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:

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-1 attached hereto by depositing such notice in the U.S. mail on Wednesday, November 23, 2016. A copy of the written notice for the Community Meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit A-2.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF MEETING:

The Community Meeting was held on December 7, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at the Hilton Garden Inn Charlotte North, 9315 Statesville Road, Charlotte, North Carolina.

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 B. The Petitioner’s representatives at the Community Meeting were: Aaron Pechota and Cheryl Steigerwald (The NRP Group, LLC), Nicholas Bushon (Design Resource Group), and John Carmichael and Ty Shaffer (Robinson, Bradsaw & Hinson, P.A.). Also in attendance was Councilmember Al Austin (District 2).

SUMMARY OF ISSUES DISCUSSED:

The meeting began with the PowerPoint presentation that is attached as Exhibit C.

John Carmichael opened the meeting and explained that it was the official Community Meeting for Petition No. 2017-009. He then introduced the Petitioner’s representatives and gave an overview of the rezoning schedule:

- Public Hearing, January 17, 2017 at 6:30 pm at the Government Center
- Zoning Committee Meeting, January 25, 2017 at 4:30 pm at the Government Center
- City Council Decision, February 20, 2017 at 5:30 pm at the Government Center

Mr. Carmichael gave an overview of the site and its location (including zoning designations for surrounding parcels). The site is currently zoned NS (CD), like the Walgreens parcel, but because it is a conditional zoning there is a specific site plan associated with the site that governs use and development. That current site plan calls for up to 16 for-sale townhome units.
The Petitioner is seeking a site plan amendment that would allow for a max three story multifamily building containing up to 75 units that would be restricted to residents age 55 and older, and with an affordable housing component.

Mr. Carmichael introduced Aaron Pechota of NRP Group, who introduced himself and NRP Group. He explained that it is a national multifamily developer that owns and manages apartments across the nation. It has been in existence since the mid-1990s and acts as developer, builder, and owner of projects. It is a vertically integrated company, meaning it runs projects from conception to management after completion. Currently, NRP Group’s footprint is primarily concentrated in the Midwest, Texas, and Florida. NRP Group manages around 15,000 units across the nation. For a development with an affordable housing focus, which is proposed for these parcels, NRP Group would own the property for the long term. The company’s senior housing projects are restricted to ages 55 and older, but the average age typically is over 70 years old. These projects are also built to be adaptable and to serve the needs of residents as they age, until they require a higher level of care. Mr. Pechota then reviewed NRP Group’s “Core Values” as shown on the slides, and offered to answer any questions.

Nicholas Bushon reviewed the site plan and its adjacency to the Walgreens store. He explained the Petitioner’s desire to preserve internal drive connectivity through the site. The site plan pushes the building up toward W. W.T. Harris Blvd. to facilitate this, which also eases the structure away from the existing residential uses along the rear of the property. Mr. Bushon explained the proposed BMP area, and that this location is driven by the topography of the site, which drops in that direction. They will work with that natural flow and use of the BMP in this site also allows for preservation of good green space. The BMP will be a sand filtered detention and release structure that will not hold water.

Mr. Bushon explained that there are few existing trees on the site, which has largely been cleared. The Petitioner wants to preserve existing hardwoods and to add plantings in the 22’ landscape buffer to meet the Class C requirements.

Mr. Carmichael explained that the development will be age-restricted, and that a note to that effect on the site plan means that this requirement must be kept. He showed the attendees proposed architectural renderings and explained that these will be submitted along with the revised site plan on December 19.

Cheryl Steigerwald gave more detail on the renderings and explained the mix of proposed vinyl and brick masonry. The structure will have a pitched roof and architectural shingle. The main entrance to the building will be in the rear. Units will be a mix of one and two bedroom units. Mr. Pechota noted that the community will be contained because it is meant for seniors. There will be modest outdoor amenities (e.g. gazebo) and internal amenities, but the petitioner is still finalizing all of this as part of the development process. Ms. Steigerwald noted that the three story structure likely will be 48’ tall to the peak of the roof.

