

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

# Planning Commission

March 6, 2017  
work session

Charlotte-Mecklenburg  
Government Center  
Room 267  
Noon



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Work Session Agenda

March 6, 2017 – Noon

CMGC – Room 267

## Call to Order & Introductions

Tony Lathrop

### Administration

#### Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Approve the February 6, 2017 work session minutes.

Tony Lathrop  
*Attachment 1*

### Policy

#### Transportation and Planning Committee Discussion

Mayor Pro Tem Vi Lyles and Transportation and Planning Committee members have been invited to attend the work session in order for the Commission to share and discuss their recent work and its relationship to the Transportation and Planning Committee's priorities.

*Attachment 2*

### Information

#### Planning Director's Report

- Unified Development Ordinance Update
- Planning Department's Public Outreach Presentations

Ed McKinney  
*Attachment 3*  
*Attachment 4*

#### March & April 2017 Meeting Schedules

*Attachment 5*

#### Committee Reports

- **Executive Committee**
  - January 17, 2017 Approved Minutes

Tony Lathrop  
*Attachment 6*

Future Work Session Agenda Items	Work Session
1. Development Ordinance Update	Ongoing
2. Pedestrian Overlay District (PED)	TBD
3. CATS Countywide Transit Services Plan & 2030 Plan	TBD

- **Zoning Committee**
  - Upcoming Rezoning Petitions

Tony Lathrop  
Tammie Keplinger

- **Planning Committee**
  - January 17, 2017 Approved Minutes

Mike Sullivan  
*Attachment 7*

- **Communication Committee**

John Fryday

- **Historic District Commission (HDC)**
  - February 8, 2017 Meeting Update

Deb Ryan  
*Attachment 8*

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

Elizabeth McMillan

- **City Council's Transportation & Planning Committee (TAP)**

John Fryday

#### Communication from Chairperson

- **FY17 Action Plan**

Tony Lathrop  
*Attachment 9*



## Work Session

February 6, 2017 – Noon

CMGC – Room 267

## Minutes

---

### Attendance

**Commissioners Present:** Tony Lathrop (Chairperson), Mike Sullivan (Vice-Chairperson), Ray Eschert, John Fryday, John Ham, Karen Labovitz, Nasif Majeed, Bolyn McClung, Elizabeth McMillan, Dionne Nelson, Deb Ryan, Cozzie Watkins, and Nancy Wiggins

**Commissioners Absent:** Sam Spencer

Commissioner Eschert left at 1:15 pm.

**Planning Staff Present:** Ed McKinney (Interim Planning Director), Scott Adams, Kathy Cornett, Garet Johnson, Tammie Keplinger, Melony McCullough, and Cheryl Neely

**Charlotte Department of Transportation Staff (CDOT):** Ben Miller

### Welcome & Introductions

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 12:16 pm, welcomed those present, and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

### Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Wiggins made a motion to approve the January 9, 2017 minutes, seconded by Commissioner Ham. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### Charlotte Bikes

Mr. Ben Miller provided an update on the Charlotte Bikes Plan. He said Charlotte Bikes is the bicycle component of the Transportation Action Plan (TAP). The last bicycle plan was done in 2008. Charlotte Bikes is an update for this plan, which identifies strategies for bicycling. The TAP recommends \$4 million dollars annually for bike planning.

Mr. Miller said that in 2001 there was one mile of bike lanes in Charlotte. In 2006 there were 36 miles and now there are 102 miles of bike lanes. He started working on Charlotte Bikes last fall with the Bicycle Advisory Committee serving as the primary stakeholders for the process. The three key themes being revised as part of this update are:

1. Address all of the essential elements of a bicycle-friendly community
2. Create an inclusive bicycling environment
3. Modernize the bikeway design toolbox

In terms of addressing all of the components of a bicycle-friendly community, the League of American Bicyclists rates communities on the following “E’s” (CDOT added Equity):

- Equity
- Engineering
- Education
- Encouragement
- Enforcement
- Evaluation/Planning

The Bike Plan has recommendations for each of these areas, however Mr. Miller's presentation focused on Equity and Engineering. He shared the following equity vision statement, as drafted by the Bicycle Advisory Committee:

*Charlotte will offer an inclusive cycling environment, where people of all ages and abilities can use their bikes for transportation, fitness and fun. The City will work to extend bicycle infrastructure, educational opportunities, and promotional events to all neighborhoods and households, striving for equitable, affordable mobility options that improve city-wide public health, support the local economy, and reduce automobile dependency in the Queen City.*

Mr. Miller reported that a 2016 CDOT survey revealed that 62 percent of residents do not think it is easy to bicycle but 51 percent of residents would like to bicycle more than they do.

Mr. Miller said there are a lot of guidelines available for bike lane designs so CDOT will utilize the Urban Bikeway Design Guide from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), as well as guidelines from the Federal Highway Authority for designing separated bike lanes. He said that CDOT has shown different bike lane options at community meetings and asked the public which type of bike facility would make them comfortable. Most attendees indicated that buffered lanes or lanes with physical barriers or paths would make them more comfortable bicycling on busy streets.

Mr. Miller continued by talking about engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation/planning strategies. Click [here](#) to view the entire presentation.

Mr. Miller asked if there were any questions.

The Chairperson said the B-Cycle station at the Government Center is not accessible because of construction. He asked Mr. Miller if the construction fence could be repositioned so that users can access the station. Mr. Miller said he would look into this.

The Chairperson asked if there will be a rail trail along the Blue Line Extension (BLE). Mr. Miller said this is difficult because the BLE is along an active railroad right of way. There was a study done to look at parallel rail trail routes in the northeast corridor that include bike facilities. The Cross Charlotte Trail will also be a protected bikeway.

Chairperson Lathrop asked about the status of the Uptown Connects Study. Mr. Miller replied that there will be a pilot project along Fifth and Sixth streets to test a protected bike lane in Uptown. Staff is working with business and property owners along the route and a public workshop is scheduled for later this month.

Commissioner Wiggins said people should be encouraged to use bicycles as a way to commute. She thinks it would be helpful to integrate it with the Charlotte Area Transit System. She also suggested that Charlotte Bikes be inclusive for the disabled and paraplegics. Mr. Miller informed the Commission that the City of Portland has bicycle ambassadors who inform new residents of their

bicycle program and encourages its use for commuting. He said he hopes to eventually have a similar program in Charlotte.

Commissioner McClung asked if developments should be required to provide bike parking and ground level secure storage. Mr. Miller replied that it depends on the type of development. It may be appropriate for major office developments and apartment complexes.

Commissioner McClung asked if bike permits will be required in the future. Mr. Miller replied no.

Commissioner Majeed asked if there are plans to disperse public bike parking throughout the city. Mr. Miller said that CDOT installed public bike parking throughout the city. He further explained that public bike parking used to be a funded initiative of the Bike Plan and public racks were installed in various locations. There are still some racks available and they are installed when they are requested. He said this initiative could be restarted if more funding is made available.

Commissioner Fryday asked if the ordinance requires bike stands, covered parking, and bicycle boxes. Mr. McKinney said yes, it is tailored to the scale and type of use.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the plan specifies where to locate bike stands. Mr. Miller said the plan does not address the location but it addresses funding. The goal is to use a portion of the funding to locate 20 bike racks per year in the community upon request. Commissioner Ryan thinks the location of bike racks should be part of the strategy.

Commissioner Ryan said that one of her graduate students looked at data for accidents with pedestrians and bicyclists (injuries and fatalities). Ninth Street is an example of a place that seems to be very dangerous. She asked about the relationship of the data where people are injured and the Bike Plan. Mr. Miller said that staff has looked at Ninth Street but mostly from a pedestrian standpoint, less of a bicycle standpoint. He explained that the previous policy indicated that all streets in Uptown are slow enough that bicyclists can share the road. However, the Uptown Connects Study will recommend a network for the entire Uptown area.

Commissioner Ryan said it would be helpful if the Bike Plan related to the location of the B-Cycle stations. In order to capitalize on the investment, the B-Cycle stations should be viewed as hubs with a safe network between the stations.

Commissioner Ryan suggested that Mr. Miller become more of a bicycle advocate. She does not think there is a need to do more studies. She said she is impatient and thinks that he should be more of the champion. She asked what the Commission can do to give more support to him. Mr. Miller said that others may not be aware that he participates in the Community Investment Plan (CIP) teams. Typically bike facilities are the only topic of discussion in these meetings. He said there is a balancing act with the bike program because of the adverse impact on motorists. He thinks there needs to be an external desire; it cannot only be city staff lobbying for this.

Commissioner Ryan said she would like to endorse the Bike Plan and say it is a good start but it is simply not enough. She thinks it is important to endorse the plan because it is consistent with the Commission's Livable City Principles.

Commissioner Wiggins seconded the motion but offered a friendly amendment to reference the commuter element. Commissioner Ryan said commuting is already referenced in the plan. Commissioner Wiggins asked that it be emphasized more. Commissioner Ryan said that everything should be emphasized more.

The Chairperson asked if there were any additional comments.

Commissioner Watkins said that everyone has not had an opportunity to ask Mr. Miller questions and she thinks they should wait until all questions have been asked before endorsing the plan. The Chairperson said that it is appropriate to endorse the plan at the end of the discussion.

Commissioner Watkins asked about the relationship of bicycle education with the state's Drivers Education Program. Mr. Miller said that there are only 3 bicycle related questions on the Department of Motor Vehicles driver license exam. However, the Bike Plan recommends education and enforcement campaigns.

Commissioner Watkins asked if CDOT is partnering with the health care industry. Mr. Miller said that Carolina Healthcare Services has someone who promotes bike safety. However, more partnerships are needed to improve bike safety.

Commissioner Watkins asked if improvements will be made to traffic signals to recognize bicyclists. Mr. Miller said there is funding in the plan for bicycle signal protectors.

Commissioner McMillan asked about the \$4 million funding. Mr. Miller explained that the Transportation Action Plan recommends \$4 million in annual funding to implement a bicycle program. Approximately \$3 million is infrastructure related. He said previously there was a standalone bike program in the CIP that ended in 2010. Commissioner McMillan asked if there is a potential for it to come back. Mr. Miller said he thinks it could because Council seems very interested in the Bike Plan.

The Chairperson asked if there were any other questions before revisiting the motion. There being none, Commissioner McClung said he was concerned about the motion with limited endorsement of the plan. He is in favor of the plan but said he would prefer to endorse something stronger instead of something that is still in the process and they do not know where it is going. Commissioner Watkins agreed that the motion of endorsement needs to be more definitive.

The Chairperson asked Commissioner Ryan to clarify the intent of the motion. Commissioner Ryan said she understands their concern with the motion. Her intent is to make Council realize how the Commission feels about the plan before their public hearing. The Commission thinks that the Bike Plan is going in the right direction but is a small first step. She welcomed an amendment to make the endorsement clearer. Commissioner Wiggins said she thought she did that when she suggested



that the motion be amended to reference the commuting component to help strengthen the overall policy. It is a first step and they have a long way to go. She said they need the \$4 million dollars every year to extend the process because the bike program is really needed for safety sake if nothing else. She said that the Commission always endorses things incrementally. She said they have done a good job reviewing it. Some Commissioners read it before they came and Mr. Miller gave a great presentation.

Commissioner Nelson asked about the status of the adoption process. Mr. Miller said the draft will be released to the Transportation and Planning Committee for review this spring. It will then go to the public for comment and ultimately to Council for adoption. Commissioner Nelson asked when the funding request will go to Council for approval. Mr. Miller said there are several budget requests in the Transportation Action Plan and it is up to Council. They could build it into this year's budget process.

Commissioner Nelson said that she is uncomfortable with the endorsement. Equally important to the Bike Plan is the funding. She suggested that the motion be amended to reference funding.

Commissioner Wiggins seconded the motion. Commissioner Ryan said that Commissioners McClung and Fryday had questions and suggested that the Commission wait to hear their questions before voting on the motion.

Commissioner Fryday asked if the Commission voted to support the Transportation Action Plan. Chairperson Lathrop replied yes and said that he spoke in support of the plan at the public hearing. Commissioner Fryday asked Mr. Miller to confirm that the \$4 million dollar funding request is in the Transportation Action Plan. Mr. Miller said that it is in the Transportation Action Plan and that the Bike Plan specifies how the funding will be used. Commissioner Fryday said that the Bike Plan includes the same level of specificity as the Transportation Action Plan. Since the Commission supported the Transportation Action Plan, he thinks they should support the Bike Plan.

Commissioner McClung suggested that the Commission support the Bike Plan versus endorsing it. The Chairperson said that there is not much difference in the two words.

Commissioner Ryan made a motion to support the Charlotte Bikes Plan as being consistent with the Livable City Policy and to include the \$4 million funding as this is considered a first step and much more has to be done. Commissioner Wiggins asked that the commuter reference be added to the motion. Commissioner Ryan said the plan already references commuting. Commissioner McClung seconded the motion.

Commissioner Wiggins said that the reason she wanted to substantially support the commuting reference is because of support from areas that we would not expect to get support, such as the Chamber. When job related tasks are referenced they become more supportive and their support is needed.

The Commission voted unanimously to support the Bike Plan. The Chairperson said that he will attend the public hearing to let Council know that the Commission supports the plan.

### **Planning Director's Report**

Mr. McKinney gave an update on the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) process. He reported that the UDO Advisory Committee has met monthly since December. The first meeting focused on introductions and the group's expectations. The January meeting clarified their mission, expectations, and goals. The majority of the meeting was used to identify questions and issues. Mr. McKinney said that staff will use the feedback received to structure future agendas for the Advisory Committee meetings.

Mr. McKinney reminded the Commission that the UDO kick-off community workshops were held in December. The next step for community engagement is to reach out to groups who want more details. Staff met with several neighborhood groups in January and is scheduled to meet with others in February to continue to educate the public and help build awareness. He said the two goals are to educate and build a network of connections.

Staff is also continuing to build on the dialogue of Place Types, the foundation for the UDO, with the Planning Committee. This will ultimately help shape the conversation with the Advisory Committee and the next round of broad community engagement for Place Types.

The Chairperson asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Watkins asked if stakeholders are excited to know that the UDO process will improve the ordinance. Mr. McKinney said that some are appreciative but there are also skeptics. He thinks it is important to communicate and clarify the goals.

Commissioner Ryan asked for a copy of the Advisory Committee roster. Mr. McKinney said that he would get the working list to the Commission.

Commissioner Fryday asked if the Commission could get the list of questions and issues that the Advisory Committee identified. Mr. McKinney replied yes.

### **Committee Reports**

#### **Executive Committee**

The Chairperson directed the Commission to Attachment 4, the Executive Committee minutes and the future agenda items list.

