September 21, 2026
Zoning Meeting
Meeting Book 163, Page 390

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Zoning Meeting on Monday, September 21, 2026, at 4:03 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Robert Harrington presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, and James Mitchell.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Danté Anderson, J.D. Mazuera Arias, Joi Mayo, Kimberly Owens, and Victoria Watlington

* * * * * * *

Mayor Harrington said the September 21, 2026, Zoning Meeting. As a reminder we will begin with decisions and move to Zoning Public Hearings at 5:00 p.m. We will have a hard stop a few minutes before 6:30 p.m. so that we can transition to the next item on our Agenda. We will begin our meeting with the introduction of those who are at the dais.

* * * * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Owens arrived at 4:04 p.m.

Councilmember Ajmera gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias arrived at 4:04 p.m.

Councilmember Mayo arrived at 4:05 p.m.

* * * * * * *

EXPLANATION OF THE ZONING MEETING PROCESS

Mayor Harrington explained the Zoning Meeting rules and procedures.

* * * * * * *

INTRODUCTION OF THE ZONING COMMITTEE

Douglas Welton, Chairman of the Zoning Committee said good evening, everyone. My name is Douglas A. Welton. I am the Chairman of the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission. Allow me to introduce my fellow committee members. They include Melissa Gaston, Will Russell, Shana Neeley, Robin Stuart, Carolyn Millen, and Andrew Blumenthal. The Zoning Committee will meet on Tuesday, October 6, 2026, at 5:30 p.m. At that meeting, the Zoning Committee will meet and discuss and make recommendations on the petitions that have a public hearing here tonight. The public is welcome to attend that meeting, but please note it is not a continuation of the public hearings. Prior to that meeting, you are welcome to contact us and provide any input. You can find contact information and information about each one of the petitions on the city's website at charlotteplanning.org. Thank you very much, and back to you, Mayor.

* * * * * * *

DEFERRALS / WITHDRAWALS

Mayor Harrington said thank you. Are there any deferrals or withdrawals on the agenda this afternoon?

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said yes, we have several, including some that were not reflected in the published agenda.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Mayo to defer: a decision on Item No. 6, Petition No. 2026-029 by Rachel Regalado to October 19, 2026, a decision on Item No. 10, Petition No. 2025-086 by Pence Road Development, LLC to October 19, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 15, Petition No. 2024-143 by Panorama Development, LLC to October 19, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 16, Petition No. 2026-027 by C4 Investments, LLC dba Crosland Southeast to October 19, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 17, Petition No. 2026-042 by Eminent Investments, LLC to October 19, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 20, Petition No. 2026-030 by Olympia & Wright LLC to October 19, 2026, a hearing on Item No. 21, Petition No. 2026-034 by Sam's Mart, LLC to October 19, 2026, and a withdraw of Item No. 9, Petition No. 2025-133 by Carolinas Properties III, LLC.

Councilmember Johnson said what item did you say was withdrawn?

Ms. Cramer said that would be Item No. 9, Petition 2025-133, by Carolinas Properties III. It went to public hearing several months ago now. I can get that exact date for you, but I believe it was in June 2026 or May 2026.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said did you say 20 and 21 for deferral?

Ms. Cramer said that's right.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimous.

* * * * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 3 THROUGH 8 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS PULLED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE PULLED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

Mayor Harrington said please note that these petitions meet the following criteria. Had no public opposition to the petition at hearing, staff recommends approval, Zoning Committee recommends approval, and there were no changes after the Zoning Committee's recommendations. Are there any Consent Agenda items Council would like to pull for a separate vote?

Motion was made by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented and adopt the Zoning Committee's statement of consistency with the exception of Item No. 6 which was deferred.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 3: Ordinance No. 1187-Z, Petition No. 2025-123 by Sanders Partnership, LLC amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 61.26 acres located east of Kelly Road, north of Pleasant Grove Road, and west of Weston Woods Lane from N1-A (Neighborhood 1-A) to N1-D(CD) (Neighborhood 1-D, Conditional).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Gaston, seconded by Millen) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the West Middle Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the Area Plan: 7: Integrated Natural & Built Environments by dedicating a greenway easement and a three-acre park site to Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation; and The petition is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The proposed rezoning is consistent with the goals and policies of the recently adopted West Middle Community Area Plan (CAP). The plan aligns with Place Type 5 (PT-5). The PT-5 criteria establish standards to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding residential patterns by evaluating factors such as lot size and configuration, street frontage types, and the location of the parcel within the block (e.g., mid-block or corner), with the goal of maintaining cohesive neighborhood character. The proposed rezoning aligns with the PT-5 criteria, as the petition covers more than 61 acres and is located outside any established neighborhood. Therefore, establishing its own consistent lot pattern. The site is located at the intersection of Kelly Road and Pleasant Grove Road. It is accessed via Kelly Road, which is designated as a Collector Street by the Charlotte Streets Map. The site has frontage on Pleasant Grove Road which is designated as a 2+ Lane Avenue. The plan proposes dedication of a greenway easement and a three-acre park site to Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation. The site is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map designation of Neighborhood 1 Place Type. The plan proposes low-intensity, single family detached dwellings along streets built to the standards of the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual (CLDSM). The site is not within walking distance of transit or Activity Center Place Types thereby conforming to the low-intensity character of the established residential area.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 212-213.

Item No. 4: Ordinance No. 1188, Petition No. 2026-011 by Tribute Companies, Inc. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 2.20 acres located south of North Tryon Street, west of Caldwell Road, and north of Lempira Lane from R-12MF(CD) (Multi-Family Residential, Conditional) to NC(CD) (Neighborhood Center, Conditional).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Millen, seconded by Blumenthal) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the Northeast Middle & Outer Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goal of the Area Plan: Goal 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by development of a Neighborhood Center site which has the potential to increase access to a concentration of daily goods and services within a half mile of residential sites. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 2 Place Type but meets Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood Center Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: This petition is modifying the previously approved petition, RZP-2021-150, that originally showed the site proposing exclusively residential development. The new proposal for a portion of the site changes the layout and uses to a neighborhood serving commercial and retail site that in conjunction with the original development offers the opportunity for a “park once” scenario increasing non-auto access to amenities, goods, and services that may enhance the overall mix of uses within the area. The Neighborhood Center district promotes walkable, compact development and allows for a range of retail and commercial uses that can provide everyday services close to existing housing. The petition commits to a 25-foot Class B landscape yard to the adjacent N1-A property. The plan commits to developing up to 22,725 square feet of nonresidential space to ensure a mix of uses. It prohibits certain

uses that are incompatible with th-e district's character. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 2 Place Type to the Neighborhood Center Place Type for the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 214-215.

Item No. 5: Ordinance No. 1189-Z, Petition No. 2026-026 by Nativity of the Holy Virgin Orthodox Church amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 2.81 acres located north of Mineral Springs Road, east of North Graham Street, and west of Century Oaks Lane from N2-B (Neighborhood 2-B) to N2-A (Neighborhood 2-A).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Gaston, seconded by Neeley) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the North Middle & Outer Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as a Neighborhood 2 Place Type by the North Middle & Outer Community Area Plan and the 2040 Policy Map. The request is in alignment with the site's Place Type designation and Community Area Plan goals. The proposed zoning represents a slight decrease in intensity over the existing N2-B entitlements. The N2-A district permits religious institutions and their accessory uses. This zoning designation is well-suited for areas like this that are less urban in character but in proximity to commercial areas and major transportation corridors.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 216-217.

Item No. 7: Ordinance No. 1190-Z, Petition No. 2026-032 by Savalex Homes, LLC amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 1.39 acres located east of Thriftwood Drive, north of Freedom Drive, and south of Marble Street from N1-C (Neighborhood 1-C) to N1-D(CD) (Neighborhood 1-D, Conditional).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Millen, seconded by Blumenthal) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the West Middle Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as a Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the West Middle Community Area Plan and the 2040 Policy Map. The request is in alignment with the site's Place Type designation. The proposed zoning represents a slight increase in intensity over the existing N1-C entitlements although the conditions of the proposal limit development to single family uses and would create fewer lots than currently exist on the site. The primary difference between N1-C (current zoning) and N1-D(CD) (proposed zoning) is in dimensional standards, such as lot size and lot width. The site meets Place Type 5 criteria using the Creating Complete Communities policy guidance in the Community Area Plan. The PT-5 criteria establish standards to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding residential patterns by evaluating factors such as lot size and configuration, street frontage types, and the location of the parcel within the block (e.g., mid-block or corner), with the goal of maintaining cohesive neighborhood character. Given the lack of established lot pattern in the area and the location of the site, the petition substantively meets PT-5 criteria.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 218-219.

Item No. 8: Ordinance No. 1191-Z, Petition No. 2026-037 by Historical Excelsior, Inc. amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Charlotte to affect a change in zoning for approximately 0.88 acres located west of Beatties Ford Road, south of Sanders Avenue, and east of Campus Street from NC (Neighborhood Center) and N1-C (Neighborhood 1-C) to CAC-1(EX) (Community Activity Center, Exception) and N2-C(CD) (Neighborhood 2-C, Conditional).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Gaston, seconded by Neeley) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the West Inner Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The majority of the petition is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood Center Place Type. A portion of the petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type but meets Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood Center Place Type. However, a portion of the site does not meet Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: While a portion of the site area is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map designation of the Neighborhood Center and Neighborhood 1 Place Types, the proposed plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the West Inner Community Area Plan. The petition advances the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the West Inner Community Area Plan by proposing reconstruction of the original Excelsior Club, a significant historic landmark for the neighborhood and the city. Reestablishing the historical use creates a community gathering space that may include a live performance venue, nightclub, restaurant/bar, and community center. The petition proposes a mixed use building oriented towards the street creating a pedestrian friendly environment. It commits to a maximum height of 40 feet, which is half the 80-foot height permitted in CAC-1 zoning district, better aligning with the intent and vision of the Neighborhood Activity Center Place Type. The site is located along the proposed CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 3 extension a future Gold Line Route. The petition commits to improving the pedestrian network by rebuilding a nearby ramp to meet ADA standards, consistent with the Neighborhood Activity Center Place Type. The petition enhances open space by increasing the required on-site open space from 10% to 15% and providing at least 5% publicly accessible open space, improving community access to the site. The petitioner will also replace the existing Washington Heights neighborhood identification sign with a new sign along Beatties Ford Road. The petition could facilitate the following 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by increasing non-residential uses in the community that may include live performance venue, nightclub, restaurant/bar, community center and other uses, which could serve as access to amenities to the surrounding communities. 9: Retain Our Identity & Charm may be facilitated by re-creating a replica of the original Excelsior Club, a significant historic landmark. The petition also includes coordination with the Historic Landmark Commission on the project and commits to working with the Washington Heights community to install a new neighborhood identification sign that recognizes the community's historic character. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from the Neighborhood 1 Place Type to the Neighborhood 2 and the Neighborhood Center Place Types for a portion of the site.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 220-221.

* * * * * * *

DECISIONS

ITEM NO. 11: ORDINANCE NO. 1192-Z, PETITION NO. 2026-019 BY ACRO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 22.89 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF MOREHEAD ROAD, WEST OF STOWE LANE,

AND EAST OF OLD HOLLAND ROAD FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) TO ML-2(CD) (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-2, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 7-0 (motion by Stuart, seconded by Gaston) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the North Middle & Outer Community Area Plan based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the Area Plan: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic opportunity may be supported by development of this site, which is connected to a portion of the same property in Concord (Cabarrus County) as part of a research campus for the motorsports industry which has the potential to generate a substantial number of jobs across a wide range of skill levels. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type but meets Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: This site is in a more rural area of Charlotte's ETJ and, although adjacent to Neighborhood 1 (N1), it is not within or adjacent to a neighborhood. Its context aligns more closely with the expanding Cabarrus County motorsports campus. The petition may include Industrial and Research & Development type uses to expand and complement the existing Hendrick Motorsport Campus. Although Manufacturing and Logistics Place Types are generally not ideal adjacent to N1, the petition includes a 100-foot Class A landscape yard along the northwestern boundary abutting the existing Neighborhood 1 zoning district, as well as 25-foot Class B landscape yards along both the Morehead Road and Old Holland Road frontages. In addition to providing landscape yards, the Petitioner acknowledges the need to be responsive of neighbors and agrees that all principal uses on the site will operate within fully enclosed buildings. No manufacturing, fabrication, processing, or assembly activities may take place outside of an enclosed structure. The Petitioner commits that any noise-producing activities on the site will comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood 1 Place Type to Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type for the site.

The petitioner made the following changes to the petition after the Zoning Committee vote. Therefore, the City Council must determine if the changes are substantial and if the petition should be referred back to the Zoning Committee for review.

1. Commits that a majority of the Class A landscape yard will be undisturbed. A portion along the northern half may be disturbed to accommodate stormwater controls but will still be planted to Class A standards.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said so, if you recall, this petition was before you for decision last month. This is the Hendrick Motorsports Complex Expansion of the facility that's on the county line, and they are proposing the ML-2 Conditional District. The conversation that we had last month, Councilmember Mayo asked whether or not the petitioner could consider committing to an undisturbed buffer. Petitioner team went back and studied this commitment. That's the change that was made. Staff believes the change is minor and does not warrant additional review.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously not to refer back to the Zoning Committee.

Councilmember Anderson arrived at 4:13 p.m.

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the North Middle & Outer Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the Area Plan: 8: Diverse & Resilient Economic opportunity may be supported by development of this site, which is connected to a portion of the same property in Concord (Cabarrus County) as part of a research campus for the motorsports industry which has the potential to generate a substantial number of jobs across a wide range of skill levels. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type but meets Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: This site is in a more rural area of Charlotte's ETJ and, although adjacent to Neighborhood 1 (N1), it is not within or adjacent to a neighborhood. Its context aligns more closely with the expanding Cabarrus County motorsports campus. The petition may include Industrial and Research & Development type uses to expand and complement the existing Hendrick Motorsport Campus. Although Manufacturing and Logistics Place Types are generally not ideal adjacent to N1, the petition includes a 100-foot Class A landscape yard along the northwestern boundary abutting the existing Neighborhood 1 zoning district, as well as 25-foot Class B landscape yards along both the Morehead Road and Old Holland Road frontages. In addition to providing landscape yards, the Petitioner acknowledges the need to be responsive of neighbors and agrees that all principal uses on the site will operate within fully enclosed buildings. No manufacturing, fabrication, processing, or assembly activities may take place outside of an enclosed structure. The Petitioner commits that any noise-producing activities on the site will comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood 1 Place Type to Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type for the site, as modified.

Councilmember Watlington arrived at 4:14 p.m.

Councilmember Mayo said Holly, just want to appreciate the time, and also the petitioner, and the work that Bridget has done on this as well. As District Three continues to grow steadily, partly because of our proximity to the Blue Line, I am very glad that Council is really taking into consideration additional undisturbed buffers. Even this Friday, I walked the neighborhood in Yorkmount after we did a rezoning, and the real issue is that we have to be thoughtful of when we are building additional infrastructure in neighborhoods and projects near single-family. We want to make sure that our residents are not feeling enclosed by buildings and things like that. So, thank you so much for having an undisturbed buffer. I think that really helps our residents feel more thoughtful and more heard when it comes to development in their neighborhood, that they are not completely losing control, that they have a modicum of support from the City. So, I just want to thank the petitioner for the insight, thinking thoughtfully of how we are allowing development, because this is something I am seeing on a regular basis, particularly in District Three, when we're not being thoughtful of the separation of developments and projects near existing single family. So, I will continue to push for this for our development community. Just want you to know that before ya'll come. I hope that you'll be thoughtful of that, because I like us to do the work in the front end instead of the back end. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you, Mayor, and although this petition is not in District Three, it's in District Four.

Ms. Mayo said oh I know it's not in my district, yes.

Ms. Johnson said no, I was going to say thank you. Thank you for raising that question, and I think this helps us to raise the bar in all of our districts. So, thank you for bringing that to our attention, and thank you to the petitioner for conceding with that and agreeing to work with us. So, we appreciate it, and I look forward to supporting it. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes, and I just want to thank the District Rep. I remember last month when this came up, you supported the deferral and developer agreed with the deferral. So, thanks to the developer for setting the bar really high for others to follow, I appreciate that, and hopefully we will see more like this where we see undisturbed buffer. That's all I have.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimous.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 222-223.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: ORDINANCE NO. 1193-Z, PETITION NO. 2026-028 BY BARNHARDT MANUFACTURING AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 21.25 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF HAWTHORNE LANE, NORTH OF CENTRAL AVENUE, AND WEST OF PECAN AVENUE FROM ML-2 (MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS-2) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Blumenthal, seconded by Millen) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the Northeast Inner Community Area Plan based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goal of the area plan: 4: Trail & Transit Oriented Development by transitioning the zoning at a site that contains future CityLYNX Gold Line infrastructure from Manufacturing & Logistics to an activity center zoning designation that is proposed to contain a mix of uses. The petition is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood Center Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest because the site is located within an area designated as the Neighborhood Center Place Type on the 2040 Policy Map. The proposal is consistent with the goals and policies of the Northeast Inner Community Area Plan. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for Neighborhood Center Place Type to be pedestrian and bicycle friendly areas where nearby residents can access daily goods and services within a short walk, bike, transit trip, or drive. The planned CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 3 extension will run through the site, with a future station located within its boundaries. The petitioner has committed to constructing a new public street that will serve as the right-of-way for the Gold Line extension and to coordinating with the Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) to minimize utility conflicts and relocations. The plan commits to developing at least 20,000 square feet of nonresidential space to ensure a mix of uses. It prohibits certain uses, such as gas stations, auto repair shops, and auto dealerships, that would be incompatible with the walkable, mixed-use, and transit-oriented vision for the site. The plan includes one or more pocket parks of at least one-half acre, to serve as publicly accessible open space. The petition could facilitate the following additional 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by proposing a mixed-use development that may include multi-family stacked residential and include a minimum of 20,000 square feet of non-residential uses, which could help provide goods, services, and amenities within close proximity to residents.

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency:

This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the Northeast Inner Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goal of the area plan: 4: Trail & Transit Oriented Development by transitioning the zoning at a site that contains future CityLYNX Gold Line infrastructure from Manufacturing & Logistics to an activity center zoning designation that is proposed to contain a mix of uses. The petition is in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood Center Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest because the site is located within an area designated as the Neighborhood Center Place Type on the 2040 Policy Map. The proposal is consistent with the goals and policies of the Northeast Inner Community Area Plan. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for Neighborhood Center Place Type to be pedestrian and bicycle friendly areas where nearby residents can access daily goods and services within a short walk, bike, transit trip, or drive. The planned CityLYNX Gold Line Phase 3 extension will run through the site, with a future station located within its boundaries. The petitioner has committed to constructing a new public street that will serve as the right-of-way for the Gold Line extension and to coordinating with the Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS) to minimize utility conflicts and relocations. The plan commits to developing at least 20,000 square feet of nonresidential space to ensure a mix of uses. It prohibits certain uses, such as gas stations, auto repair shops, and auto dealerships, that would be incompatible with the walkable, mixed-use, and transit-oriented vision for the site. The plan includes one or more pocket parks of at least one-half acre, to serve as publicly accessible open space. The petition could facilitate the following additional 2040 Comprehensive Plan Goals: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by proposing a mixed-use development that may include multi-family stacked residential and include a minimum of 20,000 square feet of non-residential uses, which could help provide goods, services, and amenities within close proximity to residents.