In response to a question, Mr. Pechota explained that the units are all independent living, not assisted living. Each will have its own kitchen and bathroom and be in the 700-900 SF range.
The price range likely will be between $600-800/mo., though 10% of the units will have to be lower due to the specific financing for this type of project. All the units will be rentals.

An attendee asked about NRP Group’s other developments in Charlotte. Mr. Pechota noted the Loft 135 project south of Uptown on Morehead St., which is a very different type of development. NRP Group has not built a senior housing community in Charlotte.

An attendee raised a number of questions about traffic flow and the impact of this development on traffic in the area. There was a general concern among the neighbors about right turn exits from the Walgreens and U-turns to change direction, which presents safety concerns. Additional traffic concerns revolve around back-ups and the absence of lights at exits in the area. Mr. Pechota noted that the Petitioner is meeting with Planning Staff to discuss traffic and other issues. He noted that in early conversations with the City, the internal connectivity currently depicted was something the City wanted included in the site plan. Mr. Pechota is not sure whether there are alternatives to the depictions on the current site plan. Mr. Bushon noted the same points, and that the exit location at Forest Drive seeks to meet the CDOT’s goal of avoiding staggered roads.

In response to a question about parking Mr. Pechota noted that 96 spaces are shown on the current plan (1.6 per unit). Because the mix of units will be 60% two bedroom and 40% one bedroom, with a large majority of the two bedroom units still having a single resident, NRP Group’s experience suggests that 1 space per unit would actually be adequate. Mr. Pechota also noted that dumpsters will be internal to the building (with trash chutes).

A neighbor raised additional concerns about traffic and the inadequacy of the existing road network, including plans to make W. W.T. Harris Blvd. a four lane road up to the Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road intersection. Mr. Bushon explained that the right-of-way dedication at 100’ would allow for expansion of the road to this level, but that the Petitioner has no information about CDOT or NCDOT plans. Ultimately, Mr. Bushon noted that the State would decide on any future road projects.

A neighbor inquired about the adequacy of proposed parking, and whether the number of handicapped spaces and possible need for wider spaces, given the residents, would be required. Mr. Pechota noted that NRP Group’s experience has been that the standard parking is adequate, both in number and size. The current site plan actually calls for more parking than is typical for NRP Group’s senior housing developments. Mr. Bushon added that the Petitioner is providing more spaces than typically seen for senior developments.

An attendee asked whether it would be possible to use the proposed internal street to access Walgreens. Mr. Pechota explained that there is an existing easement agreement with Walgreens and the Petitioner will not be eliminating that access (though it likely will implement speed control measures).

In response to a request to elaborate on his discussion of the affordable component of this development, Mr. Pechota explained that approximately 10% of the units would be targeted to residents at 30% of Area Median Income (AMI, a measurement built on Charlotte area income
data to derive a maximum rent burden for those residents), and that those units likely will rent in the $300-400/mo. range. He explained that this will not be HUD or Section 8, government subsidized, housing. The affordable housing component is made possible by tax credits that are awarded to the developer by the state, which are then sold to investors. The estimated median income range for residents likely will be $25,000-30,000/year. The entire development will be affordable housing (i.e. no market rent units).

When asked about the meaning of the “55 and older” designation, Mr. Pechota explained that the age restrictions will be imposed by deed restriction and fair housing practices. The only exception will be for married couples no more than 2 years apart in age, where only one spouse is older than 55. Otherwise, the Petitioner will not make exceptions because fair housing rules require the same options be afforded to all residents. There will be policies and procedures put into place by the Petitioner to ensure grandparents and children are not living in the development.

The Petitioner was then asked about lighting on the site. Mr. Bushon noted that the lighting would be pedestrian scale all directed at the parking lot with full cutoff (no glare into adjacent properties) Mr. Carmichael explained that this is a typical zoning requirement.

A neighbor asked about fencing and buffers. Mr. Bushon said the site plan currently calls only for buffer plantings. The Petitioner has discussed fencing, and Mr. Bushon noted that a Class C buffer can be reduced by fencing. However, the Petitioner is likely to maintain the 22’ buffer called for on the current site plan, and is open to adding a screen. The neighbor noted that the current approved site plan calls for 40’ buffers and fencing, and that he is troubled by this reduction in size and design. Mr. Carmichael agreed with the neighbor’s description of the changes called for in this site plan amendment, and offered for the Petitioner to discuss with neighbors ways to mitigate their concerns.