Commissioner Nelson said that she is interested in the Pedestrian Overlay District (PED) future agenda item. She thinks it would be helpful to the rezoning review process. Mr. McKinney said that the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) discussion was held at the Planning Committee meetings and the conclusion was brought to the full Commission. He asked if the Commission would like to have a similar format for the PED discussion. Commissioner Nelson replied yes. Commissioner Fryday said he thinks that the full Commission can benefit from the PED discussions. Since there are not many future agenda items listed for the Commission, he suggested that the full Commission discuss PED.

Commissioner Ryan said she agreed but reminded the Commission that at the end of the TOD discussion, they realized that the issue with the ordinance was more of an interpretation issue. For example, the term walkability is vague. She said that Grant Meacci said that he would write an internal memo or somehow clarify the level of interpretation that he thought was more appropriate in order to be more specific about what walkability means. The Committee never received a report back about this. She asked if Mr. Meacci could follow-up on this issue. Mr. McKinney said he remembered this differently. One of the conclusions that came from the analysis is that there is a fair amount of language in the district that leaves a fair amount to interpretation. His perspective is that the way to solve this is not by redefining how we interpret the ordinance. This is a basic gap that has been identified in the ordinance and the work that will be done with the UDO will include language that will be absolutely clear about the design expectations.

Commissioner Ryan said that she thought Mr. McKinney had previously expressed concern about the Commission putting anything in front of Council that would distract from the UDO. She thought the suggestion was made to not do anything formally because this could be taken care of informally. Commissioner Fryday said that he recalled that the Commission expressed numerous concerns with TOD and received a 4 page list back explaining how most of these concerns were already addressed in the ordinance. Then the question was asked about enforcement. That is when the comment was made that some of these issues can be dealt with in how certain elements are interpreted because we do not want to derail the UDO with dealing with some of these issues now. Commissioner Fryday is concerned that development would continue to occur with these same issues while the ordinance is being rewritten. He said that Council member Phipps shared the same concern at the last Transportation and Planning Committee meeting. He is concerned about development continuing to occur in his district while the ordinance rewrite is underway. Commissioner Fryday said that staff said that the Planning Commission is going to be looking at PED in the same manner as TOD. Commissioner Ryan said that she was concerned that the Commission did a lot of work on TOD and yet nothing has changed.

Commissioner Nelson agreed but said that she has learned over the last six months to a year to better understand the Commission's role. She thought the Commission agreed to analyze TOD with staff, identify issues and write a letter to Council identifying issues and recommendations. She believes that the communication identified the issues, many of which can be addressed through enforcement. Since the Commission sent the message to Council and the Manager's office, she did not think it was appropriate to circle back to staff. Council has the authority to respond and the letter was sent to Council and the Manager's office. She asked what else can the Commission do. They flagged TOD and can do the same with PED. Commissioner Nelson does not want to spend a lot of time talking about something that will not go forward because the Commission does not have the authority to influence.

Commissioner Fryday asked if TOD left the Planning Committee. Commissioner Nelson said that it left the Committee and came to the full Commission for discussion and the full Commission agreed that the concerns would be communicated to the Transportation and Planning Committee and Council. She asked if that occurred.

Commissioner Fryday said that he did not think it went to the Transportation and Planning Committee. The Chairperson asked Mr. McKinney to remind the Commission what happened with the TOD recommendations. Mr. McKinney said there is a difference of opinions of how we landed on it. He said that staff would review the document and the specifics of how the Commission acted on it. He said that there needs to be clarity on the issues of interpretation and the discussion can go back to the Planning Committee, if necessary. He does not want it characterized that staff is simply not enforcing the ordinance as it is written. The ordinance was written to allow flexibility. Changes to the ordinance would require a public engagement process and adoption by Council. The avenue for this to occur is the UDO. Mr. McKinney said the discussion with the Advisory Committee is vitally important.

The Chairperson asked if the TOD document was sent to the Transportation and Planning Committee or Council. Mr. McKinney said not to his knowledge. He said that staff will go back and check the records to determine how the Commission acted on it. The Chairperson suggested that this item be revisited at the Planning Committee meeting and the Committee could decide how to move forward. Depending on the Planning Committee's decision, it could come back to the full Commission. The Vice-Chairperson agreed that it may be best for the Planning Committee to discuss this and then bring it back to the full Commission.

Commissioner Fryday suggested that everyone read the minutes from the Commission's July, 11 2016 work session when Council members Lyles and Kinsey attended the meeting. Commissioner Nelson said that the Commission took action on TOD prior to this meeting; before leadership of the Planning Committee transitioned. She suggested that they look at minutes prior to July 2016.

### **Zoning Committee**

Ms. Tammie Keplinger reminded the Commission that the City Council meeting is February 20. There are 18 decisions and 12 hearings on the agenda. Since February is a short month, the Zoning Committee meeting is March 1. She also reminded the Zoning Committee that they will begin their new meeting schedule at the end of March. Therefore, the March 1 meeting is not affected by the new meeting time. Due to the new meeting schedule, the Zoning Committee will not meet on March 29; instead they will meet on April 4. Ms. Keplinger said that staff has sent out a calendar with these dates and will send additional reminders.

### **Planning Committee**

The Vice-Chairperson referred the Commission to the minutes from the last Planning Committee meeting. He said the Committee continued the discussion on the mandatory referral process. This new process clarifies the Committee's role and helps provide more information to the submitting bodies. The Committee implemented the new process on two mandatory referrals at their January meeting. They also continued to discuss Place Types at this meeting.

### **Communications Committee**

Commissioner Fryday reported that the Communications Committee met last month to review the responsibilities of the Committee. The Committee is responsible for producing an annual report to Council in July. He said the Committee is also supposed to produce a statement to Council about Planning Priorities for the coming year in January. The Committee talked about how the formal

process should be communicated in the future, as well as having regular meetings with Council. Commissioner Fryday suggested that the Committee meet with the Executive Committee for direction on how to move forward with these responsibilities.

#### **Historic District Committee (HDC)**

Commissioner Ryan said the HDC had a shorter meeting last month. They also had a retreat to review the Historic District Guidelines but unfortunately, they were not able to approve them at the retreat. She sent the Guidelines to the Planning Committee because they are similar to Place Types and she thinks this could be helpful for the Planning Committee's Place Types discussions. She hopes the HDC is able to approve the Guidelines at their next meeting.

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

Commissioner McMillan reported that she attended the January CRTPO meeting. Bob Cook asked her to send a link to all Commissioners so that they can provide comments on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Commissioner McMillian said she sent the link prior to coming to the meeting.

#### **City Council's Transportation & Planning Committee (TAP)**

Commissioner Fryday said that a group of citizens coordinated with Council members to have a traffic calming study done for The Plaza and Parkwood Avenue. The purpose of the study is to make these corridors safer for bicyclists and to improve walkability. The Transportation and Planning Committee had a presentation on this at their last meeting.

#### **Communication from Chairperson**

The Chairperson mentioned a Charlotte Observer article about affordable housing. He commended the Commission for their work and for the good meeting today. He thanked staff for the work that has been done on the UDO.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:55 pm.





## A Letter to the Community

Monday, Oct. 3, 2016

We, the 11 members of Charlotte City Council, hear the anger, frustration and need expressed both in the streets and in our Council Chamber. We have been working to address many of these concerns, and we can and will take additional action. We commit to you that our approach will be inclusive, and we value all voices in this process. We must enact policies, initiate programs and collaborate meaningfully to do this work together.

We recognize that there are some people who enjoy relative wealth, prosperity and opportunity while others struggle to find good paying jobs, affordable housing, and some may not trust law enforcement. Our challenges are no different than in other places in this country.

Our love, passion and pride for our city demand action. To move forward requires everyone's help. When our community comes together, great things happen. This is our spirit. This is our culture. This is our city. We will lead. We will act. We will do this together.

To that end, this City Council pledges its energy and focus on three key areas for further discussion and action at upcoming City Council meetings beginning on Oct. 10:

- Safety, Trust & Accountability
- Access to safe, quality and affordable housing
- Good paying jobs

For **Safety, Trust & Accountability**, we support our Police Chief and the men and women of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department, including our Chief's continued efforts to enhance trust and accountability within the Department and within the community. We will also continue to review and implement the recommendations from the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing.

For **Housing**, we seek to accelerate funding for housing, with the goal of creating 5,000 workforce and affordable housing units in three years so those who work in our City can live in our City.

For those in need of **Jobs**, we seek to invest \$1 million in a new workforce development program that will increase jobs, training and opportunities for our youth and individuals with multiple barriers to employment.

We ask our federal, state and local partners across the public, private and non-profit sectors to join us. This is just a start with more to follow. Through it all, we ask that you hold us accountable as we build a stronger and more inclusive Queen City.

*Members of the Charlotte City Council*







## **Ten Traits of Winning Cities of the Future**

At the January 2017 Charlotte City Council Retreat, Frank Martin, with SIR, presented what his firm has identified as the ten defining traits of the winning cities of tomorrow. These traits were identified based on major demographic, cultural, societal, and generational forces. Council conversations during the retreat included consideration of these traits and how Charlotte can be THE winning city of tomorrow. Below are the ten traits identified by SIR:

1. Positive Buzz – Inspiring and Scaling Positive Word of Mouth
2. Shared Story – Advancing a Seamless Narrative; Why We’re Unique
3. 15-Minute Livable Communities – Investing in Diverse Neighborhoods
4. Affordable Spaces – Meeting the Rising Demand for Affordable Housing
5. Workforce Dynamics – Advancing Large-Scale Training and Re-Skilling
6. Millennial Magnet – Being a Hot Spot for Young Professionals
7. Beyond Borders – Advancing Collaboration Across and Outside the Region
8. Open Minds – Being Creative, Innovative, and Accepting of New Ideas
9. Open Book – Being Hyper-Transparent and a Proactive Communicator
10. Big Tent – Being a Welcoming and Inclusive Community



# Transportation & Planning

## FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan

“Charlotte will be a vibrant, livable city where residents of all income levels have convenient transportation access to employment, services, and housing choices.”

Effective planning and continued transportation investments will enable Charlotte to accommodate growth, enhance quality of life and ensure the continuation of a vibrant, growing economy. The City will continue to integrate land use, urban design, and transportation decisions that maintain mobility to create more places and neighborhoods throughout Charlotte that are walkable, transit-oriented, and bicycle-friendly.

Objectives WHAT?	Strategies HOW?
Accommodate and Support Growth	Implement the Centers, Corridors, and Wedges Growth Framework, the 2030 Transit System Plan and the Transportation Action Plan
	Prepare and adopt 1) Charlotte Place Type Policies, which further define the Centers, Corridors, and Wedges growth framework; and 2) a Unified Development Ordinance, a tool to implement the City's land use, urban design, and transportation policies*
	Coordinate with partners to advance multimodal transportation projects (streets, transit, bikeways, sidewalks, freeways, arterials, and high-occupancy toll lanes)
	In conjunction with regional partners, review the regional growth framework to link development patterns with transportation investments*
Support a Vibrant and Growing Economy	Develop the Charlotte Gateway Station project that serves regional public transit and rail services
	Continue to position Charlotte as a global freight and logistics hub by investing appropriate rail and roadway projects*
Maintain and Support Charlotte's Transportation Assets	Maintain Charlotte's transportation infrastructure by planning and investing current and future resources into the City's transportation network
	Maintain a twelve-year resurfacing cycle
Foster Economic Success for Everyone in the Community	Clarify policy guidance used in evaluating rezoning requests*
	Improve Charlotte's mobility and accessibility by enhancing walkability and bicycle friendliness*
	Implement the projects and programs identified in the Community Investment Plan to enhance safety, livability, transportation choices, and job growth*
	Implement the recommendations of the CATS bus system comprehensive review to increase access to transit and effectively deploy transit resources

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

**Transportation & Planning  
FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan**

**Performance**

Objective and Strategy	Measure/Target	FY2016 Actual
<b>Objective: Accommodate and Support Growth</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Implement the Centers, Corridors, and Wedges Growth Framework, the 2030 Transit System Plan and the Transportation Action Plan	Four major arterial road projects completed per year	Three major projects completed
	Two major intersection projects completed per year	No major projects completed
	Complete construction of the Blue Line Extension and CityLynx Gold Line Phase II	New measure in FY2018
	Conduct appropriate planning and design studies of the Silver Line (East), rapid transit alignment through Uptown Charlotte to the Airport (West), and Enhanced Bus (North) and future phases of the CityLynx Gold Line	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Prepare and adopt 1) Charlotte Place Type Policies, which further define the Centers, Corridors, and Wedges growth framework; and 2) a Unified Development Ordinance, a tool to implement the City's land use, urban design, and transportation policies*	Complete initial draft of the Unified Development Ordinance	New measure in FY2018
	Complete Charlotte Place Type Policy Manual	New measure in FY2018
	In accordance with the Gartner Study recommendations, use the Accela land development management system to complete the automation of rezoning activities to increase efficiency and improve customer service	New measure in FY2018
<b>Objective: Support a Vibrant and Growing Economy</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Continue to position Charlotte as a global freight and logistics hub by implementing appropriate infrastructure projects*	Fund transportation improvements through approved CIP projects	Advance preliminary planning report for Airport/West Corridor completed August 2015
	Implement Area Plans	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Develop the Charlotte Gateway Station project that serves regional public transit and rail services	Begin construction of Phase I track improvement	New measure in FY2018
	Pursue funding for Phase II improvements	New measure in FY2018
<b>Objective: Maintain and Support Charlotte's Transportation Assets</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Maintain Charlotte's transportation infrastructure by planning and investing current and future resources into the City's transportation network	Begin developing a long-term funding strategy for the Transportation Action Plan	New measure in FY2018
	Perform preventative maintenance on 100% of traffic signals every two years	Preventative maintenance performed on 100% of traffic signals over two year period
<b>Strategy:</b> Maintain a twelve-year resurfacing cycle	Achieve pavement rating of 90.0 or above	82.0 pavement rating
<b>Objective: Foster Economic Success for Everyone in the Community</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Implement the projects and programs identified in the Community Investment Plan to enhance safety, livability, transportation choices, and job growth*	Build 15 or more pedestrian safety and crossing projects per year to enhance safety, provide transportation choices, and better connect residents to employment opportunities and services	42 pedestrian safety projects installed
	Build 10 miles of new sidewalks and bikeways per year to enhance safety, provide transportation choices, and better connect residents to employment opportunities and services	13.02 miles of sidewalk and 2.96 miles of bikeways
	Conduct pedestrian safety awareness campaign to enhance safety, provide transportation, choices, and better connect residents to employment opportunities and services	Participated in the NC Watch for Me campaign
<b>Strategy:</b> Implement the recommendations of the CATS bus system comprehensive review to increase access to transit and effectively deploy transit resources	Conduct and complete a comprehensive analysis of CATS bus route structure to connect more people to jobs, employment centers, and services	New measure in FY2018

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

## Environment

### FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan

“Charlotte will become a global leader in environmental sustainability, balancing economic growth with preserving our natural resources.”