Councilmember Mayfield said I want to take a moment to, one, thank Mayor Pro Tem Mitchell. He and I worked with community back in 2024. This was the landfill area that went through multiple discussions, and what is being proposed tonight is housing development in an area that needs additional housing, but more importantly did not a landfill. So, I am happy that we are at this place tonight. Most people know I'm not a fan of too many units. Yet, for where we came from in a couple of years, I do want to publically acknowledge the work that you did, because you led this conversation. We attended numerous meetings out in community together, but you really took hold of this particular conversation regarding the landfill and hearing from the community.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said I just want to clarify, this is item number 12, and Petition 2026-028.

Ms. Mayfield said so, I did all that on the wrong one even with my glasses on?

Councilmember Mitchell said I appreciate the love.

Mayor Harrington said we're going to consider that an advanced commendation for Mayor Pro Tem from Councilmember Mayfield.

Ms. Mayfield said so, when that landfill one comes up, ya'll already know and understand that.

Mayor Harrington said we got it.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimous.

Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said Councilmember Mayfield, just wanted to let you know that that petition was Item No. 3, so it was approved in consent.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you, I knew it was in there, yes, even with my glasses, but thank you.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 224-225.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: ORDINANCE NO. 1194-Z, PETITION NO. 2026-031 BY CHARLOTTE PIPE AND FOUNDRY CO. AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.48 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF MORAVIAN LANE, WEST OF PROVIDENCE ROAD, AND EAST OF HERMITAGE ROAD FROM N1-C (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-C) TO NC(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Neeley, seconded by Gaston) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the South Inner Community Area Plan based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition does not facilitate the priority goals of the South Inner Community Area Plan. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type and does not meet Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood Center Place Type. However, we find this petition to be unreasonable and not in the public interest, based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition's proximity to the Neighborhood Center place type. The petition's immediate adjacency to the existing mix of uses along Moravian Lane. The petition does not negatively impact housing and the City's broader housing initiative. The petition's site plan and conditional notes exceed city standards and addresses stormwater concerns. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood 1 to Neighborhood Center for the site.

Motion was made by Councilmember Owens, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the South Inner Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition does not facilitate the priority goals of the South Inner Community Area Plan. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type and does not meet Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood Center Place Type. However, we find this petition to be unreasonable and not in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition's proximity to the Neighborhood Center place type. The petition's immediate adjacency to the existing mix of uses along Moravian Lane. The petition does not negatively impact housing and the City's broader housing initiative. The petition's site plan and conditional notes exceed city standards and addresses stormwater concerns. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map, from Neighborhood 1 to Neighborhood Center for the site.

Councilmember Mayo said just wanted to talk again about thanking the petitioner about thinking outside the box with this. I know we kind of asked for the next level when it comes to environmental protection. We know that this site had some stormwater issues, and we lobbied, or asked the petitioner to think about pervious concrete. So, as we're thinking about sites and redeveloping sites, I'm glad to see that we're thinking

through eco-friendly construction. I think that is important, particularly as our city continues to grow. I know that's something we talked about in our Housing Committee, the fact that we should be thinking about environmental and green infrastructure for some of our building sites. I think this is something a bit different, thinking about how are we allowing stormwater to not kind of be such a pain, because we're getting these crazy storm surges, you'll get all this rain, and what effect can that have on the neighbors for a site that could be expanded like this. So, once again, I do want to thank the petitioner and their attorney for conceding to this and agreeing to it. I think that is a type of proactive work that we need. If you know a site has stormwater issues, how are you working on that in the front end? This Council, I think, is going to continue to challenge developers to go above and beyond, so that we can create the best outcomes for all of our residents, future residents that may be living in that area and current residents. So, I am happy to support this and looking forward to continuing to work together and thinking through best practices.

Councilmember Owens said thank you, Councilmember Mayo. I'm excited about this one, because Charlotte Pipe and Foundry is an important and really thoughtful resident of District Six. I've been to their properties, and I said earlier to someone, that they put the park in parking lot. I'm assuming this will be no more beautiful a space than the ones that I've seen them do before. The manicured lawns and just really an attention to detail that bar none is also really welcomed by this community. Couple that with the stormwater improvements that we're anticipating seeing, I really think this is going to be a win for this area. It's just a small parcel, so we've probably talked about it more than enough, but I'm very excited to advance this. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I just want to comment, this is an instance that comes along from time to time where staff does not recommend approval of the petition, and if we approve it that is not in any way a repudiation of the work of staff. They interpret our rules and they reach a conclusion, and then we have the right in the public interest to decide as we see fit. So, I just hope that people understand this is not a rejection of staff's recommendation. It is simply a public interest decision that I expect we're going to make.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimous.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 226-227.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: ORDINANCE NO. 1195-Z, PETITION NO. 2026-035 BY DREAMKEY PARTNERS AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TO AFFECT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.00 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF BEATTIES FORD ROAD, SOUTH OF SLATER ROAD, AND NORTH OF CINDY LANE FROM N1-B (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-B) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 (motion by Blumenthal, seconded by Russell) to recommend approval of this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the West Middle Community Area Plan based on the information from the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the area plan: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by developing new housing in a location that has convenient access to neighborhood serving daily needs such as a daycare, grocery, retail, medical, and fitness uses. The site is accessible by existing sidewalks along Beatties Ford Road, as well as nearby bus stops, to further enhance connectivity. 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion may be facilitated by developing 64 additional multi-family attached townhome dwelling units, including a mix of duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type but meets Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from

the post-hearing staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as the Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed zoning of N2-A(CD) (Neighborhood 2-A, conditional) is not in alignment with the Policy Map recommendation. However, the plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the West Middle Community Area Plan and meets minor map amendment criteria to transition to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. The site is in an area containing a mix of single-family, multi-family, commercial, and institutional uses. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for the development of multi-family housing along major roadways with access to public transportation, and options for active forms for transportation like walking and bicycling. The site fronts Beatties Ford Road, which the Charlotte Streets Map identifies as a 4+ Lane Avenue, an Arterial Street, and a major corridor. The site is within walking distance of CATS bus stops. The plan provides a 12-foot multi-use path along the site's frontage, improving existing pedestrian facilities. The site abuts a recently approved multi-family attached townhome development to the south and will gain access through this development at the signalized intersection of Beatties Ford Road and Capps Mine Road. The site is adjacent to the McCrory YMCA and within a half-mile walk of daily needs such as daycare, grocery, retail, and medical uses. The Zoning Committee specified that a pedestrian connection from the interior of the site, through Development Area A, should be constructed to allow residents direct access to Beatties Ford Road and the CATS bus stop located along the site's frontage. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map (2022) from Neighborhood 1 Place Type to Neighborhood 2 for the site.

The petitioner made the following changes to the petition after the Zoning Committee vote. Therefore, the City Council must determine if the changes are substantial and if the petition should be referred back to the Zoning Committee for review.

1. A direct sidewalk connection from Public Street B to Beatties Ford Road will be provided through Development Area A.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said Zoning Committee made their recommendation for approval contingent upon the petitioner including a sidewalk connection, which was also an outstanding issue from staff. At the time, the petitioner wasn't sure if they were going to be able to accommodate that request, but following review after Zoning Committee, they were able to make a change to commit to providing such access. So, we believe this is a positive change, and this change is also minor and does not warrant additional review by Zoning Committee.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Graham, and carried unanimously not to refer back to the Zoning Committee.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Graham, and carried unanimously to approve this petition and adopt the following statement of consistency: This petition is found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the West Middle Community Area Plan based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition may facilitate the following priority goals of the area plan: 1: 10 Minute Neighborhoods may be facilitated by developing new housing in a location that has convenient access to neighborhood serving daily needs such as a daycare, grocery, retail, medical, and fitness uses. The site is accessible by existing sidewalks along Beatties Ford Road, as well as nearby bus stops, to further enhance connectivity. 2: Neighborhood Diversity & Inclusion may be facilitated by developing 64 additional multi-family attached townhome dwelling units, including a mix of duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes. The petition is not in alignment with the 2040 Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood 1 Place Type but meets Minor Map

Amendment Criteria for a change to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the final staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The site is designated as the Neighborhood 1 Place Type by the 2040 Policy Map. The proposed zoning of N2-A(CD) (Neighborhood 2-A, conditional) is not in alignment with the Policy Map recommendation. However, the plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the West Middle Community Area Plan and meets minor map amendment criteria to transition to the Neighborhood 2 Place Type. The site is in an area containing a mix of single-family, multi-family, commercial, and institutional uses. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan calls for the development of multi-family housing along major roadways with access to public transportation, and options for active forms for transportation like walking and bicycling. The site fronts Beatties Ford Road, which the Charlotte Streets Map identifies as a 4+ Lane Avenue, an Arterial Street, and a major corridor. The site is within walking distance of CATS bus stops. The plan provides a 12-foot multi-use path along the site's frontage, improving existing pedestrian facilities. The site abuts a recently approved multi-family attached townhome development to the south and will gain access through this development at the signalized intersection of Beatties Ford Road and Capps Mine Road. The site is adjacent to the McCrory YMCA and within a half-mile walk of daily needs such as daycare, grocery, retail, and medical uses. The Zoning Committee specified that a pedestrian connection from the interior of the site, through Development Area A, should be constructed to allow residents direct access to Beatties Ford Road and the CATS bus stop located along the site's frontage. The approval of this petition will revise the recommended place type as specified by the 2040 Policy Map (2022) from Neighborhood 1 Place Type to Neighborhood 2 for the site, as modified.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 228-229.

The meeting was recessed at 4:26 p.m. because Public Hearings were advertised to start at 5:00 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 5:00 p.m.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 18: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2026-023 BY MIDDLEBURG FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20.15 ACRES LOCATED SOUTH OF WILKINSON BOULEVARD, NORTH OF WILLILYN LANE, AND WEST OF SAM WILSON ROAD FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) TO N2-B(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-B, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Harrington declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said apologies for the lighting. We're working on getting those lights dimmed so you can see the screen a little bit better, but as noted, this is for approximately 20 acres, just south of Wilkinson Boulevard, west of Sam Wilson Road, in an area where we have a lot of industrial and commercial uses, and some single-family and generally low intensity residential uses to the south and west there. Currently zoned General Commercial. They are proposing to go to Neighborhood 2-B, Conditional. The 2040 Policy Map calls for the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type, so this request is considered out of alignment with that recommendation. The proposal itself is for up to 321 apartment-style units. It does have a commitment for 10 percent of those units to be reserved for affordability and that's for 80 percent of Area Median Income for a period of no less than 20 years. It establishes a new collector street with connections to Wilkinson Boulevard, Huntwood Drive, and Dewey Drive. It also reserves right-of-way for the future Silver Line. Provides a 25-foot Class B landscape yard along the northeastern property boundary where you're

adjacent to those industrial entitlements. Also has a 20-foot Class C landscape yard as well as a fence along the southern property boundary where you have Neighborhood-1 Place Type, and also depicts on the site plan a one-acre dedication to the County for a future park, and also shows enhanced open space features. This is within the West Outer Community Area Plan. We've considered this inconsistent with the goals and policies of the West Outer Community Area Plan and not in alignment with that recommendation for the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type, though it is facilitating priority goals number two for Neighborhood Diversity and Inclusion, because it's proposing multi-family units, stacked units in an area where you don't see a lot of that type of housing. It also is furthering priority goal three, Housing Access for All, by providing that affordability commitment.

This is our Minor Map Amendment Criteria table. Because this is taking the site from Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type to Neighborhood 2, we've shown you here how it's meeting or not meeting some of that criteria. So, it is meeting some of the criteria when it comes to minimum acreage. It is adjacent to some preferred adjacencies, but not the preferred adjacency of Manufacturing and Logistics, which we do not like to locate residential next to, and on some of that locational criteria we're not meeting some of those items that we would like to see, in particular when we think about being in proximity to areas, it is close to Innovation Mixed-Use Place Type but, there aren't really goods and services located within that Innovation Mixed-Use Place Type to provide daily needs in goods and services for future residents. It is along a future Light Rail for the Silver Line that's not currently funded, and it is also along a bus stop, which is great, though it does not run frequently. So, a bit of a mixed bag, I would say, in terms of meeting and not meeting that Minor Map Amendment Criteria.

Staff does not recommend approval of this petition in its current form. This rezoning area is situated between low-density and single-family housing to the south and to the west, and commercial and industrial uses to the north and to the east. So, when we consider those moderately-intense residential developments like this proposal, we look for certain locational criteria that I was just explaining that can demonstrate the area's ability to support that type of residential product, and when we looked at this petition along this portion of Wilkinson, we didn't find it to be in close proximity to daily goods and services that might benefit future residents. Although it is along that future Silver Line. It's not currently funded, and that bus stop does not run frequently.

So, the petitioner has made efforts to speak to the Comprehensive Plan goals and community desires by providing affordable housing commitment and also setting aside one acre for a future park, but in its current form staff does not recommend approval of the petition, and we'd rather see the petitioner consider a less intense residential development. We have some concerns also with locating affordable housing in areas that might lack amenities and reliable transit, but we do look forward to working with the petitioner, and trying to find resolution on those items, and seeing what progress can be made. Happy to take questions following comments.

Bridget Grant, 100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700 said good evening. Bridget Grant, Land Use Consultant with Moore & Van Allen. A pleasure to be here tonight. Good evening, members of Council, members of staff, members of the Zoning Committee. I'm here tonight on behalf of Middleburg Communities and Adam Ricketts. I'm going to take a little bit of time to explain why this site's physical constraints and the surrounding context support residential in this location, notwithstanding the current Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type. It's not often that I'm here before you inconsistent without staff support, but we'd like to just set the table and provide a little more context on why we're pursuing this in this location. I think this aerial site provides the larger context for the property. The surrounding area is very mixed. There are employment and distribution uses near the Interstate along the corridor. There are also existing established developing residential communities nearby, including Huntwood Park, Pathway Hills, and Harbor House. That mixed context really matters here. This is not a large unconstrained tract in the middle of an Industrial District. It sits as a transition point between residential, environmental features, an employment corridor, and nearby existing residential development.

As staff mentioned, the site is currently zoned CG, which is General Commercial. The requested zoning is N-2B, which would allow the property to be developed as a residential community. The zoning map shows that really broad range of nearby districts that surrounds the site, including Commercial, Office, Manufacturing and Logistics, Residential, and a Mobile Home Park zoning. These conditions are basically essentially to the request, because they reflect the appropriateness of this transition of residential to the more intense industrial uses. We understand the fundamental land use policy. We understand that the 2040 Plan recommends Manufacturing and Logistics in this location. I think, as Councilmember Driggs mentioned earlier, we're not necessarily asking staff to disregard the policy recommendation. We're asking Council to consider how that recommendation applies to this property given more site-specific context and constraints when you look at it a little closer. This rezoning allows for site-specific review of whether what's mapped is actually practical in this location. Just because it's colored purple, does it make sense for it to be developed in that context.

So, I'm not going to read all of this to you, but this slide summarizes why this site is different from a typical Manufacturing and Logistics site. First, portions of the site lie within protected and critical watershed areas. The property is narrow and has steep topography. There's about 100-feet of fall that goes across this site. In addition, we're also reserving right-of-way for the Silver Line Extension. There are existing residential streets that would stub into this property regardless of how it's developed, and those constraints make industrial development a little bit more difficult. More intensive users generally need larger, flatter, more flexible sites for buildings, truck ports, and otherwise, and residential design can work with these site constraints and kind of work within the confines of the site, and can add additional housing in proximity to the Wilkinson Boulevard employment and transportation investments. For those reasons, we think that the requested Policy Map amendment is a response to a challenging property, rather than a rejection of the Manufacturing and Logistics Place Type.

We also understand staff has an established criteria for minor map amendments, and we believe our proposal meets the spirit of that intent, given our site location along the corridor, and the ability for us to transition to single-family residential. Most notable in that criteria for the site to be amended is that we're located on the Wilkinson corridor, which is positioned along a major transportation infrastructure investment. Route 35 runs local bus service nearby. The LYNX Silver Line alignment and proposed Sam Wilson Station are shown in relation to our site. The map identifies our site as being a half a mile away from a transit context, and we understand that the Silver Line is proposed, and we're not acknowledging that it's a definite, but this is where we have begun to put our investment and where we believe that type of residential density should be in place as we work towards that investment. Locating housing here supports that long-term goal of placing more residents near employment and planned high-capacity transit.

The more recently adopted West Outer Community Plan provides that broader planning framework for this part of Charlotte. The site sits within an area with employment access, transportation investment, and environmental conditions where housing needs are placed at a high priority, and we'd like all those things to be considered together. Our request is consistent with this sort of balanced approach of looking at everything that's happening in the corridor, and again we think that putting residential in this area makes sense in context of the Silver Line, as well as the additional employment that's already in the area.

This slide just shows that access to housing is one of the top goals identified in the West Outer Community Area Plan that was just recently adopted. As staff described, this is the proposed site plan for the community. The petition allows for up to 321 units on just over 20 acres. You can see that we're providing those connectivity points to the residential to the let's say planned southwest and to the south, as well as providing additional access for those residential communities up to Wilkinson Boulevard. In addition, as Holly mentioned, we are providing 10 percent of the households earning up to 80 percent AMI (Area Median Income), commitment for 20 years, and that was in response to some community feedback we received.

Ultimately, we believe there are four reasons to support this petition. First, this is a difficult logistics site. I think otherwise it probably would've been entertained by this point. The required connectivity to existing residential, the significant grade change, both of those things make it very difficult for Manufacturing and Logistics. Second, we're putting housing near existing employment opportunities. Third, this location is in transit supportive environment. We're also adding that affordability component. So, taking all this together, this site's specific solution takes a constrained commercial site and puts housing near jobs and transportation investment.

In closing, I just want to say, I think it's fair to say that there's a little more agreement to our inconsistency than the word inconsistent leads off. I think even staff agree that it's not necessarily that they think this site should be developed as a Manufacturing and Logistics site. They acknowledge that they would like to see a differentiation in the type of products that we're developing on this site, and we're pleased to hear that. We've heard that feedback. We're going to continue to revise our plan and attempt to move the needle a little bit more in that direction. At the same time, we have to recognize the physical constraints that are on this site, and so working with a site like this will take a little bit more density. So, our goal is to find that middle ground. We appreciate your time tonight, and staff's feedback to date, and we'll continue to work through this process, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Greg Raymond, 8912 Wilkinson Boulevard said my name is Greg Raymond. I work across the street from this proposed site. The company name is Caroplast, Incorporated. We've been there for many years. I'm not against growth. There's apartments, there's condos, there's townhouses going up all over Charlotte. We all know that. My reason for being here, the problem I see which I know is already a problem, is traffic. Three-hundred and twenty-one apartments cannot be accommodated right now with the traffic situation there. Basically, on Wilkinson Boulevard, on that section, there's already a brand new apartment complex, that's Sam Wilson Road and Wilkinson. Across the street, there's already a Circle K that just started being built. Across the street from that, there's a business being built, and like I said, if anybody wants to know what I'm talking about, be at that site at 8:00 a.m. in the morning or 4:00 p.m. in the afternoon, it's bumper to bumper. We already have problems with trucks trying to get into our business, trying to leave. Employees trying to get to work, leave work. It's a mess. So, like I said, my concern is not against growth, but my concern is against the traffic, and that particular section of Wilkinson Boulevard cannot handle 321 apartments. So, that's where I'm at. So, it's nothing against Middleburg or any corporation or any business or anything like that. It's just plain and simple. It's a traffic nightmare. So, if anybody cares, like I said, be there at 8:00 a.m. in the morning, be there at 4:00 p.m. in the afternoon, you'll see, it's bumper to bumper, and probably traffic don't matter, but anyway, that's where I'm at. So, I appreciate you letting me come up here, so appreciate it.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Mr. Raymond, appreciate you.

Mr. Raymond said thank you.