The neighbor explained that his concerns also extended to the height (which was restricted in the current approved plan) and increased number of units, and wondered why the Petitioner was attracted to this site. Mr. Pechota explained that access and visibility make this location attractive, along with the proximity to retail, restaurants, and the interstate system.

When asked if the Petitioner had considered making the building lower, Mr. Pechota explained that this would cause a reduction in the number of units and, given the tight financing for affordable housing projects, that would make this project infeasible. The attendee noted concerns that there will be a 40’+ high building looking directly down into neighboring properties, with only a 20’ +/- buffer. Ms. Steigerwald noted that rear renderings/elevations haven’t yet been prepared. She did note, however, that there will not be any balconies on this development and there will be fewer windows on the rear of the property. Mr. Bushon pointed out the green space provided on the plan, and added that Charlotte Urban Forestry will provide feedback on replanting, given that the existing site does not meet tree coverage requirements. He explained that the distance from the building to the adjoining property lines will be 80’ to the rear properties and 200’ across the BMP and green space.
An attendee asked about the restrictions in place that will prevent deviations from the site plan, including with respect to storm water and runoff concerns. Mr. Carmichael explained the nature of conditional zoning districts, and that the Petitioner will be limited to doing what is depicted on the approved rezoning plan unless it goes back through the entire rezoning process. Mr. Bushon added that Code requires the Petitioner to ensure that the post-construction release rate for storm water matches the existing conditions.

A neighbor expressed concern that all of the concessions made by the owner during the previous rezoning process for this site, which resulted in the existing approved site plan, are being thrown out. He expressed frustration that there is nothing to prevent a subsequent owner from pursuing the rezoning process and changing the status quo. He also was concerned about the move to a smaller buffer and more units, noting that the neighbors fought hard to obtain the large buffer on the existing approved plan. Mr. Carmichael expressed his understanding, and noted that the attendee is correct that what the Petitioner is proposing is very different from the 16-unit for sale townhome development approved for the site. Mr. Pechota stated that the Petitioner has no plans for the site other than what it is proposing as part of this rezoning. Mr. Carmichael added that the Petitioner could discuss including notes that limit encroachment into the passive open space, BMP, and the like, and also is willing to discuss screening concerns. Mr. Pechota confirmed a neighbor’s suggestion that carrying over the larger buffer width from the existing approved site plan would encroach into the proposed parking area and make the Petitioner’s project infeasible.

An attendee asked about sidewalks and noted that there is inconsistent sidewalk access along W. W.T. Harris Blvd. at the site. He worries that pedestrians will simply continue on the path and walk across grass on properties without sidewalk access. Mr. Pechota explained that the Petitioner will install internal sidewalks and some sidewalks built along W. W.T. Harris Blvd., though not the complete length of W. W.T. Harris Blvd. Mr. Bushon noted that CDOT has discussed Petitioner connecting its sidewalk project into the existing network. The attendee suggested that this is now the time to address sidewalk continuity along W. W.T. Harris Blvd.

A resident asked about security measures for the development, and added there have been random car break-ins in the area. Mr. Pechota noted that for this type of development the Petitioner would not have on-site security, though there will be access restrictions (key fobs/cards) and video cameras, which give the residents some comfort even if it is not necessary. The resident suggested that the break-ins have been common enough that the Petitioner might want to consider enhanced security measures.

An attendee noted that he would like to see a fence included with the planted buffer. Mr. Pechota said the Petitioner is willing to consider that. The same attendee noted that a masonry fence would be preferable. Mr. Bushon explained what a Class C buffer is, and how the width is derived from the table provided in the Zoning Ordinance. The same attendee noted that he understands a buffer to mean “I cannot see you,” and wants to see more detail on what exactly will be blocked from view. Another resident noted that it will take 10-15 years before the plantings proposed in the plan actually mature enough to provide a screen. Mr. Bushon noted that it is very unfortunate that the site already has been cleared by a prior owner, and agreed that it will be necessary to give the trees in the buffer time to grow.
Mr. Pechota responded to a question about maintenance for the landscaping by explaining that the Petitioner will use third party contract landscape professionals. He also added that Petitioner is committed to taking a careful look at additional screening and a fence.

