

COMMUNITY MEETING REPORT

Petitioner: Shea Anniston, LLC

Rezoning Petition No. 2013-091

This Community Meeting Report is being filed with the Office of the City Clerk and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance.

PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED WITH DATE AND EXPLANATION OF HOW CONTACTED:

A representative of the Petitioner mailed a written notice of the date, time and location of the Community Meeting to the individuals and organizations set out on Exhibit A attached hereto by depositing such notice in the U.S. mail on November 1, 2013. A copy of the written notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF MEETING:

The Community Meeting was held on Wednesday, November 13, 2013 at 6:30 P.M at the Sports Connection, 11611 Ardrey Kell Road, Charlotte, NC 28277.

PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE AT MEETING (see attached copy of sign-in sheet):

The Community Meeting was attended by those individuals identified on the sign-in sheet attached hereto as Exhibit C. The Petitioner was represented at the Community Meeting by Mike Shea and Chase Kerley with the Shea Homes. The Petitioner's agent, Collin Brown with K&L Gates, and Lee McLaren with DPR Associates also attended on behalf of the Petitioner.

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION:

Mr. Brown welcomed the attendees and introduced the Petitioner's team. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the rezoning request and the conditional site plan and to respond to questions and concerns from nearby residents and property owners.

Mr. Brown used a PowerPoint presentation throughout the meeting, a copy of the presentation is attached as Exhibit D. Mr. Brown provided background information related to the location of the property and its current zoning. He then reviewed the details of the Petitioner's proposed site plan and explained the unique type of housing that Shea plans to develop. Mr. Brown responded to questions about the proposed density and explained how density is calculated for land use purposes.

Mr. Brown explained that Shea's proposal was innovative for the City of Charlotte due to the layout and orientation of the proposed homes. He showed photographs of neighborhoods in the area that were developed at a similar density and noted that most had narrow lots and streetscapes dotted with individual driveways and front-facing garages. Then showed Shea's

proposed layout and home elevations and explained that Shea's plan offered a much more attractive streetscape that would not be dominated by garages, driveways and mailboxes.

Mr. Brown acknowledged that there are significant traffic issues related to the Marvin Road intersection at Johnston Road. He then explained a variety of transportation improvements that would soon be made in conjunction with the development of a new apartment community adjacent to the property. He noted that the forthcoming improvements were not related to Shea's development but that they would significantly reduce congestion in the area.

Following the formal presentation the Petitioner's team took questions from attendees. Several attendees asked various questions related to the proposed water quality feature. Mr. Brown and Mr. McLaren explained the requirement of the Post Construction Controls Ordinances related to water quality and water quantity control. Mr. McLaren provided information about the appearance, location and function of the water quality feature.

Several attendees asked questions about the proposed connection to Wilklee Drive. Mr. Brown indicated that the connection would be required by Charlotte's subdivision ordinance and he acknowledged that future residents could use Wilklee Drive as an alternate access to Marvin Road. An attendee asked if Shea planned to provide any monumentation at the connection to Wilklee to distinguish between Shea's proposed development and the existing neighborhood. Mr. Shea indicated that Shea would consider that.

In response to a question, Mr. Brown explained that Shea would likely commit to provide a left-turn lane into the property but that they were still discussing that issue with CDOT.

An attendee said that he did not like the proposed "cluster style" homes and that he did not think that type of housing was consistent with adjacent neighborhoods. Mr. Brown responded that the proposed density was just over 4.5 units per acre which is fairly similar to the adjoining neighborhoods. Several attendees asked if the rezoning request was necessary in order to increase the allowable density. Mr. Brown acknowledged that the density would increase but he pointed out that the main reason for the MX-1 Zoning District was to accommodate the unique layout of homes that the Petitioner was proposing. He explained that the proposed layout would provide a much more attractive streetscape than a site plan with many townhomes or narrow lots with front-facing garages and individual driveways.

Several attendees asked repeated questions about the number of homes that could be developed without a rezoning. Mr. Brown explained that there were development options that would allow the property to be developed at a density significantly higher than three units per acres without a rezoning. However, he reiterated that the Petitioner was focused on the proposed plan. Several attendees stated that they would prefer to keep the density at three units per acre. Mr. Brown said that he understood their concerns but he thought that any development scenario would likely involve higher density due to the property's location and features.

Attendees asked questions about the Petitioner's plans for the large open space area at the rear of the property. Mr. Brown explained that the area would be an amenity for future residents and

that the Petitioner's team was open to feedback from attendees regarding how this area should be treated.

An attendee asked if Shea planned to provide plantings or screening along the property's eastern boundary that adjoins existing homes on Sturkie Court and Wilkee Drive. Mr. Shea indicated that Shea would provide some type of screening in that area and invited residents to let him know if there were any preferred species that they would like Shea to consider.

Mr. Brown confirmed that there would be sidewalks throughout the development.

Mr. Kerley and Mr. Shea responded to questions about the sizes and price points of the proposed homes. Mr. Shea also talked about Shea's history in the community and invited attendees to visit other Shea communities to see the type and quality of homes that the company builds. Mr. Shea said that Shea was excited to have an opportunity to develop in such a desirable location and that he believed that the proposed development would have a positive impact on nearby property values. He noted that Shea was still considering finishes and amenities and said that Shea was evaluating upgraded pavement surfaces within the driveway/courtyard areas.

Mr. Brown reminded attendees to sign-in and provide their e-mail addresses so that he could send follow-up correspondence if necessary.

Following the formal presentation, the Petitioner's representatives continued conversations with attendees individually.

Respectfully submitted, this 6th day of December, 2013.

cc: Ms. Tammie Keplinger, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department
Ms. Clare Lyte-Graham, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department
The Honorable Ed Driggs, Charlotte City Council
Clerk to Charlotte City Council