Ms. Grant said this is actually an odd situation where the requested rezoning would likely generate less trips than the existing rezoning. That said, we do understand his concerns and look at the opportunities along this corridor where infrastructure investments are occurring. Of course, when this site's reviewed, we'll be looking at it for how access into the site will get reviewed by C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation), and any improvements we'll be making prior to any CO's (Certificates of Occupancies). So, thank you. Happy to answer any other questions.

Councilmember Mayo said thank you so much, sir, for coming down and sharing your concerns. This was very helpful to hear from someone who is in that area and affected by this everyday to understand your point of view and how this development would impact you and your co-workers. So, thank you so much for coming and speaking on that. That helps give us additional perspective. So, I did want other members of Council to know, and I hope it's okay if I say this, Rickey, that you did work with Bridget to

include affordability on this project. Something I always have our rezoning petitioners do is make sure they are talking to the closest Neighborhood Association to receive feedback. I know that after your conversation with Rickey, you made concessions to reserve 10 percent of the dwelling units at 80 percent AMI for a period of 20 years. So, I just want to highlight that for my Council colleagues. I know there's a lot of fine print in this one, but that was something that really stood out to me. I have spoken to staff about this, and I'm hoping that we continue to have conversations, because I know that staff is saying this is kind of out of alignment. I'm not quite sure where I land on this yet, but I'm hoping that we can think through different opportunities. Are there ways to think of helping with some of the traffic issues that he addressed with some kind of road improvements? Bridget, I have your number, I'll call you, and we can talk through maybe some strategies and innovative ways for us to try to work together. So, appreciate your willingness to always work with me to improve the community, but also to receive the feedback of our residents. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said how are you doing, Bridget?

Ms. Grant said I'm good, thank you.

Ms. Watlington said so, I just wanted to kind of double click on some of this rationale for staff's current recommendation. I think about the upcoming Silver Line, which we know doesn't have a timeline, but even still, putting residential here sounds like there's some concerns about proximity to other amenities and things of that nature, it being car dependent. Can you talk to me a little bit about how the petitioner is thinking about amenities? I see the one building, but I would love for us to do a lot more, particularly around these transit lines of like first-level retail, and how to create that walkability because we have amenities in close proximity. This still feels very much like you're going to have to walk quite a ways even just to get to your building from the Line. So, can you just talk to me a little bit about what was considered in that regard?

Ms. Grant said yes, ma'am. So, we're looking at the amenities. There is an amenity building on the site, and then we've also got the one-acre park dedication that's towards the bottom of the site. Part of that was also putting it in closer access to the existing single-family neighborhoods that are to the south, not making them traverse all the way through the site to get to some of the amenities. We're still looking at other more fine-tuned amenities to put throughout the site. One of the reasons that we don't have retail in our proposal is because of that difficulty on the site, the topography that's on the site. We have very little access that's actually up on Wilkinson Boulevard. So, we've got our Silver Line right-of-way set aside, the existing sidewalk connections. I think we're interested in looking at what else we can do to improve the site, based on the outstanding comments and feedback from staff. It really was an opportunity to provide housing where there's such strong proximity to existing jobs in that corridor, and though the Silver Line isn't planned, I know that there are a lot of other petitions that I work on that this is exactly the type of density that we're trying to encourage, and so we thought that was a step in the right direction.

Ms. Watlington said sure, and I mean, I have my feelings about planning before we have transit investment, but given where we are, certainly I can understand the density, and to the extent that we can increase density and then also be able to support some level of retail, not just for the site, but for like you said, the residential neighborhoods nearby. I would love to see how we could get creative about that, because, maybe I'm a little too ambitious, but it would be great if this could be a little town center, if you will, for residents. So, I don't know what that does to the numbers or how that pencils out but definitely would be interested in exploring it.

Ms. Grant said happy to explore the options, thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I appreciate the community benefits that's been incorporated here, especially in terms of housing, by reserving 10 percent towards 80 percent AMI for a period of 20 years. They certainly appreciate that. Thanks to the District Rep and the neighborhood leaders for their work. Also, I want to highlight one

acre for a future park, I think that's great. I just want to understand the proximity to industrial use. Do we have a site map here? Can we bring that up? So, what is the buffer? Because I see this project will introduce residential adjacent to industrial use. Are we looking at undisturbed buffer and what is the buffer as part of the site plan? So, do you have a pointer?

Ms. Cramer said we do have buffer along the periphery of the site, and I can back to you. Even with my readers, I'm not sure what the exact distance is on that. The other thing I'll note is that there is a natural gas easement along this side of the property, and so in this area there's already a buffer where it can't be developed, which gives us a good buffer, to your point, about the proximity of residential in proximity to industrial. There's already something there that would preclude us from direct adjacency.

Ms. Ajmera said so, we have industrial to the north and east?

Ms. Cramer said here's existing zoning and conditions. So, it's Manufactured Home Park Zoning, and single-family homes, as well as Manufactured Home Park type uses to the south and west here, and then industrial commercial uses all to the north and east of the site, and then as Ms. Grant was noting, there is Piedmont easement along this northeastern boundary where they would have their Class B landscape yard.

Ms. Ajmera said so, that boundary is utility easement, is that correct?

Ms. Cramer said right, and that's on that I-2 Conditional property here, and this other commercial property.

Ms. Ajmera said so, that covers both north and east where there are industrial uses?

Ms. Cramer said right. It essentially provides you additional buffering. When we looked at that, that was another reason where we considered, okay, typically in those situations we wouldn't necessarily be comfortable with introducing more residential next to Manufacturing and Logistics. I know we went through that big exercise, of course, in community area planning recently about those policies, but because we do have a lot of natural buffering by virtue of those easements that can't be traversed, I think a residential product can be contemplated here. It's just a matter of what type of residential product it would be.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. So, in addition to that utility easement, is there additional buffer, what is that?

Ms. Cramer said yes. This is a 25-foot Class B landscape yard.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, is that undisturbed buffer?

Ms. Cramer said they have not committed to it being undisturbed at this time, as far as I'm aware.

Ms. Ajmera said I would like us to explore that, Ms. Grant.

Ms. Grant said happy to explore that. I think part of it is that we're working with that 100-foot of fall across the site, so we want to look at the best places to save the trees that are there. We'll follow up with that.

Ms. Ajmera said absolutely. Yes, because we are looking at industrial, and introducing residential. I know that staff doesn't support it, and I understand their rationale, as it's detailed here under recommendations. I would like us to see if there are additional improvements that can be made to protect future residents from the industrial noise. That's all I have. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you, Bridget, for the presentation. You mentioned that 10 percent is going to be designated for 80 percent AMI?

Ms. Grant said that's correct.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and this might be for staff. I know that the Area Median Income just increased. Can you tell me what the AMI is, and what 80 percent would equal, and what that rent would look like?

Ms. Cramer said I don't have that number on hand. I'll work with our folks in Housing & Neighborhood Services and get that number back to you in a follow-up report, because I don't want to give you an incorrect number right now.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Is there any way we can get that for tonight?

Ms. Cramer said tonight?

Ms. Johnson said yes. Do you have it, Ms. Craig? Do you know it?

Alyson Craig, Assistant City Manager said I do not. We would have to reach out to staff, but we can see if we can get it this evening.

Ms. Johnson said okay. So, I think for our colleagues when we talk about affordability, that's something it's nice to say, 80 percent AMI or throw that term out there, but what does that really mean, and is that truly affordable? Sometimes we look at numbers, and I know that we don't make decisions on that, Terrie, I know, our City Attorney, but the information was offered. So, we look at numbers like $1,900, and who is that truly affordable to? So, I don't want us to get caught up on 80 percent AMI until we actually know the numbers that we're considering. That was my first question.

Mr. Raymond, thank you for speaking. Mr. Raymond mentioned an apartment complex that was recently approved in that area, but I'm looking in our book, and I don't know that it's listed. So, if we could get that information as well. When I talk about cumulative impact and how the residents feel, they feel that growth, but we're not able to consider it if we're not seeing that petition. So, I'd like to know what that petition was. I'm looking at the school impact. One of the schools is already at 100 percent. I'd like to know what that number was in a previous petition, so that we are looking at the true impact of growth on these areas.

Ms. Cramer said I will just add, sorry, before we move on to your next comment, on the rezoning history, and I'll work with Mr. Raymond to make sure I am capturing or understand which apartment complex he was referring to, but on the second row under rezoning history, we do note a rezoning application that was approved and permits filed for apartments that are to the east of the site along Sam Wilson Road.

Ms. Johnson said which number is that?

Ms. Cramer said it was Petition 2022-067. It was rezoned under TOD-NC.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and that was for, oh, the 378 units. Okay, it's under construction. We should look that up and see what the school impact was from that. I can do that, and I'm sure a traffic study is going to be required for this petition.

Ms. Cramer said for this petition, it did not trigger a traffic study.

Ms. Johnson said with 2,100 trips?

Ms. Cramer said for 321 units, it did not trigger a traffic study.

Ms. Johnson said did I read 2,100 trips somewhere, 2,133, did I see that number?

Ms. Cramer said yes, it says 1,480.

Ms. Johnson said I thought I read 2,133, okay, but 321 units.

Ms. Cramer said sorry, I apologize. I'll make sure our trips are accurately reflected in our staff analysis, but I know when it was reanalyzed it didn't trigger a traffic study. I know Mr. Raymond, just speaking to traffic impacts, and I think it was noted already, the current entitlements do allow for General Commercial uses, which may be a much larger traffic impact, if that matters.

Ms. Johnson said okay. So, let me look, hold on one second. I thought I saw the number 2,133.

Ms. Cramer said yes, you're correct that that is what is in the staff analysis. I think that might be an outdated number, because I know the traffic, it was reanalyzed the trip generation, because that was incorrect.

Ms. Johnson said oh, okay. Well, again, without that information we're expected to make these decisions. We have to have the information, the cumulative information, so that we understand how our residents are impacted by this level of density. So, I look forward to the additional information. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said so to my colleague, Councilmember Johnson, the most recent studies, effective June 2026, that DreamKey identified for 80 percent for an individual is $65,750, and up to a family of eight, $123,950. You know no family of eight is necessarily going to be in an apartment, because we don't build past two and three bedrooms. So, thinking of a family of two, that 80 percent is $75,150.

Ms. Cramer said we did just get an update in real time from Warren Wooten in Housing & Neighborhood Services that for a family of four, 80 percent AMI would be $93,900.

Ms. Mayfield said which I would've shared, but again, most apartments today are maybe two or three, we get very few four bedrooms. Those are the latest numbers that are out there according to us, Housing & Neighborhood Services, as well as DreamKey, as of June 1, 2026.

I have a couple of questions on the actual streetscape. So, where it looks like the entrance is, and Bridget you may be able to answer this, on Wilkinson Boulevard, it's a three-lane road. There is a long stretch of median that is along this particular area where this development is going, and there's one turn lane, because there's a U-Haul across the street, as well as a big warehouse production across the street from it. Is there a plan for you all to invest breaking up that median? Because I'm concerned, whenever there's a one way in and out, if there was an emergency, but that's more than like a mile of median that's in front of a good part of the frontage of this proposed development.

Ms. Grant said so, I want to clarify, in addition to the Wilkinson Boulevard access, we actually have another entrance here where Huntwood Drive is required to connect into the site.

Ms. Mayfield said so going through the neighborhood?

Ms. Grant said and where Dewey Drive, which is one of the reasons that we thought that a residential use was better than an industrial use in this location, was that we're connecting residential to residential. So, there are two other points of egress other than Wilkinson Boulevard. When it comes to the median, C-DOT might best be able to answer this. They generally give us guidance on whether or not our access is going to be limited to right-in/right-out, and where our acceleration lanes and deceleration lanes will go during the land development review process.

Ms. Mayfield said do we have anyone from C-DOT that's here tonight? Help me understand this? Because I have concerns with this many units, because again this is a three-lane road on Wilkinson. It fills with traffic, because you're going into Gastonia for those, or even trying to get access to and from the airport. So, help me understand what potentially is going to happen with that median?

Jacob Carpenter, C-DOT said Jake Carpenter with C-DOT. So, we have an outstanding comment to the development team to work on their access. In tandem with our partners at NC-DOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation), we review these petitions ahead of time, and there's a joint comment that's outstanding to relocate their access to the center of the site, and this is primarily to restrict to right-in/right-out access for safety. So, they would have a single access to Wilkinson, but they would have the multiple local street connections as well, but there would just be one single access to Wilkinson, which would be right-in/right-out only.

Ms. Mayfield said so, I definitely have concerns regarding that, because right in front of your potential site we have all the arrows for a merge lane that is currently there to accommodate the traffic that's going up. Have ya'll reached out to the Wingate Neighborhood Association or the neighborhood? I appreciate Rickey being a part of the conversation. He's the head of the West Boulevard Neighborhood Coalition. Wilkinson Boulevard has a number of active neighborhood groups that have been meeting at the police station there on a regular basis for many years. It's mostly an older community, but has there been any direct outreach to the residents that live within that corridor?

Ms. Cramer said we have talked to some residents who live slightly to the west of the site. We did have some participation in our community meeting. Happy to do any additional follow-up for other neighbors as needed.

Ms. Mayfield said I'll also reach out to some of the elders. I have additional questions. I'll follow up with you.

Councilmember Driggs said yes. I just wanted to note, when you look at 80 percent AMI, whatever your starting point, the experience has been that market rates go up faster than AMI, and therefore over the span of 20 years the gap between the restricted rate and the market rate gets wider. Just as an illustration, if you had a three percent escalation in AMI and a four percent escalation in market rates for apartments, the difference would actually be something like 40 percent higher rent in the market rate unit versus the affordable unit. If you do a little more back of the envelope arithmetic, the cost to the developer of capping over that entire 20 years, the increasingly large disparity between the market and the capped rate, I'm guessing it's over a million dollars, possibly a couple million dollars impact on economics. It's not insignificant, given that there's no Trust Fund dollars involved. So, I agree that we should have that information and know about it, but to minimize this based on a comparison at today's rate, when you think about how different the rates will be in the future, would be to understate the benefit. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said I want to thank my colleague for the finance lesson, thank you, but my point is the AMI for a family of four at $93,000, is not realistic or attainable for so many in our City, especially when we have emails from individual or families, who don't have a place to stay, because there's no family shelters, and people aren't making $93,000 a year for a family of four. Even with that, if I do the math just very quickly, I believe that rent's going to be, and maybe Mr. Wooten has the information, I didn't do the deductions, but I think it's around $2,000 to $2,300.

Mr. Driggs said that's my estimate, I agree.

Ms. Johnson said yes, so there are people who can't afford that. Our federal government still pays $996 for SSI. So, I just want us not to, again, be moved if we're seeking affordable housing by 80 percent AMI housing. Thank you.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2025-137 BY BLUE AZALEA ASSET MANAGEMENT, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 3.07 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF COLONY ROAD, NORTH OF SHARON VIEW ROAD, AND WEST OF ALLISON AVENUE FROM N1-A (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A) AND R-20MF(CD) (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, CONDITIONAL) TO N2-A(CD) (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Harrington declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just over three acres on the north side of Sharon View Road just east of Colony Road in an area where we have a mix of single-family uses as well as some older multi-family developments. Currently zoned Neighborhood-1A on the eastern portion of the site, and R-20MF, Conditional, from an old 1971 plan on the western portion of the site. They are proposing to go Neighborhood-2A, Conditional. This is considered in alignment with the Policy Map's recommendation for the Neighborhood-2 Place Type.

The proposal itself is for 10 attached multi-family units townhome-style units. It is proposing a 24-foot front setback from future back of curb. Also provides designated tree save, common open space areas beyond ordinance requirements, enhanced landscape plantings also exceeding ordinance minimums, a large 59-foot site setback along that eastern edge where there are single-family homes, and also proposed masonry wall along portions of that eastern property line to help provide extra buffering and edge definition. Provides common open space areas designed to be accessible within a 1,000-foot radius of all residential units. Limits structures to no more than five units per building, and a building height limit of 40 feet. Access through an internal alleyway, eight-foot planting strip and six-foot sidewalk along the rezoning boundary, and also multiple connections to the existing sidewalks to support neighborhood connectivity. This is located within the South Middle Community Area Plan in alignment with the Policy Map given the Neighborhood-2 Place Type designation. It could further facilitate goal two of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Neighborhood-2, Diversity and Inclusion by proposing 10 townhome-style units in an area where you have a lot of single-family detached housing predominately.

Staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of some minor outstanding issues and technical revisions. This townhome proposal is an appropriate transition between the existing multi-family development and the adjacent single-family homes to the east and the south. The plan exceeds our ordinance requirements in terms of open space, tree save area, setbacks and buffering. Also, they have committed to limits on the number of units per building and height not to exceed 40 feet. All those commitments in tandem speak to their effort to incorporate the existing neighborhood characteristics and being mindful of the single-family neighborhoods along the corridor. I'll be happy to take questions following petitioner comments.

Walter Fields, 4667 Webbs chapel Church Road, Denver said thank you, Mayor, members of Council, members of the Zoning Committee. My name is Walter Fields. Beside me is Joe Di Zazzo, who is Blue Azalea, who has done a number of infill projects in Charlotte, including one right up the street from this site, one in Elizabeth, and several in other communities. Dale Powell is here as well. He's going to speak in just a moment. He's the President of the Sir John's Hill Homeowners Association. This site is part of their original conditional zoning site. The R-20MF Zoning went away with the adoption of the new UDO (Unified Development Ordinance). It's a historical district. It is a conditional plan, and so we're essentially amending a part of that plan, as well as rezoning a small piece of property that was zoned N-1A. This is an infill site. It's consistent with the South Community Area Plan.

The staff actually made us feel really good with statements and their comments, like exceeds several zoning expectations, fits with the varying variety of style and densities in the community. We agree, if you looked at that aerial earlier you saw that there was multi-family, single-family townhomes in this entire area, and on Sharon View in both directions. The staff does recommend approval. There is a list of technical issues and

corrections that we need to make and we will make those corrections. SouthPark Area Neighborhood Association also supports this petition. Over the period of several months, in fact this case started about this time last year, our development team has met with the entire community, with the Allison Avenue community, with the SPAN (SouthPark Association of Neighborhoods) Organization, had a well-attended community meeting, and generally got favorable comments. There were a lot of details that had to be worked out. Changes at the site plan were made in response to the staff concerns as well as some from the neighbors, larger setbacks, reduce the density, open space details, but we hope that we bring to you a plan now that meets your approval, and I'm going to stop and let Dale come and wrap this up.

Dale Powell, 3715 Winding Creek Lane said good evening. My name is Dale Powell. I'm the President of the Homeowners Association which is selling this property. We have 78 homeowners in townhomes. Last year, we took a vote among our homeowners, and we received an 84 percent majority support for selling this property. We're very anxious to improve our area with improved landscaping and newer high-quality homes. We've also set aside a substantial tree save area to keep this natural beauty for future generations, and in our view representing the homeowners, we really look forward to your approval for this project. I'll relinquish the remainder of my time to the petitioner.

The following persons submitted written comments regarding this item pursuant to S.L. 2020-3, SB 704. To review comments in their entirety, contact the City Clerk's Office.

William Waters, 3850 Sharon View Road

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

Mr. Fields said thank you very much.

Mr. Powell said thank you.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2026-033 BY THE DROX GROUP, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.4 ACRES LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF SANDY PORTER ROAD, NORTH OF BROWN-GRIER ROAD, AND SOUTH OF WILLIAMS GLENN ROAD FROM N1-A ANDO (NEIGHBORHOOD 1-A, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY) TO N2-A(CD) ANDO (NEIGHBORHOOD 2-A, CONDITIONAL, AIRPORT NOISE DISCLOSURE OVERLAY).