A neighbor noted that from the perspective of an adjoining property owner, the buffer is a significant issue, but there are also real concerns about traffic flow and congestion. This includes traffic flow out of the property to Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and the U-turns previously discussed. Mr. Pechota noted that he understands that issue is not an ideal situation.

Mr. Pechota and Ms. Steigerwald explained, in response to a question, that all utilities meters will be interior to the building, except for an exterior transformer and typical exterior access boxes that you would see on any property.

A neighbor asked whether the Petitioner had considered the impact on the value of his and other neighboring properties once this is developed, because of the affordable housing component. Mr. Pechota noted that many studies have analyzed this question, and there is no definitive link between a project like this and the value of neighboring properties, one way or another. The neighbor added that he wouldn’t be interested in purchasing his property because of the parking lot adjacent to his lot. Mr. Pechota noted that he understands the neighbor’s concerns.

An attendee asked about HVAC unit placement. Ms. Steigerwald noted that the building would have “thorough the wall” units, with grills on the exterior placed in indentions on the façade as much as possible. There will not be a row of air conditioner units. Mr. Pechota noted that there may be 3 or 4 units outside of the community center portion of the building, but no cooling towers or chillers.

When asked to expand on light pollution issues, Mr. Bushon noted that all lights will be angled interior to the site, and screens will be utilized to keep the lighting targeted. A neighbor noted skepticism and concern that the lighting would still be visible. Ms. Steigerwald offered to prepare a photometric plan to show the light distribution and offered to look at keeping the 15’ height for lighting on the current approved site plan.

Mr. Carmichael noted that the Petitioner is keeping a list of questions and will communicate with residents about them going forward.

An attendee commented that it seems like the only thing that cannot be “fixed” is traffic. Between 4:30pm-6:30pm it’s nearly impossible to move at this intersection and this will be a continued problem until W. W.T. Harris Blvd. is fully developed and the state makes road improvements. Mr. Bushon noted that the state will have to address this issue in the future, though timing and the availability of funding is a real issue.

Mr. Bushon noted that there is nothing the Petitioner can to do restrict left turns out of the Walgreens property. However, in his experience, the traffic impact of senior communities is slight, in part because the residents are operating on different (i.e. non-peak) schedules and exiting less often. Mr. Pechota said because the average age will be north of 70 years old, the
majority will not be working and trip generation for this type of development is substantially less than for a typical apartment project.

A neighbor asked about whether Petitioner will offer busses or other transportation to residents, like in other senior communities. Mr. Pechota noted that this will be independent living, so there will not be a dedicated bus, but that they do help to schedule and to facilitate bringing busses and other transportation on site for the residents to use. This is something the community’s on-site manager will schedule, including helping the residents access public/social services they are entitled to because of their income range.

A resident noted a concern that residents of the community will want to walk across W. W.T. Harris Blvd. to access the Food Lion and other properties. Mr. Bushon noted that the Petitioner is discussing this very concern with CDOT and Planning Staff, and that a pedestrian refuge island is often required at a site like this. Mr. Pechota echoed these comments and noted that although the Petitioner is not pitching the development as a mixed use or pedestrian neighborhood, they understand the way residents are likely to take advantage of this proximity to retail establishments.

Mr. Carmichael was asked to summarize the rezoning process and communication going forward. He noted that a revised site plan will be submitted on December 19. The Petitioner is scheduled to meet with Planning Staff on December 8 and would then make internal decisions about revisions to be submitted on the 19th. Mr. Carmichael said the Petitioner could share the revised site plan with attendees (if they have provided their e-mail address on the sign-in sheet) and then offered to return to a meeting with neighbors to discuss those changes. A resident noted that Wedgewood Neighborhood would be meeting at 6:30 pm on January 12, 2017 and suggested the Petitioner might want to attend that meeting. The Petitioner will await an invitation to that meeting. After the revised site plan is submitted, Planning Staff will review and give its recommendation. There will be a Public Hearing on January 17, 2017; a zoning committee review session on January 25, 2017; and City Council will vote on the plan February 20, 2017.

