

Dear Community Residents and Leaders,

Please join us for a community meeting to discuss Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Department Rezoning Petition 2009-31, and the proposed plans for the redevelopment of 1013, 1017, and 1021 Belmont Avenue and 1100 Allen Street. A brief presentation will be followed by open discussion and questions and answer session.

Date

June 3, 2009

Time

6:00pm – 7:00pm

Location

Belmont Regional Center

700 Parkwood Avenue





Charlotte, NC 28205

Your attendance is encouraged. We look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Roger and Perina Stewart

Date: June 3, 2009
Project Name: Belmont Korner
Project Number: Rezoning Petition 2009-31
Subject: Community Meeting
Meeting Location: Belmont Regional Center
 700 Parkwood Avenue
 Charlotte, NC 28205
Meeting Date: June 3, 2009

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE	EMAIL
Dini Rucker	718 E. 9th St Charlotte, NC 28202	704-458 7467	rvrcker@clearwire.net
Matt Bogart	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
Melinda Dundy	1121 Seigle NU Charlotte NC	704 334-4061	
Tammy Willis	904 HARRILL ST CHAR. NC 28205	704 625-2886	
William R. Collins	1226 Pinyram	NA	
JON	Belmont 1111	704-733-9116	
Jarvis Kuc	1115 N HARRILL ST	980-205-3665	
Robert Boster	1016 Harrill St	704-379-1877	

Date: June 3, 2009

Page 2 of 3

Project Name: Belmont Korner
Project Number: Rezoning Petition 2009-31

Alice Bennett			
Teresa Reed	1020 Belmont Ave		
Lisa Eelesn	1014 N. Allen St		
TERESA Webb	1010 Allen St		
JOHN AMON	857 BELMONT AVE		
ANNIE FIDJINGBE	1016 BELMONT AVE CHAR. NC 28203		

Petition #: 2009-31
Petitioner: Roger and Perina Stewart
Existing Zoning: R-5 and B-1
Proposed Zoning: UR-3 (CD)
Location: Approximately 0.68 acres at Belmont Ave. and Allen St

Community Meeting Summary

The Community meeting was held on June 3, 2009 at 6:00pm at the Belmont Regional Center. After a presentation outlining the purpose of the rezoning, the proposed increased density, scale of the buildings, parking, and alley abandonment the floor was opened up for discussion.

1. There were no objections to the plan as presented in terms of land use, scale, and density.
2. What type of housing units are proposed? The petitioner responded 16 apartments for seniors (55 years of age and above)
3. The question was raised about the type of retail to be included in the project. The petitioner responded that the existing convenience store currently on site would be relocated into the new structure and be expanded to offer the community a greater variety of goods, including a deli, fresh meats and produce, and a small outdoor dining area for carry out deli food.
4. A community member stated that this would benefit the elderly people in the neighborhood as well as keep commerce in the community.
5. A community member asked if beer and wine would continue to be sold in the convenience store. The petitioner responded yes.
6. There was a discussion on how security was to be handled to eliminate loitering. The additional density was discussed as a positive to increase the amount of "community watch" of the property by the residents that will live there. There will also be added security measures for the residents that live there. The petitioner also proposed the opportunity for a CMPD outpost as part of the development in the office / retail area.
7. A comparison was made by a community member to First Ward, and that loitering does not exist there any more as it once did. It was discussed that redevelopment, much like the petitioners proposed project, was a contributing factor to this.
8. There was a person in attendance that stated she was not invited to the community meeting. It was explained that property owners within 300 feet of the petition property and community associations within a 1 mile radius were notified per the planning departments contact list. Being a Belmont resident, her comments were welcomed.

In closing, it was agreed by both the petitioner and community members in the room that the redevelopment of the property will be good for the surrounding neighborhood, and that they need to work together as a community to make it a success. The petitioner stated his willingness to work with the community to address their concerns as the project is further developed.