---

The City of Charlotte recognizes that protecting our natural resources, promoting conservation, and improving the environment is fundamentally important to quality of life and essential to maintaining a vibrant economy.

Charlotte will become a global leader in environmental sustainability by:

- Becoming a model environmental community in how it manages solid waste, energy, water and air;
- Leading by example by practicing environmental stewardship in City operations and facilities as guided through the Internal Environmental Operations Plan;
- Seeking and supporting collaborative and regional solutions to environmental problems;
- Analyzing data and applying technologies to reach our environmental goals.

Objectives WHAT?	Strategies HOW?
Practice Environmental Stewardship in City Operations and Facilities	Increase use of alternative fuel vehicles in City fleet*
	Decrease waste in City facilities
	Increase the use of recycled and environmentally friendly products
	Reduce energy usage in City facilities*
	Increase renewable energy usage
	Reduce water usage in City facilities
Protect Water Quality as a Resource to the Community	Rehabilitate streams to improve water quality*
	Encourage residents to conserve water through education and awareness
Protect Air Quality	Encourage the use of environmentally friendly transportation options
	Increase public alternative fueling stations
Reduce, Reuse and Recycle Waste	Divert waste from the landfill
	Increase composting
	Promote waste options*
Maintain/Protect Urban Forest as a Community Resource	Assess aging tree canopy
	Plant more trees*
Improve Sustainability through the Use of Data and Technology	Develop a pilot research and design district for the City to test Smart systems and sensor data
Foster Economic Success for Everyone in the Community	Promote education and job training in the field of sustainability
	Develop affordable transit options that enhance connectivity within the Charlotte region

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

**Environment**  
**FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan**  
**Performance**

Objective and Strategy	Measure/Target	FY2016 Actual
<b>Objective: Practice Environmental Stewardship in City Operations and Facilities</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase use of alternative fuel vehicles in City fleet*	Increase alternative fuel vehicles in City fleet by 50 vehicles over two years	65 alternative fuel; 3,012 total
<b>Strategy:</b> Decrease waste in City facilities	Maintain a 15% minimum recycling rate in police stations	Obtained data for only 1 of the 13 divisions (Providence)
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase the use of recycled and environmentally friendly products	Increase Green purchasing	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Reduce energy usage in City facilities*	Use 15% less energy as compared to facilities across the Southeastern US	Currently tracking
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase renewable energy usage	Assess 5 City assets for renewable technology opportunities	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Reduce water usage in City facilities	Install three technologies to reduce consumption	New measure in FY2018
<b>Objective: Protect Water Quality as a Resource to the Community</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Rehabilitate streams to improve water quality*	Improve at least 5,000 feet of impaired stream per year	New measure in FY2018
	Treat 100 acres of impervious area runoff prior to entering streams	216 acres of impervious area treated
<b>Strategy:</b> Encourage residents to conserve water through education and awareness	Increase number of smart irrigation devices installed by 5%	283 devices installed
	Increase number of individuals reached through public events and conservation education efforts by 10%	27,605 individuals reached
<b>Objective: Protect Air Quality</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Encourage the use of environmentally friendly transportation options	Increase the percent of residents who walk, bicycle or take transit to work	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase public alternative fueling stations (e.g. Electric charging stations, compressed natural gas fueling stations)	Increase the number of alternative fueling stations available to the public by 25%	66 fueling stations available
<b>Objective: Reduce, Reuse and Recycle Waste</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Divert waste from the landfill	Reduce pounds landfilled per curbside residential unit compared to the prior fiscal year	1,719.9 pounds landfilled per curbside unit
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase composting	Establish a baseline number of outreach events	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Promote waste options*	Increase education on residential recycling for lowest recycling neighborhood profile areas	24 events
<b>Objective: Maintain/Protect Urban Forest as a Community Resource</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Assess aging tree canopy	Assess 4,400 large trees per year to inform proper stewardship or removal strategies	3,400 trees assessed
	Establish a tree canopy neutrality goal for public projects	New measure in FY2018
	Plant 15,000 trees per year through public planting and private partnerships	10,571 (plus 5,800 seedlings given away)
<b>Objective: Improve Sustainability through the Use of Data and Technology</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Develop a pilot research and design district for the City to test Smart systems and sensor data	Test three different Smart technologies	New measure in FY2018
<b>Objective: Foster Economic Success for Everyone in the Community</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Promote education and job training in the field of sustainability	Create five apprenticeship opportunities in sustainability	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Develop affordable transit options that enhance connectivity within the Charlotte region	Implement the Envision My Ride program	New measure in FY2018

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

## Community Safety

### FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan

“Charlotte will be one of America’s safest communities.”

One of the highest priorities for the City of Charlotte is to create a community where residents and visitors feel safe and citizens are actively engaged in promoting safety and addressing public safety threats. The City of Charlotte will invest in personnel, practices, and training that foster trust in public safety, reduce crime, and minimize community risks with the highest standards of integrity and professionalism.

Objectives WHAT?	Strategies HOW?
Minimize loss of life, property damage, and injury	Continue to refine community policing and crime fighting practices to protect potential victims of crime
	Improve response times for emergency calls
	Reduce risks to commuter safety on and around city streets, sidewalks, greenways, and transit modes
	Improve investigation clearance rate for arson, robbery, burglary, and larceny from vehicle cases
	Increase code inspections and other proactive risk mitigation programs in the community
Improve perception of safety and level of trust in Community Safety*	Improve and protect quality of life in Charlotte neighborhoods and corridors
	Implement recommendations from the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing and Police Foundation Independent Assessment
	Expand Juvenile and Young Adult Diversion efforts and support for youth and young adult programs
	Develop effective planning tools for significant community events
	Implement and support community education programs in schools, neighborhoods, and during community events
Develop an inclusive, representative, and highly trained workforce	Enhance efforts to attract and develop a public safety workforce that is more representative of the community it serves
	Increase education and training to include: implicit bias, cultural awareness, crisis intervention, and conflict de-escalation
	Enhance operational effectiveness and customer service by using technology and collaborating with other agencies
Enhance emergency preparedness	Conduct annual disaster preparedness public education activities
	Maintain and continue to refine a comprehensive emergency operations plan
Foster economic success for everyone in the community	Collaborate between agencies to engage and strengthen relationships in vulnerable areas of the community

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

**Community Safety**  
**FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan**

**Performance**

Objective and Strategy	Measure/Target	FY2016 Actual
<b>Objective: Minimize loss of life, property damage, and injury</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Continue to refine community policing and crime fighting practices to protect potential victims of crime	≥3% reduction in reported Part One UCR crime rates per 100,000 population	12.2% increase
<b>Strategy:</b> Improve response times for emergency calls	≤7 minute CMPD response to a Priority 1 (emergency) call for service	6.5 minute response time
	Percent of Fire calls where first company is on scene in ≤6 minutes (90% of time goal)	84.59% arrival time
<b>Strategy:</b> Reduce risks to commuter safety on and around city streets, sidewalks, greenways, and transit modes	Complete ≥15 pedestrian safety and crossing projects per year	42 projects completed
	Build 10 miles of new sidewalks and bikeways per year to enhance safety, provide transportation choices, and better connect residents to employment opportunities and services	13.02 miles of sidewalk and 2.96 miles of bikeways
<b>Objective: Improve perception of safety and level of trust in Community Safety*</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Improve and protect quality of life in Charlotte neighborhoods and corridors	Keep 95% of streetlights operational city-wide	95.4% of streetlights operational
	Achieve pavement rating of 90.0 or above	82.0 pavement rating
<b>Strategy:</b> Expand Juvenile Diversion and support for youth programs	Increase the completion rate of first time youthful offenders referred to the Juvenile Diversion Program by ≥10%	28.7% increase
<b>Strategy:</b> Implement and support community education programs in schools, neighborhoods, and during community events	Enhance the Community Response model by conducting community safety forums to disseminate crime information and obtain community input on areas to focus resources	9 community safety forums conducted
	Percent of CMS 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade classrooms that receive fire education programs	100% of CMS 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade classrooms reached
<b>Objective: Develop an inclusive, representative, and highly trained workforce</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Enhance efforts to attract and develop a public safety workforce that is more representative of the community it serves	Percent of women and minorities in police officer and firefighter applicant pool	64.8% Police 35.0% Fire
<b>Objective: Enhance emergency preparedness</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Conduct annual disaster preparedness public education activities	Number of Annual Disaster and Incident Action Plans developed	37 plans developed
<b>Objective: Foster economic success for everyone in the community</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Collaborate between agencies to engage and strengthen relationships in vulnerable areas of the community	Implement Performance Strategic Plan with other City and County Departments	New measure in FY2018

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix



## Economic Development FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan

“Charlotte will thrive with diverse businesses and economic opportunity for all.”

The vision will be accomplished through the success of people, places, and businesses.

<b>Objectives WHAT?</b>	<b>Strategies HOW?</b>
Provide access to job training and employment opportunities for youth and adults	Implement Workforce Development Project serving individuals with multiple barriers to employment*
	Increase number of work experiences and internships through City programs*
	Connect individuals to jobs, apprenticeships, and other on-the-job training opportunities available through the private sector, educational institutions, and not-for-profit entities*
Promote the holistic development of targeted business districts and neighborhoods	Increase Amateur Sports-related tourism through enhancing and expanding amateur sports facilities*
	Implement the Global Logistics Strategy for the area surrounding the Airport*
	Invest in Airport facility improvements to meet domestic and international demand*
	Stimulate private investment in targeted areas and within areas identified by the Community Investment Plan and Business Corridor Revitalization Plan. Examples include Smart Districts, Applied Innovation Corridor, the Northwest Corridor, the Eastland/Central Avenue Area, the West Boulevard area, Southpark Area, and the Freedom Drive Area*
Foster economic success for everyone in the community	Increase contracting opportunities for Minority, Women, Small Business Enterprise (MWSBE) firms through the Charlotte Business INCLUSION Policy*
	Simplify and clarify regulatory processes for real estate development and businesses*
	Provide and connect small businesses, including immigrant-owned and international businesses, to networking and learning opportunities in order to grow and operate more effectively*
	Complete enhancements to the City's web portal (CharlotteBusinessResources.com) to meet the needs and increase usage of portal by emerging international and growing small businesses*
	Update economic development grant programs to better align with business needs and community goals*

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

**Economic Development  
FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan**

**Performance**

Objective and Strategy	Measure/Target	FY2016 Actual
<b>Objective: Provide access to job training and employment opportunities for youth and adults</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Implement Workforce Development Program serving individuals with multiple barriers to employment*	Train 90 participants in highway construction, residential and commercial construction and broadband and fiber optic cabling through community and corporate partnerships	New measure in FY2018
	Graduate at least 72 participants from the Program by June 2018	New measure in FY2018
	Place 51 individuals from the Program in employment opportunities by June 2018	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase number of work experiences and internships through City programs*	Graduate at least 50% of enrolled participants from the Pre-Apprenticeship program for Transit Management by August 2019	New measure in FY2018
	Create proposal for City Council consideration to increase youth employment and internship opportunities to 1,000 by June 2019	Mayor's Youth Employment Program: 357 internships
<b>Strategy:</b> Connect individuals to jobs, apprenticeships, and other on-the-job training opportunities available through the private sector, educational institutions, and not-for-profit entities*	Create Corporate Advisory Councils for workforce development program by December 31, 2017	New measure in FY2018
<b>Objective: Promote the holistic development of targeted business districts and neighborhoods</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Stimulate private investment in targeted areas and within areas identified by the Community Investment Plan and Business Corridor Revitalization Plan. Examples include Smart Districts, Applied Innovation Corridor, the Northwest Corridor, the Eastland/Central Avenue Area, the West Boulevard area, Southpark Area, and the Freedom Drive Area*	Complete a North End Smart District public-private partnership agreement with developers by December 31, 2017	New measure in FY2018
	Revise economic development grant programs for City Council consideration by July 1, 2017	New measure in FY2018
	Complete a redevelopment framework strategy for Eastland Mall site by July 1, 2017	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Invest in Airport facility improvements to meet domestic and international demand*	Continue to implement the Destination CLT program and Airport Area Strategic Development Plan	25% plan completion
<b>Objective: Foster economic success for everyone in the community</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase contracting opportunities for Minority, Women, Small Business Enterprise (MWSBE) firms through the Charlotte Business INclusion Policy*	FY2018 Target: 14% utilization FY2019 Target: 16% utilization	FY2016 year-end spend is currently being reconciled. Based on preliminary data, the City is on track to meet the target for 12% MWSBE Citywide Direct Spend
<b>Strategy:</b> Simplify and clarify regulatory processes for real estate developers and businesses*	Use technology to make processes simpler for staff and customers	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Provide and connect small businesses, including immigrant-owned and international businesses, to networking and learning opportunities in order to grow and operate more effectively*	300 small business survey respondents and focus group participants (in conjunction with Mecklenburg County) and outreach to 100 immigrant-owned and international businesses by December 31, 2017	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Update economic development grant programs to better align with business needs and community goals*	Create and adopt new and improved policy guidelines for Business Investment Grant Program by December 31, 2017	New measure in FY2018

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

# Housing & Neighborhood Development

## FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan

“The City of Charlotte will sustain and create distinct and diverse neighborhoods for all its residents”

The City’s long-term health and vitality are dependent on a built environment offering diverse housing options, vibrant neighborhoods and commercial corridors, and safe access to public amenities.

The City’s housing and neighborhood strategy focuses on preserving and creating neighborhoods and amenities that allow people to reach their full potential by creating places where:

- Families have access to quality affordable housing, quality education, and equitable economic opportunity and services,
- People and businesses are safe, and
- Civic infrastructure supports neighborhood quality of life.