A resident asked if the City has any concerns about the site plan. Mr. Carmichael explained that Planning Staff’s site plan comments had not yet been received. CDOT has raised the issue of construction of a pedestrian refuge. Mr. Bushon explained what a pedestrian refuge is (safety zone for pedestrians in the right of way).

Ms. Steigerwald added that the Petitioner will be submitting to the state an application package for the affordable housing tax credits on January 20, 2017, and will be required to submit full renderings/elevations at that time.

The Community Meeting then adjourned and informal discussions continued between the Petitioner, its representatives, and attendees.
CHANGES MADE TO THE PETITION AS A RESULT OF THE COMMUNITY MEETING AS OF THE DATE HEREOF:

None at this time.

Respectfully submitted, this 16th day of December, 2016.

NPR Properties, LLC, the Petitioner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>1234 Main Street</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>33135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>5678 Oak Street</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>32806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>9109 Pine Street</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>30307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1122 Cedar Street</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>60611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>3333 Elm Street</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>75201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>4444 Maple Street</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>78757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>5555 Pine Street</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>77002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>6666 Oak Street</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>80206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>7777 Willow Street</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>98101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET_NO</td>
<td>TAPID</td>
<td>COMPANY</td>
<td>CORNERFIRST</td>
<td>COMPLETORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312215</td>
<td>ALGIERI</td>
<td>LUTHER M.</td>
<td>CARYLLON C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312216</td>
<td>AVERY</td>
<td>ALPRIA</td>
<td>MARY E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312217</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>JILL L.</td>
<td>CHRISTIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312218</td>
<td>BENNETT</td>
<td>SHAMONI</td>
<td>CHRISTIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312219</td>
<td>BITTIS</td>
<td>RAYMOND L.</td>
<td>VERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312220</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>DEBRA M.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312221</td>
<td>BURCHNALL</td>
<td>MICHAEL</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312222</td>
<td>CADWALD</td>
<td>EDISHA M.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312223</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312224</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312225</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312226</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312227</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312228</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312229</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312230</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312231</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312232</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-009</td>
<td>02312233</td>
<td>CATHY</td>
<td>DONALD W.</td>
<td>KATHLEEN L.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTENTION:** This data is extracted from the image provided. Any additional context or specific details are not available from the image alone.
NOTICE TO INTERESTED PARTIES
OF COMMUNITY MEETING

Subject: Community Meeting -- Rezoning Petition No. 2017-009 filed by NRP Properties, LLC and The Drakeford Company to request the rezoning of an approximately 2.97 acre site located on the west side of West W.T. Harris Boulevard between Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and Lake Spring Avenue from the Neighborhood Services zoning district to the Neighborhood Services Plan Amendment zoning district

Date and Time of Meeting: Wednesday, December 7, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

Place of Meeting: Conference Room at the Hilton Garden Inn Charlotte North
9315 Statesville Road
Charlotte, NC 28269

We are assisting NRP Properties, LLC and The Drakeford Company (the “Petitioners”) in connection with a Rezoning Petition they have filed with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department requesting the rezoning of an approximately 2.97 acre site located on the west side of West W.T. Harris Boulevard between Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and Lake Spring Avenue from the Neighborhood Services zoning district to the Neighborhood Services Plan Amendment zoning district. The purpose of this site plan amendment request is to accommodate the development of an age restricted, multi-family residential community on the site that could contain up to 75 dwelling units. This residential community would provide high quality housing for seniors at or below 60% of the area median income.

The Petitioners will hold a Community Meeting prior to the Public Hearing on this Rezoning Petition for the purpose of discussing this rezoning proposal with nearby property owners and organizations. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department’s records indicate that you are either a representative of a registered neighborhood organization or an owner of property that adjoins, is located across the street from, or is near the site.

