

SECOND OFFICIAL COMMUNITY MEETING REPORT

Petitioner: Proffitt Dixon Partners

Rezoning Petition No. 2018-142

This Second 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 Second Community Meeting to the individuals and organizations set out on Exhibit A attached hereto by depositing such notice in the U.S. mail on April 22, 2019. A copy of the written notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF MEETING:

The Second Community Meeting was held on Thursday, May 2nd at 6:00 p.m. at the Matthew Murkland Presbyterian Church, 7001 Old Providence Road, Charlotte NC 28226. This meeting was a follow-up from the First Official Community Meeting held on January 10, 2019 at the same location.

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

The Second Community Meeting was attended by those individuals identified on the sign-in sheet attached hereto as Exhibit C. The Petitioner was represented by Wyatt Dixon and Matt Poindexter as well as by Petitioner's agents, Chuck Travis with Housing Studio, Jeff Orsborn with Orsborn Engineering Group, and Collin Brown and Brittany Lins with K&L Gates. Council member Ed Driggs was also in attendance.

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION:

Mr. Collin Brown welcomed the attendees and introduced the Petitioner's team, using a PowerPoint presentation, attached hereto as Exhibit D. Before the Petitioner's team continued with the presentation, several neighbors introduced themselves and offered their general support of the project. Mr. Philip Stafford of the adjacent Providence Landing neighborhood and Annie Martin and Jan Adams of the adjacent Darby Hall neighborhood spoke of the Petitioner's willingness to coordinate meetings, listen to the neighbors' concerns, and accommodated requests within the Petitioner's control. They recognized that the current property owners are ready to sell their land and the likelihood of redevelopment is very strong. Mr. Stafford reported that the Providence Landing neighborhood association voted unanimously in support of this project and stated that he "cannot imagine another developer as willing to work with [the community] as Proffitt Dixon." Mr. Stafford also noted that the general community's focus on Providence Road traffic should be separated out from this rezoning petition because the project will have a comparatively miniscule impact on the overall traffic problem and it is not in the Petitioner's capacity to fix the broader issue.

Mr. Brown then continued the presentation by explaining the property location, current zoning, land use plan recommendation, development considerations, and rezoning process generally, in a similar fashion to the prior community meeting, held on January 10th. Mr. Brown restated that the Petitioner is seeking the

INST (institutional) zoning district for the central 10-acre portion of the site to accommodate an active adult retirement community and the R-8MF (multi-family residential, up to 8 DUA) zoning district for the other portions of the site to accommodate a single-family attached residential community. Mr. Brown also reiterated that the Petitioner's team felt that an active-adult retirement community was a good fit for the site because it has zero school impact and less traffic impact, two concerns that are often expressed in this area of Charlotte.

Mr. Brown spent the bulk of the presentation focusing on community feedback and changes made to the site plan since the prior meeting. In comparing the updated site plan to the previous one, the Petitioner's team has made four significant changes: (1) reduced building height, (2) break up of building form for the Active Adult building, (3) additional access point, and (4) option for carriage units as an alternative to townhomes.

Building Height. In response to community concerns regarding height, the Petitioner is committing to decreasing the height of the Active Adult building by a full story. Now, the buildings will be a maximum of three stories and will take advantage of the existing site topography to allow for basements on two of the buildings. The prior plan was for one four-story building to accommodate the Active Adult use at the site.

Building Form. In response to community concerns that the Active Adult building's massing will appear large and monolithic from Providence Road, the Petitioner's team has broken up the building into four smaller buildings. Now, instead of one long four-story building, the site plan is committing to four smaller 3-story buildings.

Additional Access. In response to Planning Staff and CDOT concerns regarding site access, the Petitioner has added an additional right-in, right-out access point for the main portion of the site to help with internal traffic flow.

Carriage Units. In response to community requests for greater greenspace preservation and buffer areas, the Petitioner's team presented a site plan utilizing carriage buildings instead of townhomes within the R-8MF portion of the site. The carriage buildings would still be a maximum of three stories and contain the same number of units as the townhomes, but will provide for condensed density that allows for greater undeveloped area within the rest of the site. The carriage buildings would each contain elevators and the units would be designed as all corner units. This type of product is appealing to the same market as the Active Adult community because it eliminates stairs while still providing large floor plans.

Mr. Brown then reiterated the feedback that has been heard from the community and explained the Petitioner's responsiveness. At the prior community meeting, several attendees stressed their desire for a traffic signal at the intersection of Providence Road and Hamilton Mill. Mr. Brown updated attendees by saying that the Petitioner's team has conducted the warrant analysis but NCDOT is not likely to support a signal in that location at this time based on current trip counts and other warrant analysis factors. The Petitioner would be willing to commit to the resubmittal of a signal warrant analysis at the project's completion to see if the traffic situation has changed in favor of warranting the signal. If a signal is warranted upon the project's completion date, the Petitioner would pay for the installation of a traffic signal at that time.

Mr. Brown stated that the Petitioner is hopeful that this petition could have a public hearing in June and obtain a City Council decision in July. Mr. Brown then opened the meeting up to discussion and questions.

In response to an attendee's question regarding the proposed setback along Providence Road, the Petitioner's agents responded that the minimum setback is thirty feet from the right-of-way, however the Petitioner's building will be setback significantly further than that, at roughly 100-120 feet from the right-of-way to the first building on the site.

A neighbor on Hamilton Mill Road stated that many of the Hamilton Mill homeowners do not want a traffic signal at the intersection with Providence Road due to concerns with traffic flow. However, neighbors living on Lynbridge Drive stated their strong desire for the traffic light to be installed in order to prevent U-turns on Providence Road. The Petitioner's agents reiterated that they would like to provide a signal at the intersection if deemed warranted by NCDOT but that they are unable to install a light without NCDOT's approval. At this time, a traffic light does not seem likely but the Petitioner is committed to continue evaluating and revisiting the warrant analysis.

Mr. Dennis Grills, an active community member involved in this rezoning petition, recognized that the Petitioner's team cannot solve the overall traffic problems in the area and that the issue is up to the elected officials to do something. However, he still believes the proposed density at the site is not justified. He also noted that although neighbors to the west and north of the site spoke in favor of the proposal, there were no representatives from the south or east of the site. He also stated that he still believes the traffic generation numbers are incorrect based on anecdotal experience despite the uniform manual's national data.

In response to an attendee's question regarding construction traffic, specifically lane closures, the Petitioner's team responded that there would be almost no lane closures since construction will not have to occur along the road. The large setback proposed for the site allows for construction trucks to maneuver within the site rather than in the roadway. The Petitioner's agent clarified that the only time a lane of Providence Road might be closed is in the event of sidewalk pouring, which would be minimal. Overall construction is expected to take between twenty and twenty-four months.

Councilmember Ed Driggs addressed the community and offered to facilitate meetings with the City's traffic engineer to clarify some traffic concerns for the Providence Road corridor. He stated that he recognized the importance of providing a consistent conclusion and cooperative plan for Providence Road. Some community members expressed that they believed it is time to freeze zoning until solutions are provided for Providence Road. Mr. Driggs stated that he did not believe Charlotte has reached the point of a moratorium yet.

The formal meeting concluded at approximately 7:30 p.m. and the Petitioner's representatives continued to answer individual questions until approximately 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, this 13th day of May, 2019.

cc: John Kinley, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department