Objectives WHAT?	Strategies HOW?
Preserve and create neighborhoods that offer affordable housing options	Expand the supply of newly constructed affordable and workforce housing geographically dispersed throughout the City*
	Preserve existing affordable housing options by using current and new housing strategies in all areas of the City*
	Explore additional housing programs and strategies to increase the supply of affordable housing*
Preserve and create neighborhoods that are attractive and environmentally sustainable	Emphasize identifying problems with buildings (residential and non-residential) complying with code before they become neighborhood issues
	Expand and enhance active participation in volunteer street and stream adoption and cleaning
	Improve cleanliness of City streets and neighborhoods
Preserve and create neighborhoods that are connected and vibrant	Implement the projects and programs identified in the Community Investment Plan to enhance safety, livability, transportation choices, and job growth*
	Promote digital connectedness
	Improve access to healthy foods throughout the City*
	Work with partners to ensure adequate lighting on City streets
Preserve and create neighborhoods that are engaged and welcoming	Connect community leaders, residents, elected officials and staff
	Support volunteer engagement and neighborhood improvement through neighborhood matching grants*
Foster economic success for everyone in the community	Provide community with training and perspective to accomplish goals and create deeper engagement across diverse communities
	Connect children to high-quality out of school time (OST) programs*
	Directly and through partner organizations provide youth with internships, pre-apprenticeships, and other work experiences*

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

# Housing & Neighborhood Development

## FY2018 & FY2019 Strategic Focus Area Plan

### Performance

Objective and Strategy	Measure/Target	FY2016 Actual
<b>Objective: Preserve and create neighborhoods that offer affordable housing options</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Expand the supply of newly constructed affordable and workforce housing geographically dispersed throughout the City*	Number of new affordable and workforce housing units annually <sup>†</sup>	286+ units added
<b>Strategy:</b> Preserve existing affordable housing options by using current and new housing strategies in all areas of the City*	Number of affordable housing units redeveloped or rehabilitated annually <sup>†</sup>	354 units redeveloped
<b>Objective: Preserve and create neighborhoods that are attractive and environmentally sustainable</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Emphasize identifying problems with buildings (residential and non-residential) before they become neighborhood issues	55% of all nuisance cases originate from inspection and only the remaining 45% require citizen complaints	65.64% originated from field observations 34.36% originated from complaints
<b>Strategy:</b> Expand and enhance active participation in volunteer street and stream adoption and cleaning*	250 active Keep Charlotte Beautiful Adopt-a-City Street participant organizations	New measure in FY2018
	80 miles of streams cleaned within the City of Charlotte as part of the Adopt-a-Stream program	83.24 miles of streams cleaned
<b>Objective: Preserve and create neighborhoods that are connected and vibrant</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Work with partners to ensure adequate lighting on City streets	Keep 95% of streetlights operational city-wide	95.4% of streetlights operational
<b>Strategy:</b> Promote digital connectedness	Increase % of subsidized housing units with internet	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Improve access to healthy foods throughout the City*	Complete Farmers Market study	New measure in FY2018
<b>Strategy:</b> Implement the projects and programs identified in the Community Investment Plan to enhance safety, livability, transportation choices, and job growth*	Build 10 miles of new sidewalks and bikeways per year to enhance safety, provide transportation choices, and better connect residents to employment opportunities and services	13.02 miles of sidewalks and 2.96 miles of bikeways
<b>Strategy:</b> Connect community leaders, residents, elected officials and staff	30 organizations attending neighborhood board retreats	31 organizations
	30 goals accomplished in the current fiscal year by all previous board retreat attendees	36 goals accomplished
<b>Objective: Preserve and create neighborhoods that are engaged and welcoming</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Support volunteer engagement and neighborhood improvement through neighborhood matching grants*	8,000 volunteer hours served as a result of grants awarded	New measure in FY2018
	60 Neighborhood Matching Grants awarded	60 grants awarded
<b>Strategy:</b> Provide community with training and perspective to accomplish goals and create deeper engagement across diverse communities	800 people participating in City sponsored training	New measure in FY2018
	80 neighborhoods represented in City sponsored training	New measure in FY2018
<b>Objective: Foster economic success for everyone in the community</b>		
<b>Strategy:</b> Connect children to high-quality quality out of school time (OST) programs*	816 children served through City OST grant contracts	776 children served
<b>Strategy:</b> Directly and through partner organizations provide youth with internships, pre-apprenticeships, and other work experiences*	200 private-sector businesses and non-profits providing youth internships, pre-apprenticeships, job shadowing, and other work experiences	151 private-sector businesses and non-profits
	5,000 MYEP internships and youth participating in career readiness training and other work experiences	4,158 internships and youth

\*Included in the Strategic Priorities Matrix

<sup>†</sup>Precise targets will be determined at the completion of the Strategic Affordable Housing Plan

## **Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission**

### **Livable City Policy Statement**

Adopted: March 7, 2016

Amended: November 7, 2016

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission has adopted this Livable City Policy Statement and Guiding Principles to articulate the Commission's priorities for the growth and development of Charlotte and guide the Commission's work in advising the governing bodies it serves.

This policy statement is founded in the City's adopted *Centers, Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework, General Development Policies* and area plans, and serves to focus and prioritize the Commission's work and recommendations. In particular, the Commission will use this policy statement to guide the development of the City's Zoning Ordinance Update, Community Character Policies and area plans, and inform the Commission's recommendation of zoning petitions and mandatory referrals.

### **Livable City Policy Statement**

*Develop a livable city where Charlotteans of all incomes can achieve, "a complete state of physical, mental and social well-being"<sup>1</sup> through the design of neighborhoods, public infrastructure and open spaces, and through easy access to employment and housing choices.*

### **Guiding Principles:**

- **Create a state-of-the-art transportation system** that equally provides for the health and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists and is accessible to people of all ages and abilities;
- **Promote a mix of land uses** within a close proximity so that Charlotteans can live, work, play, shop and worship in a neighborhood without the need for an automobile;
- **Ensure access to affordable housing** by supporting the dispersal of a range of housing types throughout the city, so that the availability of transportation does not limit access to economic opportunity;
- **Build vibrant and activity-filled public streets and open spaces** that promote community engagement so that Charlotteans of all ages and abilities can participate in a public life;
- **Promote access to affordable and healthy/local foods** so that income and location don't limit dietary choices; and
- **Protect the air we breathe**, and the trees that filter it, while also shading us from the hot, southern sun.
- **Build safe communities**, by using planning tools to prevent crime and violence through environmental design.

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpt of World Health Organization definition of public health



## Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission Transit Oriented Development Priorities

May 6, 2016

### Background

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission has adopted a Livable City Policy Statement and Guiding Principles to articulate the Commission's priorities for Charlotte's growth and development and guide the Commission's work in advising the governing bodies it serves. This policy statement is founded in the City's adopted *Centers, Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework*, *General Development Policies* and area plans, and serves to focus and prioritize the Commission's work and recommendations. In particular, the Commission is using this policy statement to guide the development of the City's Unified Development (Zoning) Ordinance, Community Character Policies and area plans, and inform the Commission's recommendation of zoning petitions and mandatory referrals.

Using its "livable cities lens", the Planning Committee began discussing Transit Oriented Development (TOD) at their January 2016 meeting, focusing on recent development in the South End area. At the February and April 2016 meetings, the Committee identified their top priorities for TOD and reviewed the current TOD zoning districts. The Committee identified areas of the current TOD regulations that needed to be strengthened to fulfill the purpose set out in the ordinance: "to require compact urban growth, opportunities for increased choice of transportation modes, and a safe and pleasant pedestrian environment by ensuring an attractive streetscape, a functional mix of complementary uses, and the provision of facilities that support transit use, bicycling, and walking."

### Issues and Priorities

The accompanying table identifies the Commission's specific priorities and linkages to the livability principles, along with references to the current ordinance language. The Commission's priorities for improving the TOD zoning ordinance are organized into nine categories:

#### TOD Standards

1. Street Level and Pedestrian Activation
2. Parking Design and Street Treatment
3. Rail Trail
4. Architectural Design and Density
5. Parking Standards

#### Overall Design Standards

6. Buffers
7. Dumpsters
8. Lighting

#### Other Concerns

9. Related, Non-Zoning Ordinance

### Conclusions and Next Steps

In general, the Commission believes that the current TOD standards need to be clarified to better communicate expectations and provide more certainty for all involved in the process. To this end, the Commission recommends that:

- In the short term, the existing TOD standards be enforced to the fullest extent possible, with particular attention given to the Commission's identified priorities;
- The identified priorities be used to help shape the elements included in Charlotte's Community Character Policies/Place Types; and,
- Ultimately, the Commission's identified priorities be incorporated and addressed in the update of the development ordinances (zoning ordinance update), especially related to TOD.

## Street Level & Pedestrian Activation

**Livable City Guiding Principle:** Build vibrant and activity-filled public streets and open spaces that promote community engagement so that Charlotteans of all ages and abilities can participate in a public life.

**Priority:** Strengthening requirements to activate pedestrian oriented streets.

Commission Discussion:

- Require more in Code Section 9.1209 to activate streets in contact with pedestrians.
- Require designs that allow for future activity when demand occurs (need minimum dimensions) and also require some percent of space to be active immediately.
- Require the first floor of residential units facing the street to physically connect to it.
- Require development to have true, honest, walkable, pedestrian scaled connections(s) to the street, leading to where we want activity and pedestrians.

## Existing TOD Ordinance

- Retail and office buildings fronting directly on a public or private street or fronting on a public multi-use path along a transit line and identified in an area plan shall be designed so that the first floor façade of the building(s) along all streets and pathways includes clear glass windows and doors to increase pedestrian interest. These openings shall be arranged so that the uses are visible from and to the street and/or pathway on at least 50% of the length of the first floor street level frontage. **[9.1209(1)(a)]**
- For all other uses, buildings shall be designed so that the first floor street façade along all streets includes the use of clear glass windows and doors arranged so that the uses are visible from and/or accessible to the street on at least 25% of the length of the first floor street frontage. When this approach is not feasible, a combination of design elements shall be used on the building façade, or included into the site design, to animate and enliven the streetscape. These design elements may include but are not limited to the following: ornamentation; molding; string courses; changes in material or color; architectural lighting; works of art; fountains and pools; street furniture; stoops, landscaping and garden areas; and display areas. **[9.1209(1)(b)]**
- The first floor façade of all buildings, including structured parking facilities, shall be designed to encourage and complement pedestrian-scale, interest, and activity. **[9.1209(1)(c)]**
- The first floor of any new building on a street identified as a retail street or site identified for ground floor retail by a Council adopted plan must have at least 50% of the linear street frontage developed to accommodate non-residential uses but may be occupied with residential uses. **[9.1209(1)(l)]**
- Internal sidewalk connections are required between buildings and from buildings to all on site facilities (parking areas, bicycle facilities, urban open space, etc.) in addition to the sidewalk requirements of Section 9.1209(8)(e). All internal sidewalks shall be hard surfaced and at least 6' in width. **[9.1208(11)(a)(1)]**
- External sidewalk connections are required to provide direct connections from all buildings on site to the existing and/or required sidewalk system, and to adjacent multi-use trails, parks and greenways. **[9.1208(11)(a)(2)]**



## Parking Design & Street Treatment

**Livable City Guiding Principle:** Build vibrant and activity-filled public streets and open spaces that promote community engagement so that Charlotteans of all ages and abilities can participate in a public life.

**Priority:** Requiring parking to be designed and located to support walkability.

Commission Discussion:

- Prohibit parking, blank walls, “cars behind bars”, wide roll up doors, fake windows or only wall recesses along streets.
- Hide parking lots from view along a public street, rather than screening them.
- Locate all parking behind a use with access and entrances directly to street.
- Provide pedestrian access through the parking lot to all entrances.
- Prohibit no front door, exiting through the parking deck, and totally walled off compounds.

### Existing TOD Ordinance

- The ground floor of parking structures that are across the street from single family zoning or that abut single family zoning on the same side of the street shall be wrapped with active uses such as residential, office and retail uses. **[9.1209(1)(k)]**
- Expanses of blank wall shall not exceed 20 continuous feet in length. A blank wall is a facade that does not add to the character of the streetscape and does not contain clear glass windows or doors or sufficient ornamentation, decoration or articulation. **[9.1209(1)(d)]**
- No surface parking or maneuvering space shall be permitted within any required or established setback, and no surface parking or maneuvering space is allowed between the permitted use and the required setback (exception may be made for driveways). **[9.1208(6)(c)]**
- Parking that is located to the rear of the primary structure may extend the entire width of the lot, with the exception of any required screening or landscaped areas. Parking that is located to the side of the primary structure shall not cover more than 35% of the total lot width. **[9.1208(6)(g)]**
- At least fifty (50%) of the linear street level frontage of the facility shall be devoted to retail, office, civic, institutional, or residential uses. If 75% or more of the linear street frontage is devoted to such uses, then the total square footage of the uses shall be credited at 200% toward the required FAR minimums. **[9.1208(6)(l)(1)]**
- Structured parking facilities shall be designed to encourage and complement pedestrian-scale interest and activity, and shall be designed so that motorized vehicles parked on all levels of the facility inside are screened from the street, the transitway, and/or from adjacent residentially zoned and/or used property. Decorative elements such as grillwork or louvers may be utilized to accomplish this objective. Openings at the street level are limited to vehicular entrances, pedestrian access to the structure, and ventilation openings. All such openings shall be decorative and be an integral part of the overall building design. **[9.1209(5)]**

## Rail Trail

**Livable City Guiding Principle:** Create a state-of-the-art transportation system that equally provides for the health and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists and is accessible to people of all ages and abilities.

**Priority:** Requiring development to consider rail trail a front that it must respect and enhance.

Commission Discussion:

- Treat trail as though it were a street – orient towards it, connect to it.
- Make requirements for streets applicable to this pedestrian/bicycle oriented street.
- Develop prototype designs and/or guidelines to demonstrate appropriate design of open space, especially rail trail.

## Existing TOD Ordinance

- Retail and office buildings fronting directly on a public or private street or fronting on a public multi-use path along a transit line and identified in an area plan shall be designed so that the first floor façade of the building(s) along all streets and pathways includes clear glass windows and doors to increase pedestrian interest. These openings shall be arranged so that the uses are visible from and to the street and/or pathway on at least 50% of the length of the first floor street level frontage. **[9.1209(1)(a)]**
- When a lot abuts an existing or proposed public open space system, multi-use trail, or greenway, entrance(s) shall be provided on the building façade closest to public open space, multi-use trail, or greenway. **[9.1209(4)(a)(2)]**
- Sidewalks shall be located and constructed as specified in the approved station area plan. This may include sidewalks along transit corridor right-of-ways. **[9.1209(8)(e)(partial)]**
- External sidewalk connections are required to provide direct connections from all buildings on site to the existing and/or required sidewalk system, and to adjacent multi-use trails, parks and greenways. **[9.1208(11)(a)(2)]**

## Architectural Design & Density

**Livable City Guiding Principle:** Promote a mix of land uses within a close proximity so that Charlotteans can live, work, play, shop and worship in a neighborhood without the need for an automobile;

**Priority:** Requiring development to be more diverse, enhancing the pedestrian environment and contributing to a unique sense of place.

### Commission Discussion

- Break up large buildings with architectural elements.
- Raise minimum density to existing conditions and require a mix of density across the site.
- Require architectural diversification in a development so the buildings do not all look alike, especially relative to adjacent property.