Accordingly, on behalf of the Petitioners, we give you notice that representatives of the Petitioners will hold a Community Meeting regarding this Rezoning Petition on Wednesday, December 7, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the Conference Room at the Hilton Garden Inn Charlotte North located at 9315 Statesville Road in Charlotte. Representatives of the Petitioners look forward to sharing this rezoning proposal with you and to answering your questions.

In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments, please call John Carmichael at (704) 377-8341.

Robinson, Bradshaw & Hinson, P.A.

cc: Mr. Al Austin, Charlotte City Council District 2 (via email)
Ms. Tammie Keplinger, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department (via email)
Ms. Claire Lyte-Graham, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department (via email)
Mr. Richard Hobbs, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department (via email)

Date Mailed: November 23, 2016
NRP Properties, LLC and The Drakeford Company, Petitioners  
Rezoning Petition No. 2017-009

Community Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Conference Room at the Hilton Garden Inn Charlotte North  
9315 Statesville Road  
Charlotte, NC 28269

Wednesday, December 7, 2016  
6:30 P.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Cannito</td>
<td>8918 Cypress Forest Dr</td>
<td>704-894-6021</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melissa.cannito@hotmail.com">melissa.cannito@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannie Jernigan</td>
<td>8406 Red Cypress Ct</td>
<td>704-499-3960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fgemison@gmail.com">fgemison@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edithanne Fritz</td>
<td>8937 Cypress Forest</td>
<td>704-957-9192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ediscurly@yahoo.com">ediscurly@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Jacobson</td>
<td>8912 Cypress Forest</td>
<td>704-651-5538</td>
<td>Alan.Jacobson@<a href="mailto:pe@yahoo.com">pe@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Skinner</td>
<td>8533 P.O. Box 1197 Denver</td>
<td>704-578-7227</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stony.creek.jar@gmail.com">stony.creek.jar@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopal Sridhar</td>
<td>8913 Carstan Dr</td>
<td>704-398-6645</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gopalsh@gmail.com">gopalsh@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Hite</td>
<td>9128 Whittcl Pl.</td>
<td>714-340-3521</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amandahw@carolinainternet.com">amandahw@carolinainternet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Williams</td>
<td>8100 Heather View Ct</td>
<td>704-651-8230</td>
<td><a href="mailto:csternew@whale09.com">csternew@whale09.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Drakeford-Smith</td>
<td>9409 Lake Spring Ave</td>
<td>704-394-4803</td>
<td><a href="mailto:april@drakeford.com">april@drakeford.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben S. Thalmann</td>
<td>8702 Hermon View Ct</td>
<td>704-245-8272</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bens@maertzandsullivan.com">bens@maertzandsullivan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay M. Owens</td>
<td>4420 Mt. Holly Hunter Rd</td>
<td>704-610-9960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmooahc@bellsouth.net">kmooahc@bellsouth.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Beamer</td>
<td>8718 Williamsburg Circle</td>
<td>704-610-9960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wineforme@carolina.rr.com">wineforme@carolina.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT C
Rezoning Petition No. 2017-009

NRP Properties, LLC and The Drakeford Company,
Petitioners

Community Meeting

December 7, 2016
I. Introduction of Development Team Members
II. Rezoning Schedule
III. Site/Existing Zoning
IV. Information on the NRP Group, LLC
V. Review and Discussion of the Site Plan
VI. Review and Discussion of Building Architecture
VII. Question, Answer and Comment Session.
Development Team

Aaron Pechota, The NRP Group, LLC
Cheryl Steigerwald, The NRP Group, LLC
Nick Bushon, Design Resource Group
Bobby Drakeford, The Drakeford Company
John Carmichael, Robinson, Bradshaw & Hinson
Ty Shaffer, Robinson, Bradshaw & Hinson
Rezoning Schedule

Public Hearing:
- Tuesday, January 17, 2017 at 5:30 PM at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center.

Zoning Committee:
- Wednesday, January 25, 2017 at 4:30 PM at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center.

