Kevin Miller, Owner | <u>HDC 2014-034</u> | Approved |
| 4. | 2132 Park Road, Dilworth Local Historic District
Front Porch Renovation
Bruce Berberick, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-039</u> | Approved |
| 5. | 1915 Lyndhurst Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
COA Amendment
Timothy Sheriff, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-042</u> | Approved |
| 6. | 2100 Park Road, Dilworth Local Historic District
Remove Front Porch/Front Porch Addition
Susan Pfahl, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-046</u> | Approved |
| 7. | 2000 Charlotte Drive, Dilworth Local Historic District
Roof Changes/Siding Changes/Window and Door Relocation
John Fryday, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-049</u> | Approved |

APPLICATIONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 8. | 2004 Charlotte Drive, Dilworth Local Historic District
Second Floor Addition
Peter Vasseur, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-002</u> | Continued |
| 9. | 909 Romany Road, Dilworth Local Historic District
Front Porch Addition/Front Dormers/Second Floor Addition
Angie Lauer, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-041</u> | Continued |
| 10. | 528 East Worthington Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
Second Floor Addition
Kathryn Cole, Owner | <u>HDC 2014-044</u> | Continued |
| 11. | 700 East Worthington Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
Front & Rear Dormer Addition
John Fryday, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-035</u> | Approved |
| 12. | 809 Mt. Vernon Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District
Demolition/New Construction
Kraig Magus, Applicant | <u>HDC 2014-043</u> | Demo Approved
New Construction
Continued |