### Existing TOD Ordinance

- Minimum density within ¼ mile walk of the transit stations is 20 DUA for residential or .75 FAR for non-residential or mixed use. These densities are 15 DUA and .50 FAR respectively outside of the ¼ mile walk distance.
- For buildings across from single family zoning or abutting single family zoning on the same side of the street, roof line variation every 30 feet is required. This can be accomplished by using vertical offsets in ridge lines, gables, exaggerated cornices, dormers, roof top patios, material changes, and/or other architectural features such as trellises, portals or porches.  
**[9.1209(1)(g)]**
- For buildings across from single family zoning or abutting single family zoning on the same side of the street, façade variations shall be provided that visually separate individual units. This can be accomplished through measures such as window arrangement and size variation, unit entrance design, roof variation, material changes, and/or offset wall planes.  
**[9.1209(1)(j)]**

### Buildings exceeding 5 stories in height: **[9.1209(2)(a,b,c)]**

- The first 3 floors above street grade shall be distinguished from the remainder of the building with an emphasis on providing design elements that will enhance the pedestrian environment. Such elements as cornices, corbeling, molding, stringcourses, ornamentation, changes in material or color, recessing, architectural lighting and other sculpturing of the base as are appropriate shall be provided to add special interest to the base.
- In the design of the building façade, attention shall be paid to the appearance both during the day and at night. Material and color changes alone do not meet the requirements of this section and design elements, which are used to meet the requirements of this section, shall be visually continuous around the building. In the event that a building façade is not visible from a public street or right-of-way then the Planning Director has the option of waiving this requirement.
- Special attention shall be given to the design of windows in the base. Band windows are prohibited. Recessed windows that are distinguished from the shaft of the building through the use of arches, pediments, mullions, and other treatments are permitted.

## Parking Standards

**Livable City Guiding Principle:** Create a state-of-the-art transportation system that equally provides for the health and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists and is accessible to people of all ages and abilities.

**Priority:** Revisiting the amount of allowed parking to ensure an appropriate balance between supporting walkability/transit use and negatively impacting surrounding neighborhoods.

Commission Discussion:

- Require freely accessible “minimum visitor parking” for residential developments adjacent to single family and count it towards the maximum parking allowed in the Ordinance.
- Ensure parking standards minimize conflicts between residents (amount, size of spaces and location).
- Provide ride sharing locations, bays, pickup areas.

## Existing TOD Ordinance

Residential Minimum:

- Minimum: 1 space per unit (on blocks with single family zoning), No minimum for all other properties
- Maximum: 1.6 spaces per unit

Office:

- Minimum: none
- Maximum: 1 space per 300 s.f. of office space

Eating, Drinking & Entertainment Establishments

- Minimum 1 space per 150 s.f (within 800 feet of single family zoning)
- Maximum 1 space per 75 s.f.

Retail:

- Minimum: None
  - Maximum: 1 space per 250 s.f.
- 
- A 25% parking reduction in the minimum number of parking spaces required is allowed if the principal use is located within 800 feet of a parking facility with parking spaces available to the general public, or within 800 feet of public transit park and ride facilities with an approved joint use agreement. This section in combination with [Section 12.202\(2\)](#) allows for no more than a total of 25% parking reduction of the minimum requirements.

## Buffers

Clarify that required buffer plantings be at the same or higher site elevation than the adjacent property required to be screened. Section 12.302(9)

### Existing TOD Zoning Ordinance

- All uses, other than single-family detached units, shall provide landscaping along all property lines abutting residentially zoned property (single-family, multi-family and urban residential zoning districts) located adjacent to the Transit Oriented zoning district. This requirement also applies in situations where an alley with a right-of-way width of 25 feet or less separates uses in a TOD zoning district from non-TOD zoned residential property. Landscaping shall be provided along all property lines abutting the alley. However, multi-family developments zoned TOD are exempt from this landscaping requirement when they abut other multi-family uses or undeveloped multi-family zoning districts. **[9.1208(9)(a)]**
- Such landscaping shall consist of a 10' wide planting strip. The planting strip shall consist of a combination of evergreen trees and evergreen shrubs. Plant materials shall be provided at a minimum of 6 trees and 20 shrubs per 100 linear feet in accordance with [Section 12.302\(9\) \(b\), \(c\), \(d\) and \(e\)](#). The 10' planting strip may be reduced to 8' and the shrubs need not be planted if a masonry wall with a height of between 6' to 8' in a side yard, or between 8' to 10' in a rear yard is installed. No more than 25% of the wall surface shall be left open. Shrubs and walls may be reduced in height to 30 inches within sight triangles as required by the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT). This landscaping area may be interrupted with a gate/pedestrian access way to an adjacent site, or a driveway to an adjacent alley. **[9.1208(9)(b)]**

## Dumpsters

Address trash and dumpster locations, screening and impacts of on-street trash pickup.

## Lighting

Address “spillover” lighting.

Commission Discussion

- Modify Section 9.1208.10 to prevent outdoor and parking deck lighting from spilling over into/onto other properties.
- Screen light inside a deck or rooftop from adjacent properties. Parking lot lighting should be screened from adjacent development/have a cut-off requirement.

## Existing TOD Zoning Ordinance

- Dumpsters, recycling containers, compactors, large above-ground utility structures and solid waste handling areas are not permitted in any setback or yard and shall be screened from adjacent property and from public view with a minimum 6-foot high solid and finished masonry wall, with closeable gate that shall be 40% - 50% open for safety and security purposes. In no instance shall a chain link fence or a barbed wire fence be permitted. Dumpsters are not permitted in any required setback or yard space. **[9.1208(8)(b)]**

## Existing TOD Zoning Ordinance

- All outdoor lighting fixtures for parking lots, and pedestrian activity areas shall be classified as full cut-off, cutoff or semi-cutoff. In addition, any building light fixtures used to illuminate parking and pedestrian areas, and service areas shall be classified as full cutoff, cutoff or semi-cutoff. **[9.1208(10)(a)]**
- No outdoor lighting fixture or building light fixtures shall cause glare on public travel lanes or on adjacent residentially used or zoned property. All fixtures shall be screened in such a way that the light source shall not cast light directly on public travel lanes or on adjacent residentially used or zoned property. **[9.1208(10)(b)]**

## Non-Zoning Ordinance

### Transit

- Do more to promote bus ridership, better signage for rail to bus and bus to rail connections.

### Street Design

- Add painted crosswalks, create speed tables, and install slate signs in middle of streets.
- Narrow roads to decrease automobile speeds and make safer for pedestrians and cyclists and use leftover space to build separated bike lanes.
- Ensure that accessible design (e.g., curb ramps) is part of all street projects

### Tree Ordinance

- Require bigger street trees at shorter intervals to provide shade sooner rather than later.
- Require trees on both sides of the sidewalk.

### Affordable Housing

Address affordable housing options within our legal authority.

- There are two types of street trees required by the Tree Ordinance, large maturing trees and small maturing trees. Large trees are normally required at 40' intervals unless there are overhead utility lines. Under overhead utilities, small maturing trees are required at 30' intervals.





---

**Committee Chair**

**Tony Lathrop**

Moore & Van Allen  
704-331-3596

[tonylathrop@mvalaw.com](mailto:tonylathrop@mvalaw.com)

**Committee Members**

**Erin Bayer Smith**

Mecklenburg County Public Health  
980-314-9066

[erin.smith@mecklenburgcountync.gov](mailto:erin.smith@mecklenburgcountync.gov)

**Shannon Binns**

Sustain Charlotte  
704-338-2610

[shannon@sustaincharlotte.org](mailto:shannon@sustaincharlotte.org)

**Shannon Boling**

David Weekly Homes  
704-972-4200

[sboling@DWHomes.com](mailto:sboling@DWHomes.com)

**Nichelle Bonaparte**

Zoning Board of Adjustment  
803-468-7805

[nichelle.bonaparte@gmail.com](mailto:nichelle.bonaparte@gmail.com)

**Collin Brown**

K&L Gates  
704-331-7531

[collin.brown@klgates.com](mailto:collin.brown@klgates.com)

**John Carmichael**

Robinson Bradshaw  
704-331-7509

[jcarmichael@robinsonbradshaw.com](mailto:jcarmichael@robinsonbradshaw.com)

**Astrid Chirinos**

Latin American Economic Development Corp.  
704-451-3978

[astrid@LatinAmericanEDC.org](mailto:astrid@LatinAmericanEDC.org)

**Nate Doolittle**

Land Design  
704-333-0325

[ndoolittle@landdesign.com](mailto:ndoolittle@landdesign.com)

**Rebecca Fant**

SouthPark Association of Neighborhoods  
704-527-4221

[rfant@archmatters.com](mailto:rfant@archmatters.com)

**Walter Fields**

The Walter Fields Group  
704-372-7855

[walter@walterfieldsgroup.com](mailto:walter@walterfieldsgroup.com)

**Jim Guyton**

Design Resource Group  
704-343-0608, x312

[jim@drgrp.com](mailto:jim@drgrp.com)

**Justin Harlow**

Biddleville-Smallwood Neighborhood  
678-656-4830

[harlow.justin@gmail.com](mailto:harlow.justin@gmail.com)

**Peggy Hey**

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS)  
980-343-6880

[Peggyh.hey@cms.k12.nc.us](mailto:Peggyh.hey@cms.k12.nc.us)

**Bryan Holladay**

Greater Charlotte Apartment Association  
704-201-3985

[bryan@greatercaa.org](mailto:bryan@greatercaa.org)

**Tobe Holmes**

University City Partners  
704-688-2482

[tholmes@universitycitypartners.org](mailto:tholmes@universitycitypartners.org)

**Virginia Keogh**

Southwest Association of Neighborhoods  
704-504-8365

[vkeogh@carolina.rr.com](mailto:vkeogh@carolina.rr.com)

**Keith MacVean**

Moore & Van Allen  
704-331-3531

[keithmacvean@mvalaw.com](mailto:keithmacvean@mvalaw.com)



**Charlotte Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)  
Advisory Committee Roster**  
(February 2017)

---

**Jim Merrifield**  
MPV Properties  
704-561-5241  
[jmerrifield@mpvre.com](mailto:jmerrifield@mpvre.com)

**David Miller**  
Raley Miller  
704-246-1492  
[david@raleymiller.com](mailto:david@raleymiller.com)

**Jon Morris**  
Beacon Properties  
704-926-1391  
[jon@beacondevelopment.com](mailto:jon@beacondevelopment.com)

**Cheryl Myers**  
Charlotte City Center Partners  
704-332-9578  
[cmyers@charlottecentercity.org](mailto:cmyers@charlottecentercity.org)

**Joe Padilla**  
Real Estate & Building Industry Coalition (REBIC)  
704-940-3171  
[joe.padilla@rebic.com](mailto:joe.padilla@rebic.com)

**John Porter**  
Charter Properties  
704-377-4172, x44  
[jdp@charterproperties.com](mailto:jdp@charterproperties.com)

**Theresa Rosa**  
Prosperity Village Area Association  
704-451-7948  
[TheresaRosa2@gmail.com](mailto:TheresaRosa2@gmail.com)

**Richard Saltrick**  
Storm Water Advisory Committee (SWAC)  
954-540-6560  
[saltrick@hotmail.com](mailto:saltrick@hotmail.com)

**Charles Thomas**  
Knight Foundation  
704-707-4280  
[cthomas@knightfoundation.org](mailto:cthomas@knightfoundation.org)

**David Walters, RIBA**  
Prof. Emeritus of Architecture & Urban Design  
UNC Charlotte  
704-517-4241  
[drwalter@uncc.edu](mailto:drwalter@uncc.edu)

**Liz Ward**  
Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership  
704-285-6014  
[lward@cmhp.org](mailto:lward@cmhp.org)

**Jeff Wells**  
Charlotte Tree Advisory Commission (CTAC)  
704-936-9271  
[jm.wells@live.com](mailto:jm.wells@live.com)

**Darrel Williams**  
Neighboring Concepts  
704-374-0916  
[darrel@neighboringconcepts.com](mailto:darrel@neighboringconcepts.com)

**Dick Winters**  
Mecklenburg County Public Health  
980-314-9067  
[dick.winters@mecklenburgcountync.gov](mailto:dick.winters@mecklenburgcountync.gov)

### **Meeting Agenda**

6:00 - **Welcome** (Ed)

6:10 - **Introductions** (Committee)

6:30 - **Background** (Ed)

6:40 - **Role & Expectations** (Ed & Committee)

- Ed's Perspective
- Your Perspective

7:30 - **Organization & Protocol** (Ed & Committee)

- Principles – How we will work together
- Meeting Logistics

7:55 - **Wrap-Up** (Ed)

- To dos & Next Steps

### **Summary Notes**

#### **Committee Expectations (Ed McKinney)**

- Provide expertise and feedback to shape the process and outcomes – not reach consensus
- Be a connection to your professional and community groups – share information and connect others to the process
- Sounding board, uncover blind spots, identify challenges/unintended consequences
- Forum for frank, honest, clear, and transparent discussion
- Chair (Tony Lathrop) will be a voice for the committee, keep on task and moving

#### **Committee Expectations (committee members)**

- Ensure the committee is diverse (social, neighborhood representation, geographic, etc.), transit representation?