City Council Decision:
- Monday, February 20, 2017 at 5:30 PM at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center.
The NRP Group: Quick Facts and Markets

- National multifamily developer, general contractor and property manager founded in 1995
- Developed over 28,000 units in 12 states, and manages over 15,000+ residential units
- More than 300 years of collective executive team experience, and over 350+ employees nationwide
- Annual building revenue of over $300 Million
- Closed over $5.0 Billion in Real Estate, $3.0 Billion since 2009
The NRP Group: Business Lines

The NRP Group is a full-service, fully-integrated, developer, general contractor and property manager.

**DEVELOPMENT**
The NRP Development team handles every aspect of development from concept to completion.

- With every new project, the team reviews and details the many elements that contribute to success: site selection, zoning, market studies, and designs that combine the most desirable features for each market.
- NRP partners with local governments, financial institutions and neighborhood organizations on its many multifamily housing, single-family infill homes, senior housing, student housing and land development projects.
- NRP’s current organization pipeline includes over 3,000 units located in 10 sub-markets representing $550 million worth of development.

**CONSTRUCTION**
NRP Contractors is a full-service general contractor providing a range of services to maximize cost efficiency & productivity.

- Licensed in 12 states, NRP Contractors has built more than 28,000 multifamily, single-family, student and senior units across the nation and has honed its skills to place a priority on key architectural features while expediting time-lines to meet objectives.
- Services include conceptual estimating, project management, design, consultation, civil engineering, architecture and budget development.
- The company currently has over 4,000 units under construction.
The NRP Group: Business Lines

The NRP Group is a full-service, fully-integrated, developer, general contractor and property manager.

- **MANAGEMENT**
  NRP Management is a full-service property manager with over 15,000+ luxury, family and senior rental units under management.

- The team includes specialists in corporate compliance, accounting, operations, marketing and leasing support as well as on-site expertise in management, leasing and maintenance at each community.

- NRP Management provides expertise in initial lease-ups, stable operations, market analysis, compliance, maintenance and training.

- NRP Management will be adding over 3,500 units over the next 12 months.

- **INVESTMENT SERVICES**
  Navistone is a financial company, owned by the principals of the NRP Group, tasked with providing financial certainty for NRP’s tax credit properties as a tax credit purchaser and tax exempt bond buyer.

  - Buyer of Tax-Exempt Bonds: Navistone supports NRP’s affordable housing projects by acquiring and holding tax-exempt bonds during the construction phase, permitting access to favorable Fannie/Freddie permanent takeout financing. Through 2016, Navistone has purchased $150+ million in tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds.

  - Purchaser of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits: Navistone was originally created during the recession to purchase LIHTC positions in NRP transactions during a dislocated and illiquid market. Today, Navistone continues to provide our partners with security of execution, providing commitments for LP equity that ensure a successful closing, no matter what is happening in the financial markets.

  - Consulting: Navistone can also provide consulting services when necessary for arranging complicated capital structures and securing debt and equity financing.
The NRP Group: Core Values

OUR CORE BEHAVIORS
Honesty, integrity and ethical behavior are shared values of every employee, and the foundation for every business activity.

SHARED GOALS
We are all here to work for a common purpose, so teamwork is essential in our every day functions, guided by helpfulness and friendliness towards our peers.

RESPECTING INDIVIDUAL STRENGTHS
Every person has his or her own unique qualities and expertise in their position; therefore, we treat everyone with respect for their originality personally and professionally.

HIGH EXPECTATIONS
We will continually strive toward our goals, and as such we expect high performance from each other to reach our objectives along the way.

A SENSE OF PURPOSE
Our commitment is on business at hand, and our perseverance individually and collectively will enable us to become the partner of choice to our residents, subcontractors, suppliers, associates and employees.

OPENNESS AND APPROACHABILITY
Each one of us has the responsibility to be open and approachable to every other person involved in any business transaction, as each transaction is reflective of the reputation and dependability of our company.

A GREAT WORKING ATMOSPHERE
Work is a necessity for all of us, and so our working environment must be enjoyable every day so that each of us can put our best efforts forward.

PROFESSIONALISM ALWAYS
We are a professional organization, and as such, will present ourselves in that fashion in every internal and external business activity.
Questions and Comments