Mayor Harrington declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said good evening. This site is 6.4 acres. It's located on the west side of Sandy Porter Road, north of Brown-Grier Road, and south of Williams Glenn Road. It's surrounded on three sides by a CMS (Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools) Campus that includes Olympic High School, Kennedy Middle School, and Steele Creek Elementary. Across Sandy Porter Road are office and institutional uses. Current zoning is N-1A, ANDO, with a proposed zoning of N-2A(CD), ANDO. The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Neighborhood-1 Place Type.

The proposal would allow for up to 70 multi-family attached dwellings, that would include one five-unit building, five quadraplex buildings, 12 triplex buildings, and three duplex buildings. Seven dwelling units would be reserved for households earning up to 80 percent Area Median Income for 15 years. Open space and green areas are being provided in excess of UDO requirements. A 10-foot Class C landscape yard would be around the perimeter of the site, committing to some preferred architectural and design

standards. An eight-foot planting strip and 12-foot multiuse path will be located along the site's frontage of Sandy Porter Road, and a left turn lane would be coordinated with C-DOT and NC-DOT during the permitting phase.

The petition is consistent with the goals and policies of the Southwest Middle Area Plan, but not in alignment with the Policy Map recommendation for the Neighborhood-1 Place Type. The petition may facilitate goals one, two, and three of the area plan by providing housing within walking distance of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as being located across Sandy Porter Road from a Community Activity Center. There is a capital improvement project that will install a 12-foot shared-use path along the west side of Sander Porter Road, which will better connect the site to the surrounding schools and to goods and services located along Arrowood Road. Neighborhood Diversity and Inclusion may be facilitated by providing 70 townhome-style units grouped together in buildings of two to five units. Housing Access for All may facilitated by reserving seven units at 80 percent AMI or 15 years. The petition does meet Minor Map Amendment Criteria for a transition to the N-2 Place Type. While out of alignment with the recommended Neighborhood-1 Place Type, the petition is consistent with the goals and policies of the South Middle Community Area Plan. The proposed townhome-style dwellings would diversify the housing options along this segment of Sandy Porter Road, which is characterized primarily by single-family dwellings and apartments. The site is a remnant parcel adjacent to a CMS Campus, and I will pause there and answer any questions following petitioner comments.

Paul Pennell, 1213 West Morehead Street said thank you, Mayor Harrington. City Council, Zoning Committee, thank you for this opportunity to present this petition to ya'll tonight. In the interest of time, I'm going to jump straight to the site plan. Thank you to staff for the thorough presentation. Yes, this is a petition that is requesting 70 residential units, single-family attached. Leading up to this meeting, we have worked with the Steele Creek Residents Association, and we've had two community meetings as well to this point. Obviously as a site that's seven acres and 70 units surrounded by CMS Schools, and the pilot programs that CMS is currently exploring to include affordable housing near their schools, we're pleased to be able to incorporate seven affordable units of 80 percent AMI deed restricted for 15 years, and at this point I'm happy to answer any questions that you all may have.

Councilmember Mayo said thank you, Paul, for continuing to do the work, for meeting with Steele Creek Residents Association to receive the feedback to make improvements on the project. Also, just want to think through, as a former teacher, having the availability to live near where you work, particularly as expensive as Charlotte is, thank you for making the commitment to ensure that our educators who are helping to shape the minds of our young people are able to live in their community. That's something we talked a lot about when I was with CMS, being able to live in the community where you serve. So, thank ya'll for making that commitment. I'm hoping that quite a few teachers will use this as an opportunity who work at some of the nearby schools. They could even walk across the street. I know that it's something that ya'll will be working on, but safely walk across the street to get to their place of employment, and continuing to serve our young people. So, thank you so much for doing the work, providing a pathway to affordable homeownership for our teachers who are doing the work everyday and continuing to make growth and improve the lives of our young people in Charlotte. Thank you so much.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you, Mr. Pennell, and thank you for the offer of affordable housing for our teachers, but when I look at the teachers' salary, the average pay looks like it's around $51,749. The top earners earn $64,224. So, I want to be realistic. That's all I have to say.

Councilmember Mayfield said I need my colleague, Councilmember Johnson tonight to get out of my head. So, Mayor, actually I have a question for you, but I have a request. We need to have it referred to Housing & Neighborhood Services Committee to give us an opportunity to have a real discussion around these AMI's, because I don't want us going down this path of when we say 80 percent, basically that's market rate,

so let's just say market rate. If we're going to target for a specific field of work, whether it's teachers, but we're not actually tracking what the salaries are for the teachers at these schools, at our elementary school, I think we might be setting ourselves up. Housing & Neighborhood Services are having some conversations regarding our upcoming policy language as we move towards a new bond package, and what we're looking at is a map of where housing potentially may go in the City, and what does Housing & Neighborhood Services looks like, not just housing, making sure that the services, and we have diversity in that area.

It's a broader conversation beyond this one, and I appreciate there being an identification of 80 percent. Yet, if today's market of 80 percent is still rents that are $2,000 or more, will our teachers actually have access, unless there's going to be additional bonus funding through a subsidy or otherwise to offset that difference, that's a different conversation.

As we're looking at the growth that's happening in Steele Creek, I think it will also be helpful to get an idea on the map, and staff can assist with this. What are our public transportation routes? We do have some buses that run out there. That was something that I worked a lot on for the eight years that I was the District Three Representative. So, it will be helpful, because there have been some changes of routes over the years. What routes that we may have accessible to your potential site? That's something again staff can assist with through CATS, and looking at our proposed TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) and other investments, those are many years down the road. So, I want to make sure that we're also being transparent when we're having the conversation, because if this were to move forward, I'm thinking your project could potentially be completed by late 2027, 2028, if everything flows the way that it could, but we're looking at transportation investment that will be coming after that, and also the impact of that construction and everything else. So, I want to make sure that if we're looking at tying in, or if Council is being asked to take into consideration investments that are coming, that those investments are aligning. So, is there a conversation of those investments potentially being moved up in the process in order for it to align with a development, so that we don't have a development and then within a three-year period we're tearing up the same roads in order to do some additional work, or the potential challenges that will come along with that. So, we have a little time since this is the hearing, but that information in partnership with staff would be helpful.

Again, Mayor, I would like to actually have a referral to Committee, so that we can have a chance to really have a much deeper conversation of what does this AMI look like, not just for today. I had a chance to attend a couple of meetings over the weekend, and it's great that AMI has been expanded. The challenge is that expansion basically just shifted the line. So, you have a higher increase, but what it has done is created a gap for those that are at the lower end of the AMI scale. If our scale is 30 percent to 120 percent, the scale just shifted, it wasn't expanded. So, I think we owe it to ourselves to have a better understanding of what those numbers look like as proposals are coming before us.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Councilmember Mayfield. We'll note the request for referral. We've noted it.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2026-041 BY OWL SERVICES FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.88 ACRES LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF FOREST PINE DRIVE, NORTH OF ARROWOOD ROAD FROM B-2(CD) (GENERAL BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL) TO CG(CD) (GENERAL COMMERCIAL, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Harrington declared the hearing open.

Joe Magnum, Planning, Design & Development said this site is just under an acre. It's located on the south side of Forest Pine Drive, north of Arrowood Road. It's surrounded by commercial uses along Arrowood Road with residential uses to the north and east. The current zoning is B-2(CD), it's a Legacy Zoning District that dates to 1996. Proposed zoning is CG(CD). The 2040 Policy Map recommends the Commercial Place Type. This is a Tier 1 Conditional with conditional notes, but no site plan. Proposes up to 8,000 square feet of gross floor area of nonresidential uses permitted in the CG Zoning District. In the interest of time, I'm not going to read through that entire list there, but it is most of the more noxious uses in the CG Zoning District. The petition is consistent with the goals and policies of the South Middle Community Area Plan, and in alignment with the Policy Map recommendation for the Commercial Place Type. It does not directly facilitate any priority goals of the area plan or other comprehensive plan goals.

Staff recommends approval of the petition upon resolution of outstanding issues related to the land use. The petition would facilitate development of a vacant site near Arrowood Road and Interstate 77 with commercial uses while prohibiting many of the more noxious uses permitted in the CG Zoning District. It would allow the site to be developed under UDO standards as opposed to a Legacy Conditional Zoning that dates to 1996. I'll turn it over to the petitioner team.

Collin Brown, 1420 East 7th Street said good evening Mr. Mayor, Council members, Zoning Committee members, Collin Brown on behalf of the petitioner. I'm going to go quickly because of the night. Councilmember Mayo has been in several conversations with us about the site. As Joe mentioned, this is a site off Arrowood. It is a vacant parcel. Its current zoning allows a lot of things. You could have drive-thru restaurant. Our client, working with Electrify America, there is demand in Charlotte for charging stations for everyone that has adopted electric vehicles. There are not many of them. They would like to operate a charging station on the site. Under our ordinance, a charging station is treated like a fueling station like a gas station. So, we have to zone to a zoning to have that. We don't want to operate a gas station. So, we are happy, as Joe mentioned, there are a lot of things that are allowed on the site now that I think the neighborhood and staff would not like to see there. So, we are adding conditions that they cannot be allowed there, trying to keep the petition simple. As we've talked to Councilmember Mayo, we do understand there's some issues in the area with lighting that has been installed but is not maintained. It is very important to our clients, members of our community or the others, that are coming there to charge their vehicles, we want that to be a safe spot. There's a nice Starbucks near that they can walk to, but the lights are very important. I did just hear from Jake at C-DOT earlier today. It sounds like there's resolution on that. So, I know we're short on time. Maybe we can follow up offline, but it sounds like C-DOT is working and has answers on that. Happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Watlington said quick question. You just mentioned that our policy reflects no difference between a fueling station and a charging station?

Mr. Brown said fueling station, that's how it would be treated under the ordinance. When we said, hey, if we want to do an electric vehicle charging station, essentially it's treated like a gas station.

Ms. Watlington said okay. Mr. Mayor, I'd like to refer that to committee to [inaudible].

Mr. Brown said that'd be a great idea.

Mayor Harrington said note the request, yes.

Councilmember Mayo said thank you, Collin, for taking into consideration so many of the challenges that I've raised. I have been working on this even before I became a Council member. I identified over 100 streetlights along Nations Ford and Arrowood that

were not properly working, and we know that we asked residents of Mecklenburg County to support. Well, we didn't. Well, the PAVE (Projects for Advancing Vehicle-Infrastructure Enhancements) Act occurred, and one of the things we talked about was transportation and improvements, and we talked about how part of that percentage went to roads being streetlights improving. So, thinking about multimodal transportation and safety and things like that. Thankfully, the vast majority of the lights were fixed after numerous conversations and emails with Duke Energy. I want to thank Mayor Pro Tem, who was very beneficial to me with this, with the streetlights, because I was having a hard time with Duke Energy getting this done.

As I reminded them, this is a black and brown neighborhood, underserved, and over 100 streetlights being out is unacceptable. Unfortunately, this has still not been resolved after over a year and some change. I've already made it clear to the petitioner, I will not be supporting this if this is not resolved. I understand some of this is not within your purview, but if we are talking about people going to charge their cars, I think people want to charge their cars in a place that is safe, that is well lit. This whole road, none of the streetlights are working, not a single one, for I don't know how many years, because I just noticed it when I was going around doing an inventory, because I was tired of nothing being done. So, I know I've talked to the Planning. I asked that an email from C-DOT be sent to my colleagues regarding this, so that they can see all the correspondence, but this has been over a year in the making to me. I am not impressed by the Business Association that has done this, as we have had two rezonings off that road, one is an affordable housing unit, and then another one is a townhome unit.

I know I'm kind of talking a lot about this. This is something I am very passionate about. If we're talking about safety and we're asking people to support a one cent sales tax, this infrastructure should've been there. So, that is something I would challenge staff in the future, doing our research. So, just like when you go buy a house, you don't just go check during the day, sometimes you go check at night too to see what is it like in the evening. So, the fact that two rezonings passed in this area, and they haven't had working streetlights for years is unacceptable, and I hope that you will do better in the future. Sorry, I'm very passionate about that. Sorry I got my teacher voice in there, but there are a lot of things that I am very passionate about, and that is one of them, streetlights, safety on our roads. So, as you already know, I'm not supporting this until more happens. I like you, Collin, but that's where I stand on that.

Mr. Brown said and again, we don't control the streetlights. We like streetlights. We hope to be a catalyst.

Councilmember Ajmera said I understand your frustration. Is this a state-maintained road?

Mr. Magnum said I believe so, Arrowood.

Ms. Mayo said no, Forest Point.

Mr. Magnum said Forest Pine, I think is City.

Ms. Ajmera said what is the answer?

Mr. Magnum said Forest Point is City maintained.

Ms. Ajmera said it's City maintained, so what's the delay in getting the streetlights?

Jacob Carpenter, C-DOT said so, the streetlights along this section were permitted by an encroachment agreement, so there is an encroachment agreement holder responsible for the maintenance of these facilities. So, C-DOT has been working with a development team and that team as well to get them to remove the infrastructure that's there from the right-of-way, and the Strategic Investment Area program has added a streetlighting project for this section of roadway that will begin installation somewhere in the very first part of 2027.

Ms. Ajmera said alright. So, it's part of the easement, and that is contributing to the delay.

Mr. Carpenter said yes. So, any time someone wants to install a nonstandard item in our right-of-way, they have to sign an encroachment agreement with C-DOT, and it says they're responsible for maintaining this item in perpetuity, and so working with Councilmember Mayo on identifying this and working through that team to figure out a solution has been the main driving issue to getting resolution.

Ms. Ajmera said so, is this normal for a streetlight to be implemented where the timeframe is for almost a year or over?

Mr. Carpenter said I don't know that I have a good answer to that question. It's a unique circumstance that we were made aware of and have been working to resolve.

Ms. Ajmera said right. So, I understand what Councilmember Mayo brought up in terms of the public safety issues, and just the infrastructure not being safe when we don't have streetlights. Is there a temporary solution that we could explore while we have this right-of-way issue getting resolved? You don't have to answer that today, but it could be part of a follow-up memo. Is there another alternative we can explore to address some of the public safety challenges that Councilmember Mayo had raised? I remember when we were working on W.T. Harris streetlights all the way from Tryon to Old Concord Road. It took two years plus. It really creates challenges for pedestrians or bikers when there are no streetlights, especially at night. So, I think there needs to be an alternative that we need to explore while we are working on easements. That's all I have. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said supporting District Three Rep.

Ms. Mayo said yes. I move to defer.

Mayor Harrington said is there a second?

Ms. Mayfield said second.

Ms. Ajmera said there's no decision here tonight, it's just the hearing.

Ms. Mayo said I'm hopeful that ya'll will fix this, and until it's fixed I hope it doesn't come back.

Ms. Mayfield said yes, we got a motion.

Ms. Ajmera said there is no decision.

Mayor Harrington said let me just, as a point or order, there's no decision tonight, and so I don't think a motion to defer lies.

Ms. Mayo said alright, I'm thinking it's the consensus that this isn't going.

Mayor Harrington said there are clearly points to bring back before we get to a decision point.

Ms. Mayo said thank you.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 24: HEARING ON PETITION NO. 2026-044 BY HENDRICK AUTOMOTIVE GROUP FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.03 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF FARMINGDALE DRIVE, EAST OF EAST INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD, AND WEST OF AMITY PLACE FROM OFC (OFFICE FLEX CAMPUS) TO CG(CD) (GENERAL COMMERCIAL, CONDITIONAL).

Mayor Harrington declared the hearing open.

Holly Cramer, Planning, Design & Development said this an acre along East Independence Boulevard in a very commercial area. So, what we're looking at is Office Flex Campus Zoning that does not accommodate the existing use. What they're proposing to go to is a General Commercial, Conditional District to allow for uses that will essentially set it up for the Neighborhood Center Place Type, so allowing for future policy alignment, and I'm just going to skip forward. So, they've prohibited a number of noxious uses, the most noxious uses within the General Commercial District. So, by virtue of the conditions that they've proposed, they've essentially conditioned themselves into alignment with the Neighborhood Center Place Type, which is what is recommended for this site. We consider this consistent with the goals and policies of the East Middle and Outer Area Plan, because of the conditions that they have imposed upon themselves, and staff recommends approval of this petition upon resolution of some very minor requested technical revisions. This is just a conditional rezoning to correct for a nonconforming situation on the site currently and also set it up for future success for some uses that align with the Neighborhood Center Place Type. Happy to take questions following petitioner comments.

Greg Hartley, 2001 West Morehead Street said Grey Hartley with ACRO Development Services here representing Hendrick Automotive Group. We are rezoning this basically to make improvements to add buffers, add internal planting islands, and continue to use it as an employee parking lot, but making it more secure for the employees. Happy to answer any questions you may have.

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

The meeting was recessed at 6:14 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:35 p.m.

* * * * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 25: I-77 SOUTH EXPRESS LANES PROJECT

Mayor Harrington said prior to any Council discussion, we are going to hear from those who have signed up to speak on this item. We have many people signed up to speak, so each speaker will be given two minutes. We have just about 60 folks signed up to speak, so two minutes each, which we will track. On behalf of the entire City Council, I ask that all speakers and audience members be civil and courteous in their use of language. Speakers are encouraged to address Council and should refrain from responding to audience members. Likewise, audience members should be courteous of each speaker and not yell out or interrupt speakers. We want to ensure that everyone has the chance to be heard.

Joseph Williams, 1778 Dunkirk Drive said Mayor, City Council, first of all I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak tonight. I want to make it clear as a resident of Wilmore, the most impacted neighborhood by this project, that it is not in the City's best interest, it's not in our community's best interest for this project to move forward as it is presented. However, if you are going to move forward, despite all this opposition here in the room, in our communities, I do want to ask a few things of you. I've seen the agreement that's been proposed with the State, a great step for community benefits to

protect our communities, but it doesn't go far enough. You must strengthen the protections for the neighborhoods that will experience the direct and very consequential impacts of this project. So, I've got four kind of targeted improvements that I would like you guys to consider to add to your motion if that is the route you decide to go tonight. First, I think it's really important to establish a binding neighborhood protection standard. So, right now this agreement talks about reducing right-of-way impacts "wherever feasible" for neighborhoods such as Wilmore that are facing displacement, loss of parks, greenspace, connectivity issues, noise, air quality, and then the construction impacts that will come along with this. Wherever feasible isn't a measurable standard. Wilmore and other impacted neighborhoods need a clear commitment to avoid and minimize those impacts and to document the alternatives that are considered.

Second, establish a dedicated fund for directly affected neighborhoods. Your agreement, again great starting point, identifies significant regional investments, again regional improvement for the project.

James Cole, 716 Waco Street said good evening, Mayor and City Council. My name is James Cole. I live in District One, and I've been a voting, tax paying resident in the City of Charlotte since 1990. I'm here to address the I-77 South Express Lanes. Nearly a century ago, the City faced a decision much like the one in front of you tonight. In the mid-1930s in the depths of the depression, then Mayor Ben Douglas made the case for a municipal airport. Some critics said it costs too much, some said it was in the wrong place, others said Charlotte didn't need it, but the visionary City leaders of that day approved it and built it with new deal dollars over some very vocal and loud opposition. Today, that decision by City leaders moves 50 million passengers a year and anchors the economy of this city and region. Nobody remembers the names of the critics who said no, but everyone benefits from the City leaders' bold decision. I-77 South currently carries 65 million vehicles a year. Unlike the airport, everyone is impacted by congestion on this major thoroughfare. There are details still to settle, but the significant benefits that've been offered in the past 60 days are too good to pass up. Bicker over subjective aspects of the project, and we'll miss this opportunity to secure another milestone in our City's history. Previously, you voted to rescind support. The state answered you with the PAVE Act provision, and now Charlotte homeowners like me are looking at potentially higher taxes for something we'd get no new benefit from, not to mention the pressure the decision would put on the City's stellar AAA bond rating. Save the political fight for the one that matters, keeping the airport under the Charlotte airport authority. That's where every ounce of this City's political capital belongs. History will remember the votes you make. Please reaffirm support for the I-77 South Express Lanes, and if you were going to take 77 South home tonight, you better leave right now. Thanks.