- Committee should have a mix of vision, technical, policy & practice
- Define the time commitment for the committee
- How should we be hearing the community feedback that is occurring now and on-going?
- How will the committee interact with staff & consultants?
- How will we provide successful input without consensus?
- Provide feedback on strategy of process
- Clarity on process and timeline for how recommendations/direction go to staff for feedback
- Define what success looks like (metrics)
- Document ideas and concerns in a way that can be easily accessible
- Council must be invested and supportive in the results of what we will be putting out (Council is invested in the current system, how will we know that we are not wasting our time?)
- Do we take this in bite size pieces - can it be done in one big bite?
- Technical aspect is scary...
- Ability to intersect health outcomes and equity
- Courage of moving forward, aggressive, brave
- Form (new thinking) vs. function (our current rules) - move beyond and bring together

- Effort is far more comprehensive than originally expected
- How will near term ordinances issues be solved with such a big project? (is the task achievable?)
- Start with what staff doesn't think works right (worry we won't see the forest through the trees)
- Need to have a vision (maybe without consensus but tapped into our expertise)
- Need to clearly understand relationship between the Place Types & UDO effort - transparency
- How previous decisions on policy pieces can be put together as the underpinning of the ordinance
- Improve design aesthetic and economic development
- Champion for density (we are at a crossroads – don't like sprawl but don't like density)
- Open, transparent and inclusive process – will ensure buy-in
- Share from a user's perspective, help to identify barriers to fix issues with the development ordinances
- Keeping Charlotte competitive - we are a growing place and the zoning ordinance has a lot to do with that.
- Unifying the ordinances that I work in everyday

**Motivation (why you are on the committee)**

- Make something a sixth grader could understand
- Make sure as Charlotte continues to grow it focuses on economic engines, upward mobility for all
- Make sure more voices in the community are represented
- Our built environment has big effect on our health
- The intersection of transportation and land use planning
- Voice at the table for healthy communities
- Bring Stormwater Committee interest to the discussion
- Simplify the complexity of the development process
- Translate “planner” speak to “community” speak - help communicate!
- Lower barriers to tree preservation and how to unify the ordinances
- Better integrate ordinances, more usable for development industry and community
- Charlotte has a system that allows negotiation without lawsuits – this is something valuable that should carry on in the UDO.
- Continue a tradition of negotiation without lawsuits (a positive outcome of our current system)
- Importance of how the ordinance can continue to positively influence growth and economic development
- Constructive ways to fix problems
- Ordinance realignment – how it will affect community and businesses

- If you are not at the table – you are on the menu
- Would like to see growth in every geography - Streamline the ordinances with consistent standards for all areas of the city
- Love living in Charlotte – Current process makes it hard to respond to citizens
- Far less negotiated process (disadvantages people that aren't good at negotiating)
- Important to schools (CMS) as one of the largest landowners
- This could be fun!
- Establish greater consistency/predictability for the end-user.
- Dichotomy of growth and housing choice affordability with a variety for all
- Reflective of the values of this City
- Been through a couple of rewrites – bring experience
- Changing the philosophy of how we describe our City
- Potential for larger improvements with small changes
- Will result in something that will help streamline the process
- Creative solutions and ideas - current ordinances sometimes delay/stagnate what would otherwise be good development
- Good return for developers + Great built environment



## **Meeting Agenda**

5:00 – **Welcome & Introductions**  
(Tony/Committee)

5:15 – **December Meeting Follow-up** (Ed)

- Meeting Schedule
- Committee Membership
- Meeting Summary

5:30 – **Organization & Protocol** (Tony)

- Principles – How we will work together
- Role & Expectations
- Documentation

6:00 – **Place Types** (Ed)

- Process & work-to-date
- Next Steps

6:30 – **Wrap Up** (Tony)

- Questions/future topics

## **Summary Notes**

### **Organization & Protocol (Tony Lathrop)**

- Inclusive, rigorous and transparent process
- Keep an open mind
- Civility and respect
- Be mindful of who you are speaking for
- Share time, and be mindful of everyone's right to speak

### **Meetings & Process (Advisory Committee)**

- Set up name cards in front of each member so names/affiliations are easy to identify
- How are we to react to information presented in the meeting? At meeting and next meeting (after homework, etc.)?
- How are “objections” by committee members documented? Can it change the course of the committee?
- OAC members are advisers, not deciders
- Communication conduits – should we have takeaways that can be relayed to constituent groups of members?
- OAC membership needs to be inclusive, and each member's role is bring a wider audience of people into the process
- Importance of sharing information – could there be “sharing challenges”? (i.e. each OAC member to discuss project with a least one new person each month between OAC meetings) Monthly goals? Suggested content for social media posts by OAC members?

## **Place Types**

### **Discussion & Comments (Advisory Committee)**

#### **How we Communicate**

- How and what is the process for engagement to make this accessible to all: language? Terminology?
- Interactive methods (short videos) to explain the process
- Will goals and aspirations be discussed with the community?
- City Council needs to be brought into the process and get buy-in early
- Need to understand demographics of engagement (Not just place, but belonging)

#### **Why Are We Doing This?**

- Why are we doing this? What are examples of failures of current policies and regulations?
- Are the existing uses broken? If not, translate to Place Types
- Focus should be on ordinances, as they're the big problem, not land use or Place Types – need ordinances that reflect an urbanizing city
- Focus on streamlined ordinances, as these are critically important for simplicity and consistency.
- Is our goal to regulate aesthetics or subjective elements? Criteria? The market should decide
- Do Place Types reduce need for rezoning? Will it be more by right and how will neighborhoods be able to interact in the process?
- What realistic mechanism (if one exists) can by right zoning occur? Is it or is it not achievable? Need to know earlier than later

#### **Vision**

- Is zoning connected to a strategic plan?
- What does Charlotte want to look like? Is it going to guide all development?
- Our process should not result in more segregation and should define what the next 800,000 people will want in a city



### Place Types – What Are They?

- How do Place Types allow for the full range of necessary places?
- Does Place Types homogenize the city and how will it represent the diversity of places?
- Can Place Types address larger societal needs – economic mobility, segregation?
- Where are we in the continuum of place – from sterile to rich/deep?
- Are Place Types just getting layered onto existing land use framework?
- Will we have existing Place Types and future Place Types, like Existing/Future Land Use?
- What is the end-result? How will a developer or resident know what the future looks like?
- Area Plans are still essential – but should/can it be in the UDO Process

### Place Types – How do They Work?

- How will the Place Types process and UDO process unfold? It's ambitious
- Other communities who have done this? Mistakes and pitfalls?
- How does development work/exist that doesn't fit in a Place Type? Will we still have organic new types and growth?
- How do entitlements change with new map?
- How does a development decision get made with this new tool?
- How will this new tool interact with older adopted plans?
- How will the gap in planning on a comprehensive vision level be handled? Plan first .. write the UDO after
- Is the Fire Dept. included, critical that they're involved
- Keeping area plans with Place Types seems cumbersome – do we need that many layers?
- Thought Place Types was more flexible in terms of mapping rather than a rigid map
- How will change be mapped? When an existing place is X and the future is Y?
- Mechanism for mapping places – how do we accommodate change? Anecdotes of issues



## **Meeting Agenda**

5:00 – **Welcome & Introductions**  
(Tony/Committee)

5:15 – **January Meeting Follow-up** (Ed)

- Review mission & purpose statement
- Meeting Schedule

5:30 – **Place Type Test Case** (Ed)

- Review January Meeting discussion
- Charlotte Place Types Test Case discussion
- Discussion & Next Steps

6:00 – **Place Types** (Ed)

- Process & work-to-date
- Next Steps

6:30 – **Wrap Up** (Tony)

- Questions/future topics

## **Summary Notes**

**January Meeting Follow-up** (Ed McKinney)

- Following meetings will focus on Vision, Process, Links to UDO

**Place Type Test Case**

**Established Neighborhood/Community Character**

- The community did define what they wanted using the existing ordinance.
- This activity node is really small in terms of geography. How does this relate to the larger city?
- Retail already had a history there – you’re dealing with places that are growing organically. If done today, would this be done differently?
- How do we encourage what’s in proximity?  
Q: How do we encourage access? A: You change the character of the neighborhood.
- The place does, however, reflect the context of its specific neighborhood.
- It’s reflective of community and neighborhood and what they want in their surroundings.
- The example used is one where the character hasn’t really changed. A good example of old Charlotte.
- Our process does need to make decisions to make a healthy community, so sometimes the professionals must decide the vision.

### **Firmness on Policy vs. Flexibility with Market**

- There was always a center there – it failed – and now it’s working again. Did zoning make or break this place?
- Concern with Place Types, as they’re drafted now, is that they outline and describe what’s already there, but doesn’t account for future conditions (i.e. demographics). How do you redraw the lines to make it a workable center?
- This place works because there’s a mix of things there: uses, price points, etc. How can you make regulations that get you to an end (i.e. walkable setting)?
- Neighborhood Centers are integral to the area – uses strengthened the neighborhood.
- What kind of neighborhood center should a “suburban” area have that doesn’t have one now?
- New neighborhood centers have been created like Phillips Place, Birkdale Village, Ayrsley.
- Does include uses that are “destinations” that happen to be in a neighborhood.
- How do you define how/what place is what Place Type?
- A “neighborhood center” should have a wider vocabulary to include broad, more “family” oriented uses that create community.
- The uses inside the buildings created the success, not necessarily the form.
- The policy/zoning didn’t appear to limit the uses of what the neighborhood wants.

- Planning and Place Types can’t/shouldn’t dictate architecture – the market should and does do that.

### **Scale: Site size/depth? Building setback/height?**

- How big should the area be? Takes issue with artificially setting a hard boundary – would like to see more integration between uses. How does this relate to Queens University? How does a place’s Sense of Place attract a New South community? How does it relate to transit?
- What we’re talking about here is scale and proximity.
- Size was based on maximizing land value – shouldn’t get hung up in the specifics, they come in all sizes.
- What can we learn from built places (scale, adjacencies) to guide how a future area could develop?
- Did form create the success?
- This place still embodies some elements that we don’t want – back of curb sidewalk, parking in front of building.
- Where/how do we decide where places are mapped in relation to infrastructure?

**Standardization for Efficiency vs.  
Customization for Flexibility**

- Will we replace zoning districts without places without addressing the fragmented policy/policies?
- Does form-based zoning lead to cookie-cutter responses? How can we find a balance?
- Large gaps in vision still exist. How can Place Types be used without filling those gaps?
- Isn't the misalignment of the ordinances the issue?!? How do Place Types address this?

**Process**

- Still need more neighborhood representatives on the committee.
- Somewhere in the process the group needs to see what makes up a place.
- Is there City Council buy-in to reduce conditional rezoning needs?
- How do we educate the community on the characteristics that define their vision? Technical tools and access to info should make it easier. How do we reach those people that don't show up for rezoning meetings?
- Individual departments and ordinances work against creating the same vision.



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

## Community Outreach Presentations

Date	Presentation	Staff
02/01/17	2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) - CPCC Levine Campus (Matthews)	CRTPO Staff
02/01/17	2045 MTP - South Piedmont Community College (Monroe)	CRTPO Staff
02/06/17	2045 MTP - South Iredell Developers Council ( Mooresville)	Burke
02/06/17	2045 MTP - Simmons YMCA	CRTPO Staff
02/06/17	Charlotte Historic Districts Program - Oaklawn Park Neighborhood Association	Howard
02/07/17	2045 MTP - Union County Public Library (Monroe)	CRTPO Staff
02/08/17	Place Types/UDO - Sustain Charlotte Monthly Mixer	Mahoney
02/08/17	2045 MTP - Charlotte Transit Center	CRTPO Staff
02/08/17	2045 MTP - Park Road YWCA	CRTPO Staff
02/08/17	2045 MTP - Lake Norman Transportation Commission ( Mooresville)	Burke
02/09/17	2045 MTP - North Meck Alliance	CRTPO Staff
02/09/17	2045 MTP - West Boulevard Neighborhood Coalition Meeting	Burke
02/11/17	2045 MTP - Birkdale (Huntersville)	CRTPO Staff
02/13/17	2045 MTP - Iredell County Public Library	CRTPO Staff
02/15/17	Place Types/UDO - University Area Neighborhoods Meeting	Cornett/Vari/ Zweifel
02/17/17	2045 MTP - Lake Norman Chamber of Commerce	Burke
02/18/17	Planning, Zoning & 2045 MTP - Ballantyne Breakfast Club Priorities Meeting	McKinney/Main/ Meacci/Burke
02/21/17	Place Types/UDO - Charlotte Mecklenburg Youth Council	Mahoney/Vari/ McCullough
02/21/17	Providence Road Sidewalk Public Meeting	Main
02/22/17	2045 MTP - Mooresville-South Iredell Chamber of Commerce	Burke
02/23/17	2045 MTP - Founders Hall	Burke
02/22/17	2045 MTP - Charlotte Chamber	CRTPO Staff
02/23/17	Place Types/UDO & 2045 MTP - Steele Creek Residents Association Meeting	Gonzalez/Cook McCullough/Rorie
02/27/17	Cherry Neighborhood Meeting - Place Types & Traffic Circles	Cornett/Main





**Meeting Schedule**

March 2017

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Full Planning Commission</b>			
03-06-17	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Executive Committee</b>			
03-20-17	4:00 pm	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Planning Committee</b>			
03-21-17	5:00 pm	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Zoning Committee</b>			
03-20-17	5:00 pm	City Council Dinner Meeting	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
03-20-17	5:30 pm	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
04-04-17	5:30 pm	Work Session <sup>1</sup>	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Other Committees</b>			
03-08-17	12:00 pm	Historic District Commission Workshop	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
03-08-17	1:00 pm	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
03-15-17	6:00 pm	CRTPO Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
03-27-17	2:00 pm	City Council Transportation & Planning Committee (TAP)	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor - CMGC
<b>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings</b>			
<b>Steele Creek Development Study</b>			
03-07-17 to 3-10-17	9:30 am – 5:00 pm	Design Studio – Drop In <sup>2</sup>	Kennedy Middle School 4000 Gallant Lane
03-07-17	6:30 pm – 8:00 pm	Kickoff Meeting	Kennedy Middle School 4000 Gallant Lane
03-14-17	6:30 pm – 8:00 pm	Wrap Up Meeting	Kennedy Middle School 4000 Gallant Lane

<sup>1</sup> Due to the new Zoning Committee meeting schedule, the Zoning Committee will meet on April 4, 2017 at 5:30 pm.

<sup>2</sup> The Design Studio Drop In is daily, Tuesday, March 7 to Friday, March 10 from 9:30 am – 5:00 pm.



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

## Meeting Schedule

April 2017

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
<b>Full Planning Commission</b>			
04-03-17	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Executive Committee</b>			
04-17-17	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Planning Committee</b>			
04-18-17	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
<b>Zoning Committee</b>			
04-04-17	5:30 pm	Work Session <sup>1</sup>	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
04-17-17	5:00 p.m.	City Council Dinner Meeting	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
04-17-17	5:30 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
<b>Other Committee(s)</b>			
04-10-17	2:00 p.m.	City Council Transportation & Planning Committee (TAP)	Conference Room 280 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor - CMGC
04-12-17	12:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission Workshop	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
04-12-17	1:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC
04-19-17	6:00 p.m.	CRTPO Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor – CMGC

### Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings

There are no Planning Department meetings scheduled at this time.

<sup>1</sup> Due to the new Zoning Committee meeting schedule, the Zoning Committee will meet on April 4, 2017 at 5:30 pm.



# Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Executive Committee

January 17 – 4:00 pm

CMGC- Room 266

Minutes

Attachment 6

Approved February 20, 2017

## Attendance

**Commissioners Present:** Tony Lathrop (Chairperson), Mike Sullivan (Vice-Chairperson), and Cozzie Watkins

**Others Present:** Commissioner John Fryday

**Planning Staff Present:** Ed McKinney (Interim Planning Director), and Cheryl Neely

## Welcome & Introductions

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm. Chairperson Lathrop invited Commissioner Fryday to join the Committee members at the table.

## Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Watkins made a motion to approve the December 19, 2016 minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairperson Sullivan. The minutes were approved unanimously.

## January 9, 2017 Work Session Follow-up

### **Transportation Action Plan**

Chairperson Lathrop asked if the Commission took any action on the Transportation Action Plan. Commissioner Fryday said the presentation was for information purposes. Mr. McKinney said there were a lot of comments and dialogue. Commissioner Fryday said that at the last Transportation and Planning Committee (TAP) meeting, the Committee members suggested that the Planning Commission and the SouthPark group that has been involved speak at the Transportation Action Plan public hearing. Mr. McKinney said he did not recall this recommendation. Chairperson Lathrop said he recalled the request.

The Chairperson asked about the hearing date. Mr. McKinney replied that the public hearing is January 23. He clarified that is not the Planning Commission's role to coordinate with the SouthPark organization. The Committee agreed. Commissioner Fryday said he was just reporting what was said at the TAP Committee meeting.

Chairperson Lathrop inquired about the hearing starting time. Mr. McKinney said the hearing is during the regular Council meeting which starts at 6:00 pm. The Chairperson said he would plan to attend the hearing. He suggested that the Executive Committee review the comments from the January work session discussion. He asked if the minutes were available. Ms. Neely said that staff had drafted the comments and questions from the Transportation Action Plan discussion. She distributed the document for the Committee to review. Chairperson Lathrop suggested that they extract the themes and main points from the document and inform Council that the Commission supports the Transportation Action Plan. Ms. Neely explained that the document contains all of the questions and comments from the Transportation Action Plan discussion. She noted that several of the questions and comments are not relevant to the Transportation Action Plan, such as the questions about CATS projects and NCDOT maintained roads. The Chairperson suggested that

Committee members review the document before the hearing. Commissioner Watkins asked if they should submit their comments to the Chairperson. Chairperson Lathrop said he would appreciate any comments.

Mr. McKinney asked Chairperson Lathrop if he will sign up to speak at the Council hearing. The Chairperson replied yes. He said he will attend since Council suggested that the Commission attend and provide comments. Commissioner Sullivan asked staff to send the meeting information to all Commissioners. Commissioner Fryday said that the request for the Planning Commission and SouthPark group to speak at the hearing came from Council member Lyles.

### **Uptown Connects Study**

Chairperson Lathrop said that the Commission endorsed the Uptown Connects Study and the pilot project at their January work session. Mr. McKinney said since the Uptown Connects Study has not been presented to the full Council, all members may not be familiar with the initiative. He suggested that staff follow-up with Ms. Vivian Coleman (CDOT) to discuss the project schedule and the appropriate way for this endorsement to be most impactful for Council.

The Chairperson said that since Council is going into their retreat and has not set their priorities, it may be appropriate to let Council know that the Commission would like them to make this study a priority. Mr. McKinney said that the details of the Uptown Connects Study will not be a topic of discussion at the Council retreat. He said that Council may not be familiar with the details. He reiterated that staff can follow-up with Ms. Coleman to see when the endorsement would be more meaningful. The Chairperson suggested that the Commission at least inform Council that they endorsed the study so that they are aware of it as they set their priorities. He said it could be revisited later. Commissioner Watkins agreed.

Chairperson Lathrop asked Commissioner Fryday for his thoughts. Commissioner Fryday said that Ms. Colman gave an update to TAP, but he does not know when this item will go to Council. He suggested that the Planning Commission's endorsement be a part of Ms. Coleman's presentation to Council. He also mentioned that Chairperson Lathrop or Mr. McKinney can send a letter to inform Council of the endorsement. The Chairperson said that he did not want to wait to inform Council if Ms. Coleman's presentation is several months away. He asked Mr. McKinney if he knew when this item will go to Council. Mr. McKinney said that testing will be done this year before the pilot and he thinks Council will be briefed before the testing. The Chairperson said he would like to endorse both the testing and the pilot.

The Chairperson suggested that Commissioner Fryday inform the TAP Committee of the Commission's endorsement at the next TAP meeting. The endorsement can then go to the entire Council when Ms. Coleman updates Council.

Chairperson Lathrop asked Vice-Chairperson Sullivan for his thoughts. Vice-Chairperson Sullivan asked if this item will be on the retreat agenda. Mr. McKinney replied no. The Vice-Chairperson said he thinks it should go to TAP first and then to the full Council when Ms. Coleman provides an update. Commissioner Watkins said the Commission is concerned because they do not want their endorsement to become dormant.

The Chairperson asked Commissioner Fryday to coordinate with Council member Lyles on the TAP Committee update. He also asked Mr. McKinney to follow-up with Ms. Coleman to see when it would be appropriate to take the endorsement to full Council. Mr. McKinney asked Ms. Neely to remind him to do this. Mr. McKinney said that there will be a time when the formal endorsement from the Commission will be valuable for Ms. Coleman to share with Council.

Chairperson Lathrop asked that this be on the March Executive Committee agenda to receive updates on Ms. Coleman's schedule and for Commissioner Fryday to give an update from the February TAP meeting. The Committee agreed.

### **Livable City Policy Statement**

Chairperson Lathrop said the Commission reaffirmed the Livable City Policy Statement at the January 2017 work session because they decided not to send it to Council last year. Commissioner Fryday said that although a letter was drafted to Council last year they decided not to send it. He asked if the letter has been sent since the Commission reaffirmed the policy. Mr. McKinney replied no. Chairperson Lathrop said that he informed the TAP Committee of the Livable City Policy Statement last year.

Commissioner Fryday had a copy of the letter that was drafted last year and shared it with the Chairperson. Vice-Chairperson Sullivan asked if it is appropriate to share the letter with Council now. Mr. McKinney said that based on the last work session conversation, the Commission wants to get this in front of the Council at their retreat. He cautioned that there is a difference in presenting the policy as context for the Commission's priorities and how it can influence their discussions versus specifically asking Council to formally adopt the policy. He said that asking them to adopt the policy will be out of context and can potentially be problematic, rather than just being clear about the Commission's priorities.

The Chairperson said that the letter indicates that the Commission offers the Livable City Policy to Council to inform and guide their deliberations and decisions. It does not say the Commission offers it to include in their General Development Policies and act as a policy for the City. Mr. McKinney said he mentioned this concern because the two different perspectives were voiced by Commissioners.

The Chairperson said the Commission could consider several options. Since Council is heading into their retreat and setting their priorities, now could be an appropriate time to ask them to include it as a development policy (unless there is a better time when it will be in context). Another option is to inform the Council of the policy in relation to the UDO process. Chairperson Lathrop asked if there were any other suggestions for how to present this to Council.

Commissioner Watkins asked if the Council retreat agenda is already set. Mr. McKinney replied yes. However, he does not think it is too late for the latter of the options, especially since these priorities have been guiding the Commission and are important for Council to be aware of as they set their priorities. Mr. McKinney further explained that having the principles adopted as part of the General Development Policies would require a separate public engagement process. The Chairperson said he

understood. He asked if it would be the same if they asked Council to adopt the policy by itself (not in relation to the General Development Policies). Mr. McKinney said the adoption of the policy independently is absent any engagement and context of how Council will use it for decisions. He said this can be confusing for Council.

The Chairperson said the Commission can ask Council to adopt the policy. They can explain that last year Council member Lyles challenged the Commission to become more engaged. As a result, the Commission has developed this policy statement that we think Council should consider adopting.

Commissioner Fryday asked if Council will send the policy to the TAP committee for review. The Chairperson said yes. Mr. McKinney said he has been trying to communicate to the Commission that the principles are really driving the Place Types/UDO process. He is concerned that asking Council to adopt the Livable City Policy Statement may confuse Council because the Place Types/UDO process is underway, which will ultimately result in the adoption of a new policy document. However, it is important for the Commission to communicate that the Livable City Policy Statement is the foundation for this major work; and the Commission thinks it is really important for Council to consider the policy in terms of their priorities.

Commissioner Sullivan asked Mr. McKinney if the Commission should wait and present the policy to Council after their retreat. Mr. McKinney replied no. The Chairperson asked what if the Commission sends it now and explains that it is a good policy and now is the time to begin thinking about it.

Commissioner Watkins said the Commission is asking Council to reframe some of the ways they have been doing things in the past. She suggested reminding them that the Place Types and UDO is vitally important and the Commission thinks think it should be guided by these principles.

The Chairperson asked about the Council retreat date. Mr. McKinney said the retreat is next week. The Chairperson said we have to move quickly. Mr. McKinney said he would draft something and send it to the Committee to review. Vice-Chairperson Sullivan suggested that it be presented as part of the UDO presentation to help provide context.

### **Future Work Session Agenda Items**

The Committee reviewed the future work session agenda items. The Chairperson asked that time be allotted on the February agenda for an UDO update. He asked about the Communication Policy agenda item. Commissioner Fryday explained that this item was on the agenda last month but it was not discussed because of time constraints. The Chairperson asked staff to place it on the February agenda.

Chairperson Lathrop said there should be time for one other agenda item. Vice-Chairperson Sullivan suggested that there be a CATS update since there were a lot of questions about CATS projects at the January work session. Mr. McKinney suggested that he check with CDOT staff to see where they are with the timing of the Charlotte Bikes Plan. He also said that the best person to invite from CATS is Mr. John Lewis. He will check on his availability and figure out which of the two topics to place on the agenda based on timing and availability of staff.



### **Approval of the February 6, 2017 Work Session Agenda**

The Committee reviewed the draft February 6 work session agenda. The Chairperson asked if staff will adjust the draft agenda based on the previous agenda item discussion. Ms. Neely replied yes.

Commissioner Watkins asked if the Commission will hear back from Council on the Commission's Livable City Policy recommendation. The Chairperson agreed that it would be good to hear what is discussed at Council's retreat. He asked Mr. McKinney if he will attend the retreat. Mr. McKinney replied yes. The Chairperson asked Mr. McKinney to inform the Commission if the Council discusses the policy (in relation to the UDO), since Council will receive this policy prior to the retreat.

Mr. McKinney reminded the Commission that Council member Lyles suggested that Council continue to be invited to the Planning Commission's work sessions. He recommended that she be invited to the February or March work session to share information from the retreat, Council's priorities, and how they relate specifically to the work of the Commission. Mr. McKinney thinks this may be a better way to have this dialogue. The Chairperson agreed to invite Council member Lyles to the March work session. He suggested that Mr. McKinney give an UDO update in February and share any noteworthy information from the retreat as part of the update.

The Committee approved the February 2017 work session agenda, subject to whether staff is able to arrange for an update on the Bike Plan or CATS as the major agenda item.

### **Approval of the February and March 2017 Meeting Schedules**

The Committee reviewed the February and March calendars. Commissioner Fryday said that he will not be at the February 20 City Council meeting. He explained that he had vacation scheduled for this day before he was rotated to the Zoning Committee. He asked if his absence could be excused since he had plans prior to being rotated to the Zoning Committee. The Chairperson explained that excused absences are not allowed. He asked Commissioner Fryday to inform Ms. Tammie Keplinger that he will not attend the meeting.

Chairperson Lathrop informed Commissioner Watkins that he will not be at the January 25 Zoning Committee meeting and she would need to chair the meeting.

The Chairperson asked if there were any other questions about the calendars. Ms. Neely reminded the Committee that the February Zoning Committee meeting will be held on March 1 because February is a short month. Also, because of the Zoning Committee's new meeting schedule, they will not have a meeting on the last Wednesday in March. Instead, the meeting will be on April 4.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.



## **Attendance**

**Commissioners Present:** Planning Committee Chairperson Mike Sullivan, Planning Committee and Commissioners John Ham, Karen Labovitz, Dionne Nelson and Deborah Ryan

**Planning Staff Present:** Scott Adams, Kathy Cornett, Garet Johnson, Linda Keich, Melony McCullough, Ed McKinney, Grant Meacci and Cheryl Neely

## **Call to Order and Introductions**

Planning Committee Chairperson Sullivan called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m., welcomed those present and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Chairperson Sullivan explained that some of the Planning Commissioners have rotated. Commissioners Eschert and Labovitz are now on the Planning Committee. Vice-Chairperson Fryday and Commissioner McClung have rotated to the Zoning Committee.

Former Planning Committee Vice-Chairperson Fryday is now on the Zoning Committee. Therefore, Chairperson Sullivan opened the floor for nominations for Planning Committee Vice-Chairperson. Commissioner Ham nominated Commissioner Ryan. Commissioner Ryan stated that she declined because she is only on the Commission for another year and that the leadership position needs someone that can carry it through. Commissioner Nelson said she agrees with Commissioner Ryan. In the spirit of seeing the Planning Commission build a leadership platform, Commissioner Nelson nominated Commissioner Ham for Vice-Chair. Commissioner Ryan seconded this nomination. Commissioner Ham declined. No one expressed interest in this position.

Chairperson Sullivan stated that he reached out to some commissioners prior to this meeting to ask if they were interested in this role. He stated that the position has additional responsibilities which include attending more meetings. This item will appear on the February meeting agenda. Commissioner Nelson added that it would be nice to see fresh leadership.

## **Approve December 20, 2016 Minutes**

*A motion was made by Commissioner Ryan and seconded by Commissioner Nelson to approve the December 20, 2016 minutes. The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes.*

## **Unified Development Ordinance and Place Types Update**

Ed McKinney (Planning) reminded the Committee that at their last meeting, staff shared information about the community workshops and what was learned. He explained a handout outlining the current terminology and structure of place types. He stated that staff learned the importance of describing the information in simple terms. He said that it is important to discuss some of the terminology and structure with the Committee before getting into more details.

Grant Meacci (Planning) explained that staff is trying to organize topics based on what people think and explained the tiers and categories. The structure evolved from conversations at community workshops and thoughts about how to describe places. Mr. Meacci said in an effort to simplify the message, consideration was given to reorganizing the place types into understandable categories.

He suggested thinking about neighborhoods and talked about how you might describe residential areas. He gave an example of single family residential being either urban or suburban. If you add a mix of building types such as apartments or townhomes, it would be mixed-residential. You could also add commercial. You have a group of place types that address neighborhoods.

There are a group of place types that are centers. There are more identifiable centers like Center City. Mr. Meacci also mentioned tiers based on the intensity of development. Industrial centers are not included at this time. An industrial center could be in the Westinghouse area or near the airport.

Mr. Meacci said staff has struggled with corridors because many are evolving from transitional to commercial. A mixed use corridor could be urban or suburban. A commercial corridor could be auto or commercial oriented. They could have a different form or different modes of transit but not include mixed uses. This might occur on some of the larger thoroughfares and arterials.

Commissioner Nelson asked if an area is not auto oriented, would you call it a mixed use center. Mr. Meacci replied possibly. He added that there are those in-between centers. You might have a mixed use center like East Boulevard, Park Road, Central Avenue or Beatties Ford Road. Places like Independence Boulevard or parts of Albemarle Road, W.T. Harris Boulevard, Freedom Drive and Wilkinson Boulevard are large transportation areas.

A campus is primarily education and employment specific. You might have an urban or suburban model for education. Commissioner Nelson asked why the airport is considered a center and not a campus. Mr. Meacci answered that the airport is going to change the environment around it and is a variety of things. Commissioner Nelson then asked if there is an expectation that there will be other uses in addition to the airport. Mr. McKinney replied that an airport type is what emerged. There have been discussions about potentially categorizing it as a campus or a center. The airport category is a way to map and describe the significant geography of the airport. The thought about it as a specific type is about the operational geography of the airport which includes the runways, parking facilities and all other components that make the airport. The activity surrounding it may be mixed use development and may be defined appropriately as a mixed use center or as an industrial center. Commissioner Nelson stated that it seems more like a campus like a UNC-Charlotte or Electrolux.

Commissioner Nelson explained that she is trying to understand the difference between a mixed use neighborhood and a mixed use center. Mr. Meacci said that it is the level of intensity or scale. He said that Plaza Midwood has the commercial area and the neighborhood area that has a mix of housing types and commercial uses that might be vastly different in scale than South Park and Ayrslay. Commissioner Nelson asked if South Park is a center. Mr. Meacci said it is a tier one center. He further explained that a tier one center might be similar to Berkeley and have an integrated mix of uses with commercial, retail and office uses that have residential above. He said as you go down that tier it becomes more horizontally mixed use. You could have a commercial center, apartments and townhomes in close proximity but not necessarily stacked. However, they are still walkable and relatively compact.

Commissioner Nelson asked if that is a center and not a neighborhood. She said the latter description sounds like a Central Avenue. Mr. Meacci said that Eastland may become a center and an intersection like Eastway and Central might start to change into a center. There are portions of Central Avenue between these areas that might be a corridor. He said staff is working to make sure we have the right categories and vocabulary. We believe that there are commercial mixed use neighborhoods that need their own description and their own vision.

Commissioner Ryan said she continues to have heartburn over the single family mixed use and mixed residential because the troublesome category titles have just been moved down a layer. Also, when she looks at these categories it seems like there is an implication that we are moving from existing place types to aspirational place types. She is not sure that single family is what we really want anymore. She thinks that we want neighborhoods to have different types of residential.

Commissioner Ryan asked to view the slide that shows the different ways to describe a place. She said the slide addresses place types and not uses. She asked if the excellent language used on this slide can be used to describe categories. If we can refer to a place and a certain density, building height or building setback and call it urban or suburban, we can come up with our own terms. She thinks it does a disservice to use old planning terms because that is what we are trying to move away from. She suggested doing place type diagrams. She thinks the info is so abstract it is difficult to support. Mr. Meacci stated that the mapping will help. In response to her question about single family, he said that it really is a form question rather than a use question. Commissioner Ryan stated that it continues to be confusing. She added her concern about the use of campuses. She suggest that they all be mixed use and does not understand why there is a separation. Mr. Meacci said that the mapping workshops will address some of this.

Ms. Cornett stated it is hard to talk about this information in the abstract. She said staff is fairly comfortable with the big categories in neighborhood centers and corridors, campuses and open space. As you get into the buckets, it becomes more difficult. It is challenging without looking at it on a map. It is easier to understand when you look at an example or a place. Consideration should be given to what it is today and what it wants to be in the future. It is very difficult to talk about this information without looking at examples. She asked if the Committee would like to go through an exercise at a future meeting.

Commissioner Ryan stated a mixed use center is still describing a use not a place. She is concerned about using old vocabulary and does not think we will get to places. She still sees a disconnect because it is not describing the place but the use. Mr. Meacci stated that the Committee could go through a work session and talk through the terms. This might yield different terms. Also, staff could walk through what they did internally with the Committee and this may yield different terms as well. Mr. Meacci said this exercise changed staff thinking and that staff has to test more places.

Ms. Cornett stated that there are some of questions that you have to ask such as what does it look like, how does it connect to things around it, what is around it, how is it parked and how tall is it. You have to ask what is it aspiring to be. Commissioner Nelson asked if staff already has the character descriptions for each place type. Mr. Meacci said staff has rewritten them based on the new structure and some words could change. There is a vision of for each one. Commissioner Ryan asked if it is fair to say those descriptions are saying the same thing. Mr. McKinney said that he takes responsibility for simplifying the descriptions. However, after hearing the concerns about the language at the last meeting, he suggested taking words out and bringing this information back to the Committee in order to figure out the disconnect.

Commissioner Nelson said her concern is that we have a code that the average person can understand. She is still struggling to figure out what a mixed use center looks like and how is it different from a mixed use residential center. She said that when Commissioner Ryan describes character, it makes sense to her. She does not understand a corridor. She never fully understood Centers, Corridors and Wedges and thinks that if we are trying to develop a code that everybody understands, the translation has to be clear.

Mr. Meacci asked if it would be helpful for staff to paint a picture of what each place looks like and include a description of each place type. The Committee could see the difference between place types and began the mapping exercise. Commissioner Nelson said that would be helpful.

Commissioner Labovitz said that she agrees with Commissioners Nelson and Ryan. She does not think that the discussion should be about use but character. She thinks it is confusing that we have mixed use corridors, mixed use centers and mixed use neighborhoods. She does not think that any of them should be called mixed use. They should not all have the same name. You should talk about the character of a neighborhood. From a zoning perspective, if a developer wants to develop multi-family in a single family neighborhood, it is up to the Zoning Committee to say that does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. Commissioner Ryan said that she encourages staff to use words that describe character.

Commissioner Nelson asked if there is a standard for how large an area has to be to get its own label and if we will label neighborhoods block by block. Mr. McKinney stated that this is uniquely challenging because of the way we have historically developed future land use plans. The challenge is starting with our currently adopted land use plans which are very specific about use. Next, developing a system that can clearly translate and include a structure of places with which everyone is comfortable. It also must be easy to understand as well as describe and protect the character of neighborhoods.

Chairperson Sullivan asked if mixed use will be so specific with labels that if you go in one block the use will change. Mr. Meacci said there are many corridors with neighborhoods that may back up to commercial properties. If you know the single family neighborhood is not going to change or you do not want commercial development to infiltrate into the neighborhood, the use could change in one block. Ms. Cornett said that you should not have to go too far into details to differentiate between place types.

Commissioner Nelson said that she is struggling with how you make a decision on a rezoning petition if you use mixed residential vs. single family. In a neighborhood like Brightwalk, if you live in a single family home, residents will want to know if the area is going to be single family or residential of a certain scale. If you use the mixed residential label because you incorporated a multi-family building in the area, all of Brightwalk is labeled mixed residential. A homeowner may be concerned that this designation opens the door for a multi-family rezoning next door. She also expressed concern about how to describe a mixed use corridor. Commissioner Nelson stated that she would like to revisit this at some point. Mr. McKinney said that staff will take a couple of areas and try to better define the character.

Chairperson Sullivan said to some degree, there are two descriptions - what is there now and what will be there in the future. That is some of the confusion. Different words can be used. It would help to see this is the place type now and this is the place type in the future. A lot more details are needed. Commissioner Ryan stated that the new *Historic District Commission Handbook* is excellent in describing place types and she could share the link with the Committee.

## **Mandatory Referral Process**

Chairperson Sullivan gave a brief overview of the mandatory referral discussions that have taken place in recent months for the benefit of Commissioner Labovitz, the newest Committee member. Ms. Johnson (Planning) noted that in October 2016, staff gave a presentation on the Mandatory Referral Process and the Committee had numerous questions and concerns. As a result, the Committee wants to make sure that mandatory referrals are evaluated appropriately and that Committee concerns are communicated to the appropriate parties.

Previously, the Committee discussed at length whether to vote to approve or not approve mandatory referrals. The Committee did not want to vote to approve or not approve, they wanted to either have additional comments or no comments. Ms. Johnson presented more detailed information about the revised process that was included in the agenda packet and explained what is being proposed for adoption. She emphasized that the Committee will begin using the new process at this meeting. She also reviewed the timeline for the Mandatory Referral Review Process and highlighted key activities.

Commissioner Ryan suggested that staff include any concerns they may have under the section titled "conclusions." Ms. Johnson said that staff could mention concerns there or clearly state any concerns elsewhere in the report. Commissioner Nelson said this makes the process clearer and supports the text with a few notes. She asked if the Committee decides who receives the comment. Ms. Johnson answered yes. Commissioner Nelson also asked if the transmittal list is a proposed list. Ms. Johnson replied yes and stated that the list is for guidance and could change in the future. Commissioner Nelson noted that the list varies by agency and should be more consistent. If you compare the list, the city's list implies that comments will be sent to all council members and that the county's list implies that comments will only be sent to the chair. She further noted that department heads and key executives of the submitting staff should be notified. She recommends revising the list of contacts to make them consistent across all agencies.

*A motion was made by Commissioner Nelson and seconded by Commissioner Ham to approve the Mandatory Referral Process dated January 23, 2017 with the recommended changes. The vote was unanimous to approve the Mandatory Referral Process.*

## **Mandatory Referrals**

**M.R. #17-01:** Charlotte Real Estate and Mecklenburg County Asset Management propose to transfer the Police Activities League building located on Oaklawn Avenue from county to city ownership.

**M.R. #17-02:** County Asset Management proposes a land exchange along Stewart Creek in the W. Morehead Street/Freedom Drive area to enable greenway development.

Chairperson Sullivan asked if anyone wished to discuss or receive additional information on the mandatory referrals. There was no discussion of the mandatory referrals.

*A motion was made by Commissioner Ryan and seconded by Commissioner Nelson to state that the Planning Committee has reviewed M.R. # 17-01 and M.R. # 17-02 and has no additional comments for the submitting agency. The vote was unanimous to state that the Planning Committee has reviewed the mandatory referrals and has no additional comments for the submitting agency.*

Commissioner Nelson and the Committee thanked staff for their patience and hard work on the Mandatory Referral Process.

Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.





**CHARLOTTE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MEETING AGENDA – FEBRUARY 8, 2017 ROOM 267 ON THE 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR.  
HDC WORKSHOP – 12:00 PM THE PUBLIC IS WELCOME TO ATTEND**

**HDC WORKSHOP – 12:00 PM**

**HDC MEETING: 1:00 – 7:00**

- CALL TO ORDER
- APPROVAL OF DECEMBER MINUTES
- APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

**CONTINUED**

1. 632 GRANDIN ROAD **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-291](#)  
WESLEY HEIGHTS  
CLEMENT ASHFORD, OWNER
2. 1422 THE PLAZA **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-299](#)  
PLAZA MIDWOOD  
KAREY DIGH, APPLICANT
3. 1564 S. MINT STREET **DENIED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-315](#)  
WILMORE  
JOE BENNETT, APPLICANT
4. 248 W. KINGSTON AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-320](#)  
WILMORE  
ASHLEY JIMENEZ, APPLICANT

**NEW CONSTRUCTION**

5. 1816 WICKFORD PLACE **CONTINUED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-321](#)  
WILMORE  
CRAIG CALCASOLA, APPLICANT
6. 1816 WICKFORD PLACE **CONTINUED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-322](#)  
WILMORE  
CRAIG CALCASOLA, APPLICANT
7. 1816 WICKFORD PLACE **CONTINUED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-323](#)  
WILMORE  
CRAIG CALCASOLA, APPLICANT
8. 1816 WICKFORD PLACE **CONTINUED**  
CASE No. [HDC 2016-324](#)  
WILMORE  
CRAIG CALCASOLA, APPLICANT

**ADDITIONS**

9. 247 W. KINGSTON AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDCRMA [2017-00012](#)  
WILMORE  
BRADLEE JOHNSON, APPLICANT
10. 619 E. TREMONT AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE N. HDCADMRM [2017-00016](#)  
DILWORTH  
ZACK ALSENTZER, APPLICANT
11. 620 WOODRUFF PLACE **CONTINUED**  
CASE No. HDCRMA [2017-00025](#)  
WESLEY HEIGHTS  
ALEXANDER ALTMAN, APPLICANT
12. 827 BERKELEY AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDCRMI [2017-00026](#)  
DILWORTH  
KENT LINEBERGER, APPLICANT
13. 1619 LYNDBURST AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDCRMA [2017-00032](#)  
DILWORTH  
JEFF MCAVENY, APPLICANT

**ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

14. 300 W. PARK AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDC [2016-317](#)  
WILMORE  
JUSTIN NIFONG, APPLICANT
15. 729 WOODRUFF PLACE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDCADMRM [2017-00010](#)  
WESLEY HEIGHTS  
GREGORY POWELL, APPLICANT
16. 1319 THOMAS AVENUE **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDCRMI [2017-00031](#)  
PLAZA MIDWOOD  
DIANE HOPPER, APPLICANT

**TREE REMOVAL**

17. 416 N. POPLAR STREET **APPROVED**  
CASE No. HDCADMRM [2017-00004](#)  
FOURTH WARD  
TONY WARD, APPLICANT



CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING COMMISSION  
FY 2017 ACTION PLAN

At the 2016 Planning Commission's Retreat, the following strategic priorities were identified for fiscal year 2017.

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES	ASSIGNMENT
<b>1. Unified Development Ordinance &amp; Place Type Policy</b> <b>Key Topics</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advisory Committee</li><li>• Place Type/Community Character Policy</li><li>• UDO Draft</li><li>• TOD and PED Implementation Strategy</li></ul> <b>Status:</b> Ongoing	Planning Committee
<b>2. Initiate Review of Pedestrian Overlay District (PED)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review PED ordinance standards &amp; application</li><li>• Identify and document key issues</li></ul> <b>Status:</b> Review to be conducted with Planning Committee in early 2017.	Planning Committee
<b>3. Update &amp; Implement Communication Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Establish a Communications Committee</li><li>• Facilitate quarterly discussion (at scheduled work sessions) with invited City Council members</li><li>• Develop communication policy and identify actions to increase dialog with City Council</li></ul> <b>Status:</b> In process. Communications Committee formed with Commissioners Fryday (Chair), Ryan, and Spencer.	Communications Committee
<b>4. Update &amp; Revise Livable City Policy Statement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Address community safety</li></ul> <b>Status:</b> Complete. Commissioner Ryan drafted a statement to address community safety. The Commission reviewed the statement and agreed to revise the Livable City Policy to reflect this change on November 7, 2016.	Full Planning Commission
<b>5. Review Affordable Housing Policies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review current city policies</li><li>• Review city, county, CMS and other programs and initiatives</li><li>• Review state regulations/legislation</li></ul> <b>Status:</b> Complete. Pamela Wideman (N&BS) led a discussion on affordable housing programs at the November 7, 2016 work session.	Full Planning Commission