Melissa McDonald, 2661 Colton Drive said thank you, Mayor Harrington and City Council. Since I-77 was expanded in the mid-1990s from four to six lanes, I've been driving the Interstate as well as several others that connect with I-77 for work. The Charlotte population and the MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area) have increased by 122 percent, 130 percent respectively. The drive times, the delays, the traffic incidents along 77 have become very difficult for workers who regularly use this Interstate to get to their place of employment and to deliver goods and services. Equally as important to me as a citizen of Charlotte is the $300 million community benefits package, which addresses affordable housing, displacement and relocation costs, and the addition of bike/pedestrian lanes. This is so needed, and when you look at, with further densifying the urban areas, it's going to make daily needs, businesses way more economically doable, and that's adding grocers and services and not causing people who don't often have cars and are using public transportation to go to the grocery store, to go to the doctor, to go anywhere. Having lived in several underserved areas as a young person, in Durham, and particularly downtown Durham, Tampa, Ft. Lauderdale, and parts of Chicago, I've seen what the collaboration of public and private money can do. We don't want to lose the funds allocated for this Interstate expansion, which is so vital to the urban neighborhoods and the continued growth of Charlotte.

Clark Neilson, 4014 Monroe Road, Suite 100 said good evening, Mayor and City Council. I am Clark Neilson. I have three points to make. I'm in favor of you voting yes for this route. It is by far the least disruptive route to the vast majority of the populous of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. The existing corridor has had 40 to 50 years of zoning that has complemented the existing Interstate Highway, for example, hotels, service stations, restaurants, etc., that would be negatively impacted by bypassing them for a new route. Two, it speeds up the time to get the project completed due to economies of time and space utilization. As a land surveyor in this county for the last 40 years, I have much professional experience with the properties that currently share the I-77 right-of-way. Using the existing right-of-way makes use of wider setbacks that already exist off of the existing I-77 corridor, minimizing the number of improvements that must be raised, parking lots, driveways, buildings. It minimizes the total number of impacted property owners in general versus generating a totally new corridor. It minimizes construction costs, because the closest point between two points is a straight line, and a new route will elongate the distance, thereby increasing overall construction material and labor for the longer footage. As a resident and business owner that uses this route daily, the shorter the impact time, the better for the economy. I emphatically request that you vote yes. Thank you.

Damian Smith, 124 Lakewood Avenue said good evening, Council. I'm not going to talk about the project. You guys again know how I feel about it. What I am going to talk about is something I also know a lot about, leadership, and what it takes sometimes to do things differently. As a wildland firefighter and a fireline leader, I know what it's like to ask people to do a job that could potentially kill them, and I'm the one who has to take responsibility for it if they were injured or maimed. As leaders, we sometimes have difficult positions that we need to take. I also come from a family of leaders. My brother is an Iraq War Vet, a West Point graduate. My father is a Vietnam Vet. He's also an organizer, one of three Captains who organized the FedEx pilots of which he was a member. My grandfather was a B-17 and a B-52 pilot, was a Base Commander in Libia. My great, great, great grandfather fought in nine battles of the revolutionary war. My Irish grandfather fought in the Irish War for independence, but also raised nine children in the poorest county in all of Ireland, and one of the least populated. It's even considered remote today. Now, as leaders, you often don't get the best of everything, but I do have an ask, and that's for Councilwoman Owens to lean into your concerns, because they are there, and they are legitimate, and we are asking to do something that is generationally harmful, and that impacts families. I see it in my own family, because I'm one of 40. Councilman Graham, I'm really not sure what's motivating your vote.

Jaclyn Didier, 615 Walnut Avenue said my name is Jaclyn Didier, and I'm here tonight to represent the Five Points Community Collaborative and our staunch opposition to this project. I think we're pretty clear on where I stand. All of you have heard from me. I emailed, showed up, and asked a lot of questions, many of which have never been answered. I believe when something doesn't look right, you don't stop asking questions because they're uncomfortable. So, here's what I can't wrap my brain around. Why are we being asked to make a $4 billion multidecade decision when we still don't have the answers about money, legal justification, the alternatives, and the procurement process. We were told there wasn't enough time to independently analyze alteratives. We have unanswered questions about $70 million in spending, we have a legal question about how the repayment obligation is being characterized, and now we have new questions about procurement and consulting relationships. Tonight, we're hearing about $300 million in community benefits. I deeply understand why that matters to communities, but if that number is influencing people's positions on the project, how do we guarantee it? We can't put it on an RFP (Request for Proposal) and guarantee it from what I'm told. A potential is not the same as a guarantee. Don't let the pressure change the question, don't let the price tag change the facts, and don't let concerns about what Raleigh might do, whether that's the airport, our transportation funding, or our relationship with the State, become the reason you stop asking the questions that still need answers. Pressure is not an answer. You were elected to represent Charlotte. Charlotte doesn't need elected officials to be fearless, we need you to withstand the pressure long enough to make sure you're making the decision that is right for the right reasons with all the information that you're entitled to have. Thank you.

Evan Schultheis, 1001 Brookrun Drive said honorable Councilors, I'm here tonight representing All Aboard Carolinas, a division of the Carolina Association for Passenger Trains to discuss an alternative to the proposed I-77 South Expansion. I would like to bring attention to one specific alternative today, the exploration of leasing tracks from Norfolk Southern to run commuter trains along their R-Line from Charlotte to Rock Hill. These tracks are already in the ground and once formed the first rail line to connect our city, the Charlotte and South Carolina Railroad. This service would not need to be massive in scope to be massive in impact. A turnkey operation on existing infrastructure, combined with a roadmap to make improvements over time, could provide rapid relief to commuters and taxpayers at significantly lower cost. We know that this model works, because North Carolina pioneered it on our Piedmont service connecting Charlotte to Raleigh. This service could begin at our Amtrak Station continuing to a station where West Boulevard meets the tracks, offering a two-seat transfer to the airport by adjusting the 60. From there it would stop at I-485 Station before arriving in the heart of downtown Pineville without disturbing its historic core. Fort Mill would offer the same opportunity before arriving in Rock Hill, linking Winthrop University's 6,000 students to Uptown Charlotte. The reason that this solution matters so much is structural. Right now, there are only three bridges across the Catawba between Charlotte and Rock Hill, I-77, US-21, and the Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge. We need to envision a solution to this corridor that expands the bottleneck, rather than shifts it north. Thank you, and please vote no on the tolls, or demand matching transit funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation to diversify this corridor. Thank you.

Corbin Smith, 1908 Archdale Drive said so good evening. My name is Corbin Smith. I am a South Charlotte resident, and one of the city's few republicans, and I'm asking you to vote no on the toll lanes. The economist Alain Bertaud put this simply, once your metro area population passes one million, it doesn't matter how many lanes or how much parking you add, the car is going to stop being your most effective option simply because of the density of the problem. You need to densify, and putting that off only makes it worse. Now Charlotte voters know that. That's why we voted yes on the transportation referendum. Now, when this project was first studied, we had a metro population of 1.6 million. We're now knocking on 3 million. The tragedy with this project is not just that it's not going to work, it's that everyone knows it's not going to work. We've seen other cities try this and fail, we saw it ourselves with the North 77 toll lanes, and frankly I think the General Assembly should be thanking us for not wanting to spend good taxpayer money after bad. But they are asking for the $70 million clawback, so let's talk about it. Our county contributes about 15 percent of the State's tax revenues. The State has committed $600 million, which did not change the $300 million being promised in community benefits, that's coming out of tolls, we'll talk about that later. So, our share of $600 million is $90 million. Let me repeat that. We're going to spend $90 million as a County so we don't have to spend $70 million. Let's go on. The balance, at least $2.6 billion, make that $2.9 billion, with the improvements with a break even, no inflation, is a direct tax on our economy. We're paying for it. It either comes directly out of us, or out of money that our small businesses miss. So, we're going to tax and pay ourselves to rip out our own neighborhoods and our neighborhoods and parks, to put in something that we know will not work, and it's not just me that's saying this. There are some people who are respectfully representing groups that have put ads up on social media asking you to vote for this. Look at the comments on those. It is almost unanimously against it from republicans and democrats, people who actually live and vote here, all agreeing for different reasons that this is a bad idea. So, that's why I'm adding my voice to this conversation, and I hope the General Assembly is listening. Please vote no on this. Thank you.

Shobita Suresh, 1425 Winnifred Street said good evening. I am Shobita Suresh, and I'm here tonight with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Climate Leaders. So, I was reading a WFAE article this week by Ely Portillo about this progressive wind that has caught on in Charlotte, and it made me realize that our City is at an important crossroads. For decades, Charlotte has been known to be friendly to business interests, but the tides are shifting. We've seen a data center moratorium, more scrutiny of rezonings, and a new City Council willing to put the people first. I've witnessed this change myself. When

the news of the I-77 Expansion first broke, my urbanist friends and I were devastated. We assumed there was nothing Charlotte could do to stop it, but then something remarkable happened. We organized, spoke out, and packed public meetings, and the City of Charlotte and CRTPO (Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization) withdrew their support. I couldn't believe it. I honestly shed a tear of joy, and that's why tonight feels so important. I understand that rescinding support comes with financial consequences. The State has put Charlotte in an incredibly difficult position, but difficult decisions are often the ones that define great leaders, and I ask you to stand with the majority of your constituents. I repeat the majority of your constituents, and once again withdraw your support for this project. You know this expansion will not solve congestion, and you know that approving it now sends the message that when enough pressure is applied from Raleigh, Charlotte will eventually give in. The article noted that Charlotte is entering a new phase, one where we don't accept projects simply because powerful interests support them, one where we ask whether those projects truly serve the public. This is a pivotal moment in Charlotte's history. You stood up once, and I'm asking you to stand up again. Thank you.

Reverend Corine Mack, 2317 Sonoma Valey Drive said good evening. I'm Reverend Corine Mack, and I come before you to ask several questions. Can we reconnect neighborhoods that government and infrastructure once divided? Can we build bridges that serve communities instead of simply carrying traffic over them? Can we improve pedestrian safety and neighborhood connectivity? Can we create better access to jobs, healthcare, education, and transportation? Can we reclaim land and use it to strengthen communities? Can we protect neighborhood stability and create opportunities for long-time residents and locally-owned businesses to participate in the economic value created by this investment? Can we make investments that remain in these communities long after the construction crews leave? Those things happen with a true community benefits agreement, and I stand before you because I did work over the last two months to ensure that we in fact had a community benefits agreement. Seven meetings with the community, two with State representatives who acted with the delegation of Mecklenburg County to discuss what it was that we wanted as a community. Now, in this room there may be several people who speak very loudly, but this is not the community. There are thousands more who truly want change, thousands who have lived in the West Corridor, what I call the greater corridor, and have been harmed for over 50 years. Tonight, if you vote yes, you can make a difference, sustainable difference, tangible difference, for those families, and God Bless you.

Shannon Binns, 1611 Tippah Park Court said good evening. My name is Shannon Binns. I'm with Sustain Charlotte, and I have my beautiful daughter and brilliant daughter, Edie Moon Binns, with me tonight. Tonight, I'm asking you to vote your conscience. I know financial considerations and political pressure weigh heavily on you tonight, but saving money and avoiding retaliation cannot be the measures of whether we are doing what is right. How do you want to be remembered? As leaders who spoke about racial equity, or as leaders who stood up for it when doing so came at a cost? Charlotte's inequities did not happen by accident. They grew from generations of decisions about whose neighborhoods could be divided, whose communities could be displaced, and whose voices could be ignored. You did not make those decisions, but tonight you are responsible for whether we repeat them. We cannot say everyone should benefit from Charlotte's growth while asking the same black communities to bear the burdens again. Racial equity cannot be a principle we uphold only when it is cheap or politically convenient. Now, I think we all understand the appeal of promised community benefits; those needs are real. West Charlotte deserves investment, but repairing past neglect should not be conditional on accepting more harm. When people look back, they will ask, when the pressure came who stood up for them? As a resident, I am pleading with you, choose people, people over profit, people over politics, people over the pressure to accept something you know is wrong. We have the opportunity to build a more equitable Charlotte, the Charlotte that you and I both want to live in. Tonight, help us become that city and vote against this unjust project. Thank you.

Meg Fencil, 5124 Shady Grove Lane said good evening, Mayor and members of City Council. My name is Meg Fencil. I'm Director of Engagement and Impact at Sustain

Charlotte, and I'm also a District Three resident, living less than a half mile west of I-77 near Woodlawn Road. NC-DOT's own analysis projects that building the toll lanes could increase daily traffic volume up to 44 percent, and more road capacity encourages more driving. Yet, if these lanes are built, the vast majority of people who would continue driving in the existing general purpose lanes are not being promised a less congested commute. We can all agree on one thing. Congestion on I-77 South is a serious problem, and something needs to be done about it. The question is what we do as a community. That's why Sustain Charlotte decided that simply opposing the project wasn't enough. We researched what other growing cities are doing to address congestion, safety, and unreliable travel on urban highways. We published these findings in our report, "A Better Way Forward", and tonight I'm leaving each of you a physical copy. Peer cities are combining strategies like ramp metering, targeted improvements to problematic ramps and interchanges, fast and frequent public transit, and transportation demand management. They're also finding ways to reconnect neighborhoods, rather than widening highways farther into them. These approaches can improve mobility without a multi-billion dollar widening of I-77 South, and this is also personal for me. I live close enough to I-77 that I can hear the highway from my neighborhood, and expanding it would affect the environment that my neighbors and I live in everyday, including our exposure to traffic-related air pollution. Our report lays out concrete strategies for making investments that provide effective, affordable mobility options for everyone, not just for those who can afford expensive daily tolls. I hope that you'll read it and pursue those alternatives. Thank you.

Sean Langley, 1621 Oaklawn Avenue said the climb towards justice. Imagine a government where courage mattered more than convenience. Imagine elected officials willing to stand firm when doing what they believe is right comes with a political price. That is the hill we are climbing. Make no mistake, I-77 is a hill, but this hill is not simply made of concrete, steel, asphalt, and toll lanes, it's made of history. It's made of decisions that once divided black neighborhoods, displaced families, and disrupted communities, and now we're being asked to believe that we can build another massive piece of infrastructure through these same communities without repeating the consequences of the past. We should know better. So, the question before Charlotte is not simply, how do we move more cars? The question is how do we move forward without moving backwards on justice? There will always be someone saying, take the money, take the investment, take the community benefits, but the community benefits should never be used to make an inequitable infrastructure decision acceptable. A community should not have to surrender its future in exchange for resources it should've received through equitable government in the first place, because money can build sidewalks, parks, and buildings, but money cannot restore a community's history once it's been fractured. It cannot erase decades of cumulative environmental burdens. It cannot purchase more authority. So, this moment requires more than negotiation, it requires conviction. Council members, imagine what Charlotte could look like if courage outweighed convenience. Imagine what racial justice looks like when it's not merely discussed but practiced. This hill is steep, but the greatest moments in the history of justice rarely happen on level ground. So, climb it. Climb it for the families who came before us. Climb it for the neighborhoods that survive. Climb it for the children who inherit what we build, because leadership means more than holding office, leadership means having the courage to do what you believe is right when doing what is right is difficult, and this is one of those moments.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Mr. Langley.

Mr. Langley said the question is not whether the hill is difficult, the question is whether we are willing to climb it, that is the hill we are climbing, and your constituents are watching how.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Mr. Langley. Mr. Langley, you are over time and you're disrupting the meeting. Mr. Langley, please stop. Thank you.

Greg Jarrell, 2910 Parkway Avenue said Reverend Greg Jarrell, District Two. Good evening, Council members. I'm glad that you'll be with me to overhear what I have to

say to those sitting behind me and watching online tonight. To all those kindred who have been fighting for your lives, for our neighborhoods, for our homes, for your children, and for our City for countless years, you know that the urban highway system is our city's most enduring monument to white supremacy, and like me you likely feel the sting of what is shaping up to be another loss in the battle to create a livable city that is willing to fight to defend the value of all of its residents. Though it may seem like cold comfort today, I want to tell you from the history books that this City's first expressway was approved in a secret meeting held at Myers Park Country Club in 1945. Today's short-sided approval to expand a highway, if that is in fact what happens, was first set in place about a decade ago quietly. Now, as of today, it has required $300 million in buyouts, a nakedly illegal act by a state legislature desperate to hang on to power, a revolving door between NC-DOT and the lead consultant, HNTB (Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff), paving the way for all manner of corruption, and the bare minimum number of Council members who have passively acquiesced when it is far more prudent at this moment to fight. There is still time, by the way, for those members to find the courage to reject this ineffective and unwise plan. Should you leave here angry, beloveds, or despairing tonight, I join you in that feeling. The damage of this project will be long-lasting and difficult to undo, and yet I look around and note that our organizing, though it is incomplete, is working. Keep going, beloveds, keep going, keep going, keep going, keep going, keep going, keep going. Thank you.

Rosemary Young, 1616 Patton Avenue said good evening, Mayor and City Council. My name is Rosemary Lawrence Young. I am a retired City employee, but most importantly I am a homeowner in McCrorey Heights, a proud homeowner. As you are aware, recently McCrorey Heights received a designation on a national level as a historic designation. None of this seems to matter as we continue to be pressured to accept these elevated toll lanes, which will further bring pain by reducing our quality of life, as those I-77 toll lanes have already done. Now, we're talking about elevating ones. I'm concerned for my grandchildren and future generations. Just think about the further reduction in air quality and the reduction in noise. We're still waiting for sound barriers that we were supposed to receive years ago. Obviously, the value of our property would be impacted. I stand before you to say I oppose the I-77 toll lane project. I ask you to keep your promise you made on the original vote and oppose this project. We ask you for an independent alternative study. I don't know whether anybody's even looking at that. We believe the benefits that are being offered are false. They'll never materialize. You were elected to represent us. We're speaking to you. We're pleading to you. Keep your promise.

Rebekah Taff, 1553 Wilmore Drive said good evening. I'm Rebekah Taff. As President of the Wilmore Neighborhood Association, I am here to oppose the I-77 South project. As we all know, Charlotte is growing rapidly, and Wilmore wants that growth to include more greenspace, better public transportation, and neighborhoods that remain connected and livable. We should be very cautious about making decisions today that lock us into more and more highway infrastructure for generations to come. This project would require the use of imminent domain to take a number of our neighbors' homes. Wilmore feels it's unacceptable to tell a homeowner that their home needs to be taken so that we can build additional toll lanes, particularly when there is significant community concern about whether expanding the highway is actually consistent with the Charlotte that we want to become. We want Charlotte to invest in a future that gives people more choices, not simply more toll lanes for cars. Thank you.

Rickey Hall, 3133 Reid Avenue said good evening, Mayor Harrington and members of Council. My name is Rickey Hall, and West Boulevard is my home. I grew up in this corridor. I spent decades working alongside residents to bring investment and opportunity into this community. I want to ask you tonight to look at I-77 differently. For most of my life, major infrastructure improvement projects have been done to our communities and around our communities. Roads came through, neighborhoods were divided, decisions were made, and then we were left to live with the consequences. This time can be different. This project can be done with the community, and if we do it right, the people who live along this corridor can receive real and lasting benefits from the infrastructure investments of this magnitude. We are people. We are families. We are

communities that have waited a long time for this level of investment. We have an opportunity to reconnect neighborhoods that were divided by I-77. We can build better bridges and crossings. We can improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. We can connect people to greenways, jobs, healthcare, education, and transportation. We can use this investment to help stabilize communities, create economic opportunity, support locally-owned businesses, and make sure that the people who live here can remain here and benefit from what comes next. So, my ask tonight is specific. Reinstate the use of the P3 to fund the I-77 project. Then use the leverage that comes with this project to negotiate hard for the people who live here. Make the community benefits durable. Make them enforceable. Make sure the communities have a seat at the table as they are designed. We have spent many years talking about what happened to communities like West Boulevard. This is our chance to decide what we're going to do with it. Thank you.

Sagar Rathie, 2015 Bradford Hall Place said good evening, Mayor Harrington and members of Council. My name is Sagar Rathie. I live in District Seven, and I work in the commercial real estate industry in Charlotte. I'm here today because I'm in full support of I-77. I want to focus on what the project makes possible for the neighborhoods along the corridor. NC-DOT has discussed committing upwards of $300 million in community investment. That means small business and economic mobility opportunities, a huge avenue for housing stability where displacement pressure is real, greenspace, potentially grocers and other retail, recreation spaces, and reconnecting communities that have felt disconnected for quite some time. A commitment of that size is extremely rare. Those are real dollars we're talking about. Spent well, it can be transformative and reaches well beyond the roadway itself. Second, let's be honest, the work is not done. There's been a lot of concern regarding this being a finality, and the reality is it's not. The seat remains open for us to be at the table to think through what we can do and how we can really contribute to what's happening along that corridor. Third, the last thing I'll ask is, it's time we also hold NC-DOT accountable for all these requirements and actions. It's not unreasonable to ask that these community benefits be memorialized in some form, or at least supported in some form, so that we can keep moving Charlotte forward. Thank you, and I appreciate your vote.

June Blotnick, 2517 Belvedere Avenue said good evening. I'm June Blotnick and I'm representing the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Climate Leaders, a coalition of dozens of people and organizations fighting for our health through climate solutions. Hopefully you know that transportation is the number one source of greenhouse gases in this county, in this state, and in this country. A DOT (Department of Transportation) April 2026 report showed that adding lanes will lead to 44 percent growth in vehicles traveling on I-77. More vehicles equals more pollution and more pollution is a driver of illness and premature death, particularly in black and brown communities, which have suffered from decades of displacement in this City, only to be relocated near roadways, landfills, and other pollution sources. Policy decisions impact public health. This Council took the high road just months ago listening to large numbers of Charlotte residents, especially those most impacted by this project. Today, you received a 12-page document from Southern Environmental Law Center on why it's premature to take the vote tonight before you look into how DOT came up with a $69 million figure the City and surrounding towns supposedly owe them. SELC (Southern Environmental Law Center) also provides examples of promised public benefits to communities in Durham and Asheville with most of them never fully realized. Your decision will impact generations to come. Please don't repeat the injustices of the past in this City. Take the time to address this new information and hold to your original decision.

Douglas Kandora,1605 Wilmore Drive said good evening. My name is Douglas Kandora, a 10-year resident of Charlotte. Let it be known I stand in opposition to the proposed toll lanes. I am confident in this position because I believe there is absolutely a better path forward. Here in 2026, when humanity solves unsolvable problems time and again by working together, I cannot accept that this toll lane plan, a plan causing such widespread anxiety, frustration, anger, and sadness for so many, is the best or only option. I believe there's a path forward where no family homes are destroyed, and the toll lanes actually start working for Charlotte residents. That said, regardless of how

you ultimately vote, I commend your courage under these circumstances. I wish you wisdom and offer sincere gratitude for your service. Tonight, my heart is with my neighbors. Thank you.

Amy Brooks, 16416 Breech Hill Drive, Huntersville said good evening. My name is Amy Brooks Paradise, and I live in Huntersville, North Carolina. I used to live in South Charlotte near where this project is happening. We have, up in North Mecklenburg, the added HOV (High-Occupancy Vehicle) lanes between Uptown and Mooreseville, it's not fun. Perhaps what's more important is the traffic isn't any better. Let me say that again, it's not better. When I'm completely stressed out by all the traffic, I've been known to jump onto the HOV lane, a practice that puts my credit card into cardiac arrest. Maybe the lanes help a few people, but frankly it's hard to tell when most of the time I'm inching along in traffic for 20 minutes to go five miles. As housing costs have risen, affordable housing, including older established communities across Charlotte, have been destroyed to make room for expensive condos and homes, as well as in this case expanded highways. I'm concerned that the impact of these practices is to drive people away from the City into the somewhat more affordable suburbs, only to be frustrated by ever longer commutes, a secondary roadway system that is completely overwhelmed and underresourced, where people sit for 30 or more minutes just trying to get to the highway as I witness daily. It makes getting to work in Charlotte more difficult, not less. A vital city needs a large cross-section of housing that meets the needs of different budgets so that people can live in the communities where they work. Why would we even partially destroy an established community close to Uptown, creating more pollution for the people left behind, and adding to our housing problems both in the City and in the suburbs. If we are looking at the City's budgetary bottom line, I fear we are missing billions in hidden costs in healthcare, housing, jobs, and quality of life for all of us. Thank you.

Allen Dargins, 4510 Ashtonboro Drive said good evening, Mayor Harrington and Charlotte City Council members. My name is Allen Dargins. I am a native Charlottean, born at Presbyterian Hospital, raised off of West Boulevard in the Reid Park community, Dalton Village area. I currently serve as the REBIC Chair, the Real Estate Building Industry Coalition, which is the leading advocacy voice for the real estate industry throughout Charlotte. Today, we ask you to support moving the I-77 project south of Uptown forward. I don't have to remind you how many people move here a day. I am also President elect of Canopy Realtor Association, taking office January 2027. It is no secret that Charlotte is growing exponentially, and with that growth comes the responsibility for managing it effectively. At REBIC we always aim to partner with policymakers and efforts to help sustain a healthy real estate industry and local economy overall. We're focused on the community benefits that could be lost for those living near the highway and many others. We cannot miss the opportunity to reconnect people and neighborhoods with an intentional approach. Through pedestrian connectivity, multi-use paths, bike lanes, and new greenspaces, it goes far beyond just mitigating road congestion. It provides community assets that help make prosperity more accessible and sustainable for all. Opportunities for projects like this are rare, and we cannot afford to delay action on such a vital corridor. Thank you.

Omar Parker, 304 Pecan Ridge Court said Mayor and members of the Charlotte City Council. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening about the I-77 South project. My name is Omar Parker. I'm a Clinical Medical Physicist and Founder and Managing Principal of New Creation Charlotte, a local company serving healthcare facilities and other commercial properties. I've called Charlotte home for 14 years, and in that time I've watched our City grow tremendously. Through my work, I've also become increasingly involved in Charlotte's healthcare, business, real estate, and hospitality communities. I support moving the I-77 South project forward, and I'm asking you to reinstate your support. I understand there are important questions about what this project ultimately looks like, how surrounding communities are affected, and what commitments should be part of it. Those questions deserve answers, and I believe we should continue the process of finding those answers. As Charlotte continues to grow, the infrastructure connecting our neighborhoods, businesses, healthcare facilities, and people needs to keep pace. For me this is about taking a long-term view of the City I've

called home for 14 years and investing thoughtfully in its future. I respectfully ask you to move the process forward. Thank you for your time and for your service to Charlotte.

Maria Sofia, 418 Seldon Drive said good evening, neighbors, Council members, and specifically good evening to my representative, Councilmember Graham. My name is Maria and I live in West Charlotte, and my favorite Apple Map function is the avoid tolls little toggle. The I-77 Expansion project was a bad idea when it was previously shot down and it still is. It can and will hurt residents by removing greenspace, decreasing air quality, and displacing residents. We are talking about literally kicking people out of their homes so people can save 10, 20 minutes on their commute. Never mind that decades of data have shown that induced demand can and will prevail. Traffic and congestion is annoying, no one likes it, but you leave a few minutes earlier. I encourage the Council members to keep in mind that traffic is an inconvenience. Community harm is permanent. Thank you.

Reverend Dr. Janet Garner Mullins, 1014 Comstock Drive said good evening. My name is Reverend Dr. Janet Garner Mullins, a native Charlottean. Good evening, Mayor and City Council members. Thank you for the opportunity to share with you. I'm here tonight with the same request I made last month, to hold your position. Do not change from opposing I-77 Lane project to supporting it. Since then, I've been wondering and thinking about one question, what has changed? Transportation needs have not changed. Our community needs have not changed. The concerns raised by residents have not changed. The burden tolls would place on working families have not changed. The risk of disrupting established neighborhoods and forcing families out of their homes has not changed. So, I ask the question, hmm, what has changed? Well, I'm glad you asked, let me tell you. What has changed has been the pressure put on Council and local government to reconsider their decision based upon, we don't know, but we know that public opinion and input has been already taken. Like everyone else, we all want safe roads, less congestion, and better transportation, but we must ask ourselves, at what cost. Families have already paid for these roads through their taxes. Now, they're going to have to pay again to go to the doctor, go to work, go to school, and go back home. We deserve transportation that is effective and has the solutions, but most importantly we deserve transportation that does not displace communities or people. City Council members, we can build roads, budgets can be revisited, but once trust in you is lost, it's lost for good.

FC "Bo" Proctor, 1616 Biltmore Drive said Mayor, City Council, my name is Bo Proctor. I'm a commercial real estate professional here in Charlotte, and I'm speaking today because I believe we are looking at I-77 primarily as a transportation problem, when we should also be looking at it as a real estate and economic development opportunity. Understand the argument for the toll lanes, understand the congestion, understand the $69 million for DOT says could have to be repaid if the project doesn't move forward, but those are not the reasons to spend $4 billion on a project simply because we've already invested money in getting this far. As a real estate professional, I have a different question. What will $4 billion produce for Charlotte over the next 50 years? Will it primarily produce more highway capacity, or could we use that extraordinary investment to create more housing, more transit, more walkable development, higher property values, and larger tax base? Charlotte has already demonstrated that transportation investment can create enormous development value. The Blue Line corridor is an example of transportation, infrastructure, helping transform land use and development patterns. I don't believe Charlotte should simply make I-77 bigger. I believe we should make I-77 corridor more productive. Let's address the real problems, safety, reliability, and congestion, but compare targeted highway improvements, transit, express bus, HOV, neighborhood connections, and development opportunities against the toll lane proposal, and let's measure the alternative, not just by how many car they move, but how many people they move, how much housing they create, how much private investment they create and generate, how much tax base they produce, and what they cost taxpayers over 50 years. Please don't let $69 million cost determine the $4 billion decision. Charlotte has one chance to decide what this corridor becomes for the next generations. Let's invest in mobility and economic productivity for Charlotte, and not simply in more lanes. Thank you.

Carl Zaccardelli, 3210 Maywood Drive said I'm Carl Zaccardelli, a Charlotte resident, and I'd like to say that although much has been said and will continue to be said about the impact of the I-77 Toll Lanes upon Charlotte communities, there are other pressing reasons why voting in favor of the toll lanes project would not just be a vote against the public good, but a vote in favor of private interest that have pervaded and perverted the project from the start. I'd like to first point out the disingenuous claims of the North Carolina Department of Transportation regarding one of the purposes of the project, specifically safety. I'd like to know in which world adding more lanes to carry more cars that go faster while adding more merges and more interchanges to service those lanes will improve safety, especially given that the United States Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration suggests a road diet program, which encourages reducing the number of lanes to improve safety, claiming that road diets can reduce total crashes by 19 percent to 47 percent. So, the North Carolina Department of Transportation's appeals of safety are really an appeal to people's fears with baseless claims and conceal their real interest, none of which include safety. Furthermore, Charlotte PR (public relations) firm, CLTPR (CLT Public Relations), in late July 2026 supposedly polled Charlotte residents, gauged their level of support for the I-77 Toll Lane Project, included that about half of the Charlotte voters are in support of the project. Yet, while trying to uncover their methodology of the survey, I went to their website and found nothing about how the poll was actually conducted. It was widely reported by the news media, and yet by going through the website the only thing I can find is YouTube videos of the flintstones, jokes, and other nonsense. There's also the big issue of legality regarding the support of the supposed $70 million payback. Matthews City Attorney Daniel Peterson has said that the law offends due process and attacks local governments for listening constituents, but aside from that there's been no other real opposition to it legally. So, why hasn't City Council or other local leaders or members of the CRTPO fought it? Beyond just the issue of legality, there's also the issue of representation. Local leaders and City Council members who will reverse their vote from opposing the toll lanes project to supporting it, in wake of the payback bullying [inaudible] wake of the state legislature.

Synceer Johnson, 2825 Fordwood Drive said hello, my name is Synceer Johnson. I was born in West Charlotte and raised in Tuckasegee, and the reason I'm here today is because Charlotte will not be sold out to big businesses. West Charlotte is the heart of the black community, and this project will do nothing but short and rip up our communities. The reason why the State feels okay to reset this project despite no community support, is because they don't care about black people. This happens with every urban development project. Black people are thrown under the bus again and again to clear ways for banks and corporations. Now we have the State of North Carolina threatening to charge us $70 million of our money if City Council doesn't reset the expansion. Right now, they're throwing $300 million of potential community benefits, but let's be real, whose actual pockets get this money? Did we actually decide where the money goes? No, absolutely not. So, the task you have today is extremely basic. Will you fulfill your responsibilities to represent the people of Charlotte, especially Councilmembers Malcolm Graham and Joi Mayo? You have all the responsibility to protect the black community of Charlotte. If you vote for the expansion, you are clearing the way for private developers to destroy our neighborhoods. So, the question today is simple. Will you fight against the history of destroying black communities in Charlotte, and will you listen to the people you represent, or will you help destroy Charlotte even more?

Rob Nanfelt, 4127 Wright Avenue said good evening, Mayor and members of Council. My name is Rob Nanfelt. I'm here representing the Real Estate and Building Industry Coalition. I don't know that I could add much more to what my Chairman had to say, as a longtime resident here of Charlotte, but I will say I am currently a resident of District Five, and I avoid I-77 as much as possible, except for this last Saturday coming back from a soccer game 1:15 p.m. in the afternoon, come to a dead standstill just north of the State line. It's obvious something has to change. The project had been contemplated for many, many years. It was on the fast track to getting done, and the community spoke out with a number of concerns. You responded, and during the last several months a number of things have happened. New money has been found to

create some connectivity that doesn't currently exist. So, I urge you to move ahead, get back to the table, get this project across the finish line so that we can create that connectivity and make I-77 work for everybody. Thank you.

Crystal Presley, 4642 Kipling Drive said hi, I'm Crystal Presley, also a Charlotte native born at Presbyterian Hospital. I'm going to talk about Charlotte history and the kind of city we want to be moving forward. Much of Charlotte's highway system was built in the 1960s and 1970s during a time when highway construction and urban renewal disrupted and displaced black communities, and I-77 is an example of that history. The highway cut through black neighborhoods and physically divided Pinewood Cemetery, one of Charlotte's historic African American cemeteries. Over 70 graves were relocated, families and communities were displaced, and integrated neighborhoods that had existed together for generations were separated. Today, the proposed project risks placing another burden on those communities through further displacement, loss of homes, generational wealth, and impact to sites like the historic cemetery. You literally have an opportunity to build a bridge between our communities again. We cannot change what happened 50 years ago, but we can decide what happens next, and I believe Charlotte should be thinking bigger than adding more lanes for cars. We should be investing in transportation options that connect our neighbors instead of divide them. Charlotte is one of the fastest growing cities in the Country, and we should not be bullied or pressured by the State into building a project that our residents don't want. Right now you can be part of reshaping what a major American city looks like, and it's your duty to make your constituents voices heard. The toll lanes themselves raise an important question about equity and who has access to faster, more reliable transportation. It's a system where it's tied to a person's ability to pay, which can deepen existing economic and racial inequities. I hope City Council will continue to stand firm on the decision to withdraw support from the I-77 South Toll Lane, and use this moment to advocate for transportation investments that do not repeat patterns of displacement and division that Charlotte has spent decades trying to overcome. Thank you.

Aaron Shawcross, 806 West 5th Street said hello, ladies and gentlemen of the Council. My name is Aaron. I'm a long-time resident of District Two and a proud member of the Charlotte Democratic Socialists of America. I'm speaking to you today to implore you to stand by your votes to reject these tolls. The decision to build these tolls was inorganic and undemocratic. Charlotte residents have had no say in these developments. This is a project being pushed on us by outside forces in Raleigh. This is just one part of a larger series of decisions by the NC General Assembly to prioritize the capitalist's class first over the working people of Charlotte. Officials in Raleigh are attempting to strong arm us into this plan and propose a legally dubious fee expecting you to be pushovers. I do not know about you, but I do not think that is what the people of Charlotte are wanting from their elected officials. The threatened fee can and should be challenged legally as the Memorandum of Understanding is not legally binding yet. Building the toll lanes will impact the working class disproportionately, especially Charlotte's black community. It will increase noise and air pollution severely in historically black neighborhoods. This City has a long history of redlining, gentrification, and displacement and we cannot allow those injustices to continue. Mr. Graham, I believe you stated that black people were finally getting their seat at the table when you voted against this decision in May 2026. I hope we are not planning to take that seat away so quickly. The toll lanes already built have not been shown to meaningfully impact traffic congestion, and there has not been a study showing this one will. Thank you.

Martin Nunnally, 5328 Haybridge Road said thank you for getting my last name right, that was perfect. I've got to say, great job to my City Councillors for not falling for a sunk cost fallacy. I can't think of a better logic than blaming a fee that's one and a half percent of the City's budget to make a generationally bad decision. I mean, maybe it's a good idea, because considering how popular I-77 North's toll road is, maybe, I don't know, I'm happy to pay $6 a mile, so I don't have to drive with the poors. So, Mr. Graham, you're my representative. You champion yourself on being an advocate for your constituents and people of color. You invited a local historian to a town hall to

speak about the impact highways have had on black communities. You said, and I quote, “Something has to be done about this highway, but it shouldn’t be done on the back of black and brown communities.” You voted this down in May 2026. You said your decision, like my friend Aaron said, was about disproportionately black communities getting a seat at the table. So, are you an advocate of black and brown communities or not? Would a true advocate roll over like this? Does an advocate, during the public hearing, play around on his phone for the first 20 speakers? Or maybe it’s the promise of the community bribe, or sorry, I mean community fund, that is up to $300 million. I’m sure your low-income constituents, if they remain, are going to love the pickleball courts, The Wegmans, The Sprouts that this is going to subsidize. So, I also hear you’re running for Mayor next term. I won’t be voting for anyone who approves this project, and maybe we should ask Pat McCrory about how toll lanes affect election outcomes.

Javier Lopez, 14428 Youngblood Road said good evening. My name is Javier Lopez, President of the Steele Creek Residents Association. Tonight, I also want to acknowledge another community leader and good friend, Virginia Keogh, who is a leader of SWAN (Southwest Area Neighborhood Coalition) and an SCRE (Southwest Area Coalition of Residential Environments) Board member. She’s with me here in spirit and watching us tonight on TV. So, hi, Virginia. I’m here to let you know that SCRE and SWAN stand with the large coalition led by Sustain Charlotte in opposing the proposed I-77 South Toll project. Despite many ongoing global and self-inflicted problems today, this country’s economy, and especially Charlotte’s, remains resilient, but history shows it won’t always be so. Let’s step back and be reminded what happens when the economy is not, companies going solvent, developers go bankrupt. Due to the subprime mortgage meltdown a developer overpromises, our Palisades community in Steele Creek bears little resemblance to the original masterplan and struggles today to maintain their orphan road, the Grand Palisades Pkwy. Thanks to NC-DOT mismanagement and COVID, highway 160 widening from South Carolina state line to the airport is delayed by over 10 years and not coming to start until 2030 or beyond. The next economic downturn will come, and when it does so many of these community benefits that are being promised will go poof. An earlier supporter used the term real dollars in describing these promises. Do we see them? Joi, Malcolm, do not give your power and voice to [inaudible].

Matt Britt, 6530 Woodshed Circle said good evening, Mr. Mayor and City Council and City staff. Thank ya’ll for being here and for giving us a chance to speak. I am Matt Britt, and I’m here as Vice Chair of South Charlotte Partners, and I’m here tonight on behalf of our board. Our position is straight forward. South Charlotte Partners supports moving the I-77 South project forward while continuing the important work of protecting affected communities and ensuring this corridor serves more than just single occupancy vehicles. More than 160,000 vehicles travel this section of I-77 each day. It is a critical corridor of commerce, connecting people to jobs, businesses to customers, and goods to markets, and congestion isn’t just an economic issue. When minutes matter, first responders need a reliable way through that corridor, but moving forward also means learning from the past. Highway projects have divided communities and disproportionately affected/harmed minority and underserved neighborhoods. We should acknowledge that history, minimize those impacts, and provide meaningful mitigation for affected communities. The future of I-77 should also be about moving people, not simply adding lanes for automobiles. That means incorporating bus, multimodal, and future transit opportunities, including reliable, free travel for high-occupancy vehicles, and we should be realistic. Additional roadway capacity alone will not permanently eliminate congestion in a growing region. There are legitimate questions about how we accomplish this, but the need to improve this corridor is not going away. South Charlotte Partners supports continued collaboration toward a solution that improves mobility and safety, strengthens economic prosperity for all, expands transportation choices, and responsibly addresses community impacts. We can be thoughtful about the future while recognizing that our region requires meaningful progress today. Thank you for your time. Thank you very much.

Andre Collins, 1057 East Morehead Street, Suite 300 said good evening, Mayor Harrington, and members of City Council. My name is Andre Collins. I’m a proud

graduate of John C. Smith University and UNC (University of North Carolina) Charlotte. I'm also the Founding Partner of First & Early Partners. We've been fortunate to work with the City of Charlotte on economic development, including Corridors of Opportunity, to help strengthen our City. I also lead First & Early Capital, our private equity platform, and as owners of Brooklyn Village South, we're collaborating with Mecklenburg County on that project. Charlotte is the only place in this great country that I've lived since I received my citizenship in 2016 and beyond. I'm also a husband and a father raising a family here. My wife's family has roots in this region from Cherry neighborhood to Derita neighborhood, all the way to Davidson. I am here tonight to support moving I-77 South Express Lane Project forward. I want our City to grow in a way that improves daily life for the people who already call it home and for those who will move here in the future. I respect the concerns about displacement and protecting historic neighborhoods. A home represents years of work, family memories, and stability. For someone worried about losing that, a promise of future benefits is not enough. Those concerns deserve concrete answers. I ask you to vote to move this project forward and keep pressing those answers. My support comes with an expectation that residents help shape the decisions affecting their homes and neighborhoods. Safer pedestrian walkings, connections to greenways, and reliable transit should be priorities. So should minimizing displacement and providing meaningful assistance to affected homeowners and renters. Community commitments need to be written, enforceable, and clear about who is responsible for delivering them. I ask you to vote yes to move I-77 South Express Lane Project forward and insist on protecting the community we can count on. Thank you.

Tim Sittema, 3824 Pomfret Lane said good evening, Mayor Harrington, members of City Council. My name is Tim Sittema. I am here to speak in support of reinstating the I-77 South Express Lanes Project. As you know, our company Crosland Southeast is continuing to work on multiple projects that align closely with your priorities. We're proud of the public and private collaboration to create enhanced spaces that will help ensure Charlotte continues to thrive for everyone. You are faced with a difficult decision with regard to I-77, and I don't envy you. We would all like to please everyone with all of our decisions. Unfortunately, we don't live in that world, and that certainly can't be done with this vote. Like many of you, I have dear friends on both sides of this issue, and they are very emotionally charged up around this topic. Both sides speak about racial equity and racial justice. Both sides do. Can they both be right? I clearly understand the conflict, and the tipping point for me on this issue is the community benefits. The private investment through the proposed public/private partnership will unlock transformational community benefits for these neighborhoods, including safer mobility, green open space, enhanced connectivity for everyone traveling nearby, whether on foot, bike, car, or bus. Youth programs, and many other vital community needs will be enhanced and strengthened by this investment. Without this project, none of these outcomes will happen, and gridlock will continue on I-77. On a personal note, I've got several co-workers that live in Southwest Charlotte, the Ballantyne area. They spend hours and hours every week on I-77. They both told me if things don't improve, they're going to have to find jobs elsewhere, further south. That's a real cost to me and it's a real cost to businesses throughout Charlotte. I urge you to vote. Thank you.

Alex Wohlbruck, 522 Hawthorne Lane said good evening, Mayor, and Council members. My name is Alex Wohlbruck. I grew up in Charlotte, and recently I spent the summer and living in New York, a city that learned a painful lesson about highways 60 years ago, and is still paying for it today. I'm going to tell you a story about two highways. In the 1960s, the State planned a 10-lane expressway straight through SoHo, Little Italy, and the Lower East Side. Two thousand families were displaced. A writer named Jane Jacobs organized her neighbors, got arrested at a public Council meeting, and in 1969 the city finally killed the project. Today, those neighborhoods are among the most valuable in the Country, and I've never met a single person who regrets having those highways not built. Across the river, the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway was built. It cut Brooklyn in half and today it's crumbling. The City spent decades and billions of dollars trying to figure out what to do with it, and every serious proposal to take it down ends in the same way, it would grind the borough to a halt. Here's the thing, they're right. Once it exists, it locks in car dependency and carves out a right-of-way that can't be taken back. We don't have the luxury of changing our minds after the fact. That's

what a highway does. Charlotte is writing its own version of that story tonight under a tight deadline with a high price tag. The cost is temporary, infrastructure is not. I'm asking you to make the same decision that Jane Jacobs and her neighbors made. Today she is lauded as one of the greatest heros of urban transportation and policymaking. I ask that the six of you voted to rescind support in May 2026, hold that vote tonight. Thank you.

Connie Proctor, 2222 Selwyn Avenue said good evening, Mayor and Council. My name is Connie Proctor. I was not originally planning to speak tonight, but I haven't been able to stop thinking about how broad and consistent the opposition to this project has been. A diverse group of people who all thought that this project is bad, people passionate enough not only to send emails, but to show up here for months. I can't help but wonder, who stands to benefit most if this goes forward? I don't believe it's my West Side neighbors. This project should succeed or fail on its own merits. There should be no need for carrots or sticks, and yet even within the equation the balance is in favor of stopping it. We've seen the renderings of the park sandwiched between two highways. We've seen the inconsistent bridge layouts that claim to provide space for people walking and biking. None of them create comfortable, enjoyable community space. We want real viable mobility options, places our children and elderly neighbors can use by themselves. We should not bow to a bully. We haven't gotten any written guarantee of investment or seen any of the receipts. We should not settle for these toll lanes and hope we can get some community benefits. We should stand and demand to go back to the drawing board, and ask the question, how can we move the most people most efficiently? Let's collaborate on a solution that provides real community benefits, not toll lanes.

Markie Millsap, 2808 Burnt Mill Road said good evening, Mayor and Council members. My name is Markie Millsap. I'm here tonight to urge you to vote no to this project. I live in District Six here in Charlotte, but recently I was also in New York City, eating dumplings on the street in Chinatown. So, eating on the street might not sound like a pleasant experience, but it was, and it made me feel more closely connected to that city. I was eating on a park bench in a public park that sat in between two bustling streets, and I realized that the park was created by taking lanes from either side of the street, thus creating a public space and slowing nearby traffic to create a more harmonious neighborhood. Neighbors and delivery workers greeted each other, kids ran around playing together, and people like me ate takeout at park tables. This space was created with the community in mind. The goal was to bring people closer together, slow us down, and allow us to take stock and appreciate the neighborhood around us. The 77 South Toll Lane Project will do the opposite. It will move individuals in the solitude of their cars through our community as quickly as possible without regard for the surrounding neighborhoods. Why increase the disconnect that so many in our City already feel when there is an opportunity to find a solution the right way with community input and connection in mind. Please stand up for us and don't be convinced to act against the best interest of this City's residents based on empty promises and meritless threats from NC-DOT. This is a critical juncture tonight where your vote can either bring us closer together or quite literally push us farther apart. I urge you to not support this project.

Jeff Locke, 13522 Merry Chase Lane said hi, I'm Jeff Locke. I live in Huntersville. We already have our toll lanes. They have only made traffic worse. I've personally spoken to my town commissioner on the CRTPO, and he has indicated to me that Huntersville plans to vote to approve. For us, we are only facing extortion by NC-DOT, and we will see no direct benefits from taking either position, but I urge you not to follow suit. I want to emphasize the costs that are being hidden here and place this threat from NC-DOT into perspective. Staring down $70 million in reimbursements is intimidating, but it's not like we get this highway for free. Even as a P3 project, State taxpayers are on the hook for $600 million of the projected $3.2 billion. This may not come out of Charlotte or the CRTPO's budget, but it's still a bill that Charlotte taxpayers are footing. For a yes vote, NC-DOT is attempting to bribe you with $300 million in local improvements. Clearly this kind of expenditure doesn't actually matter to them, so why so much design cost? The State could in theory pay that $70 million and the $300 million local improvement and

have another $230 million for literally anything else that would actually improve our lives here in the Charlotte metro area, and what do we actually get for the $600 million? Axios reported in April 2026 that they had obtained internal email from NC-DOT containing their own projections under a build scenario traffic would be up to 44 percent worse, 44 percent. Publically, NC-DOT has stated that they believe the peer reviewed engineering science proving induced demand does not apply to toll lanes, but privately they know this never-ending cycle of one more lane never actually fixes traffic.

Stacy Gray, 9000 Statesville Road said Mayor and members of Council. My name is Stacy Gray. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this evening. I'm speaking as a citizen, as a business person, and as someone who cares deeply about our Charlotte community. We are in support of moving the I-77 South Express Lane Project forward with strong and enforceable protections for affected communities. The need for action is clear. NC-DOT reports approximately five crashes each day along this corridor. Its crash rate is roughly 2.8 times the statewide average for urban interstates. Continued growth will place even greater pressure on I-77 South. Rejecting the project would leave the underlying congestion and safety problems unresolved. This vote also concerns economic mobility. Predictable travel times help residents reach jobs, schools, healthcare, and other essential services. The project should form part of a broader, multimodal transportation strategy. Managed lanes can support buses and carpools while complementing bicycles and pedestrian improvements. We also support NC-DOT's proposed investment of up to $300 million in affected communities. We agree that those commitments must be specific and binding in the RFP and final contract. The appropriate course is to move the project forward, while requiring meaningful public engagement and enforceable neighborhood protections. We respectfully ask Council to support the project tonight, and use its authority to secure clear, binding, and accountable community commitments. Thank you.

Tim Daly, 2226 North Davidson Street said good evening. Tim Daly. I'm a resident of District One. I just want to take a moment of silence for the Ballantyne workers who may have to relocate if these tolls are now moving forward. I'm sure they will have trouble finding six figure jobs elsewhere. Everyone here has spoken very eloquently about things, so I don't need to harp on them. I just have two points to make. I would like any of you to look at me with a straight face and say that the tolls on the north side have reduced congestion, they have not. People talked about safety. One of the things I experience traveling up to Moorseville often is people cutting across the dividers that are there, causing accidents. You have cars going 60 miles an hour, 70, 80 miles an hour, someone's cutting across from a standstill to avoid traffic. That's not going to make us safer on the south side. The other thing. Everyone has been talking about the $70 million, that appears to be what is the reason for this vote after you made a decision in May 2026 to rescind this. Most people in the room and maybe at home might not know this, but you all as Council received a memo. It was briefly mentioned from the Southern Environmental Law Center, talking about how the PAVE Act expressly allows for eligible roadways, expenditures, including plans, designs, and related studies to be money from that Act to be spent on that. Additionally, I-77, part of the National Highway Systems, any preliminary engineering expenditures are generally eligible for 90 percent reimbursement. All of this stuff started in 2018. I would encourage you to ask NC-DOT how much if any of that has already been reimbursed, and if it hasn't been or if they haven't applied for it, why not? That would take the $70 million of the State obligation down to about $7 million. Again, Charlotte, we have, whatever, 40 percent of the expenditure for this wide metro area project. You're talking about $2 million when it comes down to it potentially, and that is on a $4.4 billion budget. This isn't a reason to stop and go away from the decision that you made in May 2026. Thank you.

Carlos Lopez, 2800 Davis Park Road said good evening, gentlemen, Mayor Harrington, and everybody that is a part of your Council. My name is Carlos, and I'm from Montes Advocacy Partners, and I primarily wanted to focus. I know that you're in a rush here to be able to create more jobs. You want to be able to approve these beautiful toll roads that are going to be able to be temporary cause to the issue that is really driving the problem. I'm not from Charlotte. I live in Gaston County, but I come to Charlotte very often for business, and one of the main issues that I see is our exits, our

entrance, some of the stoplights timing seems to be a little bit too slow. It could be [inaudible]. The workers that are currently traveling in those lanes to be able to travel to that area down south, those are just temporary workers that are going to be needed right now for the development that are the driving issue. I think that those workers need to be having a better insurance. I think we've got to take care of our workers that we currently already have here to be able to make sure they could be able to play in the system that we're developing. Also, another thing is, with the technology infrastructure that we currently are building around the area, we could be able to use it in an advantage to be able to drive transportation issues to the future. We've got to start thinking. We are in 1960s buses, trains, all of these other stuff, now we want to be able to community, connect with each other and have your hands free where we can be able to also enjoy the City [inaudible]. You promised us flying cars, and your still building toll roads.

Mayor Harrington said Mr. Lopez, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Lopez. Thank you, Mr. Lopez. In fairness, I've stopped everyone else. Please stop, thank you.

Noble Fields, 11204 Canoe Cove Lane said hi, my name is Noble Fields. I am 17 years old and I'm from Mecklenburg County. What aggravates me the most about this displacement of historic black homes is the horrible logic behind it. We fund this or the State takes away $600 million from completely unrelated future projects. We're going to let a bully steal our lunch money today, and then foolishly believe that they are not coming back right tomorrow for more. Today, it's 30 black homes, but next week it could be up your street. As Martin Niemöller once said, "First they came for the communists, then I didn't speak out because I'm not a communist. Then, they came for the socialists, and I am not a socialist, so I didn't speak out. Then, they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out because I'm not a trade unionist. Then, they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out because I am not a Jew. Then, they came for me, and there was no one left to speak out for me." Who's to say the State won't wake up on the wrong side of the bed and fine us $600 million just because people want to wear blue jeans. The overall question we must ask ourselves is who do we serve? Because the answer to that question determines whether or not you get reelected.

Parker Garrison, 2150 South Boulevard said hi, I am Parker Garrison, a Cyber Security Engineer and small business owner, and as a resident of District Three, the area under study, I oppose the zoning changes to build the I-77 express lanes. I'll share three points at this meeting. First, the suggestion of funding for community improvements has been confirmed by the State to be unenforceable and possibly pulled in the future for any reason. Second, a fundamental flaw that it sits in the design/build process, the process that's being used for these toll lanes proposals drives up the costs while also reducing the value to drivers. Third, that there are low cost and unintrusive alternatives that have been implemented in northern Virginia and many other areas that have turned nightmare commuter freeways back to normal. So, first on possible improvements. Over half of that funding is widening overpasses to provide bike lanes that connect to areas where people don't bike because of safety, and inevitably State budgets get tightened and this will easily be the first thing to go. Second, the design/build process. That means that it has the same company responsible for setting the design and for building it. The industry is thus incentivized to overengineer a design that may just not be a bad deal for the money, but costs as much money as possible. Look at the "As it Sits" interchange if you want to see an example of that. So, building these express lanes is not a good use of money for the City of Charlotte. Then, third, some possible improvements that've been done elsewhere that we could easily implement here. Connecting the entrance lane to the next exit lane has not yet been studied, but that's been shown to be a major improvement in I-66 in Virginia. The major slowdowns on the I-77 corridor are always caused where the lane ends, not just from traffic being there, and northern Virginia did this and turned the nightmare commuter highway back to normal. There's also space under every bridge, except for as it sits which requires a minor alteration to add one additional through lane in each direction. NC-DOT's own correspondence has also shown that compared to the no build alternative, traffic increases 44 percent. Take a metaphorical [inaudible]. Quiet please.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Mr. Garrison. Thank you, Mr. Garrison. Thank you, Mr. Garrison. Thank you, Mr. Garrison. Mr. Garrison.

Councilmember Watlington said point of order, Mr. Mayor, I don't mean to interrupt, but Councilmember Mayo did just remind us that they can share their remarks with the clerk, and we can receive those.

Councilmember Mayo said yes. Sir, if you could share your remarks with the Clerk, so that we can read through that, that would be helpful.

Mr. Garrison said thank you. Yes, I'll share my cards also if anyone wants them.

Ms. Mayo said thank you, sir.

Dr. Kenny Robinson, 6203 Rockshire Drive said how ya doing, Mayor, Council. First, for I-77, two Districts, Four and Five, get there, get to 77, coming from District Five where I live at, find a way to even get into the City to get to 77, find a way to get to 77 coming through University, and then you've got a problem. So, those of us in our communities in the Far East, and the University, we're having struggles even getting to I-77, before having to make a decision if we're going to pay a toll or not. Secondly, from that, we have a trust issue with the government that ya'll are sitting there. Three-hundred million dollars ain't no money for this. You should be saying it's a billion dollars to go to the community for something as large as this, but then we'd have an issue trusting the State of North Carolina. The State, Raleigh, we send them more money than we get back from them. They do nothing for Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte, and you want these people whose grandparents made $2 an hour to give up their home, to then trust the State that the State's going to come back and reimburse and do something for this community, that's not going to happen. So, I really wasn't even coming here to talk about this, because I just don't have no confidence in the government to do what they say that they're going to do for the people, because historically they have not done that, specifically for black and brown neighborhoods. I said I'm going to sign up to say this. While we're talking about toll roads and we're talking about data moratoriums in the future, a four-year-old was killed the other night in his home, a man was shot in the back by the police the other day, and where's the energy for that? Because it was big energy when a woman was killed on the train, big energy. Where's the energy for this four-year-old, Caleb is his name?

Susanna Chen, 3208 Central Avenue said this Council is supposed to represent and serve the people of Charlotte, and if this process is so fair and democratic, why is a quarter of the seats in this chamber empty while outside the room is packed? That's my question, and on top of that, my question for Councillor Malcolm Graham, why is it that you were flicking rails, I saw you, I was up there, while people were talking? Is this not supposed to be a democratic process? Are you not supposed to be listening to your constituents? I think the reason for this, and I think the reason people aren't allowed in this room, and the City staff made the decision, is because ya'll are afraid to face the people. You're afraid to look us in the eye and watch as you betray us. So, instead of listening to your constituents, the vast majority of Charlotte, you take direction from big business. It's plain and simple, toll lanes do not work. Safe, free, accessible public transportation works, and that's been proven by scientific research. Like, ask anyone who's read the papers, that's just the reality, and so the question here is bigger than toll lanes. This is about Charlotte, the city itself. Who does the Charlotte City Council actually serve? Who is Charlotte for? Because to me, it seems like Charlotte is becoming more and more a place for these banks and suits to feel comfortable taking over our homes and neighborhoods with no accountability. So, as a proud member of The Party for Socialism and Liberation, and what that means is that we believe in creating a society for the people. Charlotte is a thriving city, and we have more than enough here to have all of our needs met, but why is it that so many of us here still struggle to make our ends meet? Why are public school teachers in Charlotte unable to afford basic supplies for their classrooms? I was at a forum a few weeks ago, and these teachers can barely afford papers.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Ms. Chen. Thank you, Ms. Chen. Thank you, Ms. Chen. Thank you, Ms. Chen. Thank you, Ms. Chen. Thank you, Ms. Chen. Ms. Chen, you're being disruptive. In fairness, Ms. Chen, please stop. Ms. Chen, everyone else has stayed to the time limit, please stop.

Dr. Blanche Penn, 2207 Century Oaks Lane said okay, alright. Dr. Blanche Penn here. Good morning, good evening, good night. I need ya'll to look up, I need ya'll to look at me, I need ya'll to listen to the people, and I need our voices heard, okay? Please don't make me pull out the history book on ya'll. First of all, somebody want to change the channel, but guess what, no senior discount over here, so what we going to do? I-77, I lived that history. I watched the changes. I am still here to speak about it. We remember, and our community deserves a voice, and what's happening next here? I remember what happened to that highway when it came through our community before. I remember the neighborhood that was divided. I remember the loss. I remember who was asking to carry the burden? Who? And we're tired. We're tired of so many people being misplaced in our community. Let me tell ya'll something. Ya'll need to wake up. Ya'll better smell some roses, because if you continue to smell the roses that you're hearing on the other side, then you'll see. Peace and blessings, Dr. Blanche Penn.

Melco McCarthy, Revolution Park Drive said I'm Melco McCarthy. I'm with the Barringer Drive Initiative. I sent a letter, only a few responded, so you would've seen my stance on this. I stand in solidarity with the SWAN's, McCrorey Heights, and all the rest of them that oppose it. The problem we have is you keep having the same voice at the table, and the same voice at the table ain't the one that's got a real coalition. So, ya'll got to start making sure ya'll got the right people at the table when you want to hear their voices, because the $300 million, it sounds good, but it's a blank check. Nobody in the real world is going to sign no contract with no meat and potatoes in it, just because it says I'm going to give you this, and I can give it to you 30 years later. So, we've got to be truthful about this situation. I don't see color, I see displacement. I don't see that family that's been transitioned from here to there, and they say I got my dream home. Now you want to put a highway through it? Ya'll got to wake up and smell the coffee. This ain't where it's at. I don't know what ya'll are sipping on, but it ain't that, but I can tell you what, the community is watching, and so we will let it go. I charge everybody that's watching on TV, if ya'll don't vote right, they can check you out at the ballot in November 2026.

Vinay Patel, 9230 Hollybush Lane said Mayor Harrington, members of City Council, you've heard a lot today, and I don't envy your position. I'm speaking in support of moving 77 forward, because doing nothing is not the answer, and by rescinding it you moved away from the negotiating table. We need to be at the table. If we want to do this right, we have to be at the table, and the only way to be at the table is to move the process forward. We've heard a lot of things about South Charlotte, Ballantyne. Yes, I'm a business owner. I have businesses along 77. I employ more than 200 people, 200 team members that sit on that road for 30 minutes, an hour, or whatever it might be, it's 30 minutes in an hour that they could be earning a paycheck. They could be taking that home. It is a problem, you have a difficult decision, but be at the table. By rescinding it, we left the decision up to somebody else and that is not the answer. Thank you.

Mayor Harrington said thank you to all of our speakers. Thanks for tolerating our time limitation given the time. We are now going to move to Council discussion.

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Owens, to (A) Reinstate support for NCDOT's Public-Private Partnership funding and delivery model for the I-77 South Express Lanes Project (P3 Project) as required by Session Law 2026-41 and approve a memorandum of agreement (MOA); and (B) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager or his designee to execute an MOA with NCDOT in cooperation and support of the P3 Project conditioned on a binding framework for implementation and fulfillment of the commitments outlined in the MOA; and (C) Direct City Council's Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO) representative to vote on behalf of the City of Charlotte to reinstate support of the P3 Project at the next CRTPO meeting.

Councilmember Mayfield said so for my motion to deny A, B, and C, I am standing by the vote to rescind. I have shared multiple concerns regarding any conversation that involves transparency with NC-DOT. I have shared concerns I have with Raleigh. This is not a Raleigh General Assembly conversation. This is the governance appointed NC-DOT. The idea of threatening Charlotte through a bully tactic with funds that cannot actually be identified, because we asked for a financial breakdown. They could not provide a line-item breakdown for a discussion, that we as Council chose to support residents after hearing from many residents' concerns with this process, we voted to rescind our vote. Our county partners are standing with their rescission of the vote. Our partners within the North Carolina General Assembly have shared concerns regarding them taking on the fight in support of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County part of our delegation, and the impact that it would have if we were to rescind this vote tonight. I have as much faith in this conversation of these potential funds from the North Carolina General Assembly as I do with the person currently obtaining residents on Pennsylvania Avenue giving $5,000 to each individual that chooses to vote for him.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, and seconded by Councilmember Mazuera Arias to deny (A) Reinstate support for NCDOT's Public-Private Partnership funding and delivery model for the I-77 South Express Lanes Project (P3 Project) as required by Session Law 2026-41 and approve a memorandum of agreement (MOA); and (B) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager or his designee to execute an MOA with NCDOT in cooperation and support of the P3 Project conditioned on a binding framework for implementation and fulfillment of the commitments outlined in the MOA; and (C) Direct City Council's Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO) representative to vote on behalf of the City of Charlotte to reinstate support of the P3 Project at the next CRTPO meeting.

I have lived through this prior to the creation of HB2 (House Bill). I have lived through this with the multiple attempts of stealing the airport. This General Assembly that just recently passed a budget, we went multiple years without them passing a budget. There are multiple roads throughout the City that NC-DOT has been financially committed to that they have not been maintaining for multiple years, and I think it sends a very dishonest message to the community if we were to say that we are, through blind faith, going to move forward and rescind our vote that is protecting our residents, when there is no proof that adding more lanes that people have to pay for, when our taxes have already paid for the current highway that we're riding on, and if you just drive on 77, because just like someone that spoke earlier, even though it's not an apple, my Samsung is set specifically no tolls. So, I asked and have waited and have not received the information of what's the actual traffic number that's utilizing the current tolls? Because we keep talking about all this traffic, but we're sitting in traffic for a reason, because we have tolls now that are being underutilized. There is a reason, and if the cost is going to be on the backs of our residents, the impact and the destruction of our communities is going to be on the back of this Council, and that's going to impact not only future residents and future Councils, then I stand by my denial, and I appreciate receiving a second, because we do not need to be moving forward with A, B, or C.

Mayor Harrington said quiet please, quiet please. Is there further discussion on Councilmember Mayfield's substitute motion?

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said I want to first thank the City Attorney, Leslie-Fite, for all your tireless work around this issue and to your team. When I took the oath of office, I swore to defend the North Carolina Constitution and protect the democratic voice of the people who elected me. Early on, I was warned that voting no today would make me look bad, and I disagree. I'm not here to play political defense or preserve an image. I'm here to stand for the working people of Charlotte, who expect their leaders to govern with courage and the conviction to fight for them and not submit under pressure. Look at the trap that has been set before us. NC-DOT comes to the table with $300 million in community benefits and $100 million bonus allocation, investments that I do agree our neighborhoods rightfully deserve, and I also want to explicitly acknowledge the community leaders who have been at the table for months, pouring their heart and soul into shaping these benefits. Please note that this vote is not a rejection of your

tireless work or your vision for our neighborhoods, but as Javier Lopez, who spoke earlier tonight warned us, economic fallout will cause these community benefits to be lost in translation using future shifts as an excuse to never actually fulfill them, and my District personally, District Five, has been here before. Take a look on Independence Boulevard. East Charlotte literally split in half. Yet it sits with no community benefits that were long promised, and what's left there? When I hear economic opportunity, that this project is economic opportunity, I think about Independence Boulevard, where is the economic opportunity there? Just car dealerships and arcade shops and vape shops. East Charlotte has continuously been left out when it comes to critical infrastructure and transit projects, and we saw that firsthand with how the Silver Line was left out of our District. I've seen this pattern of broken promises repeated time again and again at the City level. When you live in a District that has been historically overlooked, you learn to look past those surface-level promises and look at the structural realities.

Crucially, we're being asked to make a monumental decision while still missing an alternative study, while still missing answers to fundamental questions about this project's true impact. Most importantly, the people of Charlotte have spoken. Our inboxes are filled with messages from residents urging us to pump the breaks, and while we have received barely any support for pushing this through in its current form. When the community speaks this clearly, our job as elected officials is not to rush headlong into a deal just because a deadline was handed down from above.

I respect my colleagues who choose to vote yes tonight, but I simply don't share their optimism, because regardless of how legally binding this Memorandum of Understanding claims to be, real world execution is never guaranteed, and let's talk about priorities and how our City handles money. We have $650 million to subsidize billionaires. We have millions of dollars to incentivize corporations to bring their headquarters here, but yet when we are asked how to pay for nearly $70 million dollars on an unconstitutional, mandated financial penalty, suddenly we are stuck.

Think about the human cost behind this. Imagine the people who built community here, the promises they have been made. We heard that firsthand tonight from Rosemary Young. Think of all the hard work endured by these residents, just for us to sit here tonight and effectively say their hard work does not matter, that their hard-earned money used to buy their homes does not matter, that their shot at a dignified life does not matter. We are better than this. The question is why we are being forced back to this table under these terms? It is because financial penalties were directly written into law to corner this Council and strip away our choice. This isn't partnership, it is financial leverage, a design to override local power.

Before I go any further, I want to honor our Mecklenburg County Legislative Delegation. When we stood up and voted to pull our support, those lawmakers in Raleigh stood shoulder to shoulder with us to defend our local autonomy. They fought for us, because they know this playbook. We saw when State leaders used HB2 to roll back local rights. We saw it this year in our State budget where corporations went to lobby Raleigh and rolled back union rights. History shows us that whenever everyday people organize to build a city that works for them, outside pressure moves and silences them. As one of my colleagues said earlier today, we have every right and every obligation to vote on behalf of the public's interest guided by our core values rather than fear or coercion.

I'm not voting against the community benefits. I want every single dime for our residents, and I hope it does happen. I'm voting against a state legislature that penalizes us for exercising the self-governance guaranteed to us. If we bow to legislative pressure today, we send a clear message to our constituents, your vote, your emails, and your voices only matter until Raleigh decides it doesn't. Our democracy is rooted in dignity, equity, and the belief that communities know what is best for themselves. We do not strengthen our values by surrendering them to financial intimidation. Democracy in my eyes does not have a price tag. It simply does not. I cannot in good consciousness vote for a deal built on the foundation of an unconstitutional state mandate, especially without the answers, the studies, the respect our residents deserve, because this is not democracy. This is not right. This is not

putting people first. In Charlotte, our democracy is not for sale. I will vote to support rescinding this, and continue our vote as it was May 11, 2026, and I'm not voting this against our community, but our fundamental right as a local government to govern ourselves. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said so you know me, I have questions. I have questions for the City Attorney. Thank you for all of the work you've done, but first of all I want to thank everyone who came out today and being engaged in this important process. We sincerely hear you, and I want to thank you. So, for the City Attorney, and this is a technical question, there are a few developers who have responded to the RFQ, correct?

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said correct. It's my understanding that, I believe, four.

Ms. Johnson said okay, there's four, and are any of these developers.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said I'm sorry, [inaudible] that's the Request For Qualifications. The RFP, the Request for Proposals, has not been released.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Are any of the current vendors local to either the State or the Country?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said I don't have that information available.

Ms. Johnson said okay, it's my understanding not, because I want to know, I see signs that say, keep the money in Charlotte, but I believe most of the money, and that was one of the concerns with this current draft, most of the money was not going to our state, so that was one of the concerns. I just wanted to clarify that.

Secondly, is the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) that we received today, is it legally binding?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said Councilmember Johnson, thank you for the question. The Memorandum of Agreement that you all received today would purport to be legally binding. It is legally binding. It specifically calls for remedies for the parties if there's a breach of the agreement to be enforced by specific performance or remedies in law and contract.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Next question, the PAVE Act. We got your memo that the PAVE Act, I think the word is may, the money may be prohibited. There's language, I know I've heard from at least three attorneys that the PAVE Act may not be prohibited or may be used to pay back this penalty. Can you speak to that, please?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes, Councilmember Johnson. The fact that several attorneys have disagreed, it's evidence of the fact that there is disagreement, and frankly it's a question of law for the courts. What I've expressed previously is that the view of whether or not the money could be used is questionable, and ultimately it is Council's decision, but in light of the fact that there could be express prohibition of the funds, the court could find that the monies were used inappropriately, and if that's the case it could certainly cost the City more so than not, and so the recommendation was to use unrestricted funds that were available to the City, but ultimately it's Council's decision.

Ms. Johnson said thank you, and the reason that's important is because one of the threats is that there's a $70 million fine, and if we don't rescind, taxes could be increased, when there may be other options if we had to repay that. So, that's what I wanted to put on record. Is this penalty legal?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, Councilmember Johnson, first of all, that's a question of law, but on behalf of this City and the City Council, I would reserve all of the defenses and rights to defend and prosecute any claims related to the legislation.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you.

Mayor Harrington said quiet please.

Ms. Johnson said is there a question of constitutionality?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said again, that is a question of law, and we would preserve all of our rights and defenses to advance any claims related to this legislation.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and as far as the $70 million, do we have dates of those expenditures, because we approved to move forward in October of 2024, but it's my understanding that some of these fees could go back to 2018. Is there any contractual obligation, prior to our vote, that would make us responsible for these fees?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said there are no contractual obligations that I found; however, again, I would reserve the right to advance those defenses on behalf of the City, if that is this Council's pleasure.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. So, for me, this is bigger than I-77. When I asked the questions, is this legal? Is this constitutional? Any answer less than absolutely is a period for me. Should Charlotte taxpayers be required to pay these costs simply because we refuse to change our vote, especially cost incurred before we approved the P3 approach. I cannot imagine anyone on this dais or in this room who would concede to this in our personal lives. As Council members we took an oath to uphold the constitution, and we have a responsibility to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. Good stewardship requires facts. We approved this process in 2024, and as I stated, some of these expenses reportedly date back to 2018. So, before Council or anyone is asked to reconsider this decision, we deserve, and so do taxpayers deserve, clear answers. What costs are we actually responsible for? Why are we responsible for them, and what is the legal basis for that responsibility? Without those answers, we cannot responsibly consider changing our vote. Instead, we're being told that if we don't reverse our decision, Charlotte taxpayers could be responsible for almost $70 million. That is not good faith policy discussion, that is duress, and for me that's a period, like I said, not a semicolon. There is no but after that. There's no however after that. So, we cannot say that this is wrong, but the consequences are too expensive. We cannot say this may be unconstitutional; however, it's easier to comply, and we cannot say that we don't have the facts or the contractural obligation, but let's change our vote anyway. Doing something that we know is wrong is never the right thing to do. It may be more comfortable. It certainly will help to avoid conflict, but none of that makes it right. We did not apply for these positions, we were elected. The people entrusted us with these seats, and they expect us to represent them, fight for them, and to be their voice. That is our job as leaders. Leadership is not cowering because we are afraid of the consequences. Leadership is standing on principle, especially when there is a cost.

Throughout our nation's history progress has depended on people willing to stand up when standing up was difficult. The rights enjoyed today by women, black and brown Americans, LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning) Americans, and many others did not come from people taking the easy path. They came from people who were willing to challenge what they believed was wrong and stand firmly on this principle, and without their fight only one of us would be sitting on this dais today. That is how justice moves forward. I will not abandon the principle for convenience, and I will stand with the residents of Charlotte today. As Reverend Dr. Janet Garner Mullins said, "Nothing has changed significantly in the design since May 11, 2026," and that will include my vote. Thank you.

Ms. Watlington said I want to start by thanking City Attorney Leslie-Fite and her team, Deputy City Manager Hefner and her team, and C-DOT, and all of staff. The agreement that is in front of us is real work. A minimum of $300 million in enforceable commitments is a meaningful result, and this is about as strong as it could've been. So, I don't want anyone to hear the comments that I'm about to make as negating that effort. I commend you. I am so happy it is you who is sitting here during this fight, so thank you for the

work that you have done, but for me the benefits were never the main question, transportation is, and nobody seems to be talking about that. A benefits package for me answers what do we get in exchange for the impact, and it should be on the order of magnitude of the impact. If it's $90 million coming out of our own pocket to avoid $70 million, I think the gentleman before told us that that math ain't mathing, and so for me, not only does this not answer does this project solve the problem that it exists to solve, I have not heard that we have any real meaningful community benefits that, if not delivered, would meaningfully stop or change this project. I have to think about I-26 in Asheville, who after not having had a community meeting since 2018, found out in April of 2025 that the community benefits that they had advocated for were no longer feasible because of cost overruns of the project, and that project didn't stop, it's not going to stop, it will continue. So, for me, enforcement doesn't ring very heavy or true in light of that, and so for me this is bittersweet, and it's not because of the people who did this work, and it's not because of my colleagues who see it differently. I respect them and I know that they're voting in good faith.

We didn't come to this vote empty handed. We laid out what a yes would require, binding commitments, scope, funding, and schedule locked before construction, independent verification of the traffic and cost assumptions, and analysis of what this does at the network level. That's why I advocated for UNC Charlotte's network level analysis, which looks at roads, transit, and land as one system that enables to find the solutions that work, not just the one that's available. We got one of the items we requested, and it's an important one, community benefits, but better than before isn't good enough. It's not lost on me that the vast majority of supporters that are here tonight are members of one particular industry, and none of them is arguing that this is the transportation solution. Instead, hanging our hats on community benefits that we've already discussed are neither binding nor commensurate to the impact. That to me is telling.

On the transportation front, our City staff also brought forward their own existing conditions analysis in the past week or so, and I want to acknowledge them for that work. You worked tremendously hard, and you worked under a lot of pressure and trying to manage a lot of things. So, I absolutely thank you for doing the work that we've asked NC-DOT to do for the last year. It's serious, and it confirms something that we should take seriously, that widening our parallel streets instead of I-77 wouldn't come close to solving this on its own, but it only tested one alternative, with no cost figures attached to any option, and through no fault of their own it landed on our desks days before this vote. That is not the independent full alternatives analysis this body asked for in May 2026, and it's not something that I've had the time to defend or question in front of the people that it affects.

In this Memorandum of Agreement, we also have language that anticipates changes to come. That matters and we should hold onto it tightly, but it tells me that the project is still moving, and I'm being asked to vote before questions are settled. We've seen this before. We've also watched 77 North, and the impacts of that project loom large in our collective minds. Trust is built on what a partner delivers, and many understandably want a longer track record before we go down that path again. We talk about Brooklyn. The lesson in Brooklyn wasn't that the benefits were too small, it was that no package makes up for us cutting through a neighborhood when the road itself doesn't do the job it was sold to do. This comes at a cost far beyond the individual neighborhoods, including my own long-time neighborhood, Westover Hills, which is directly impacted by this widening. We are at a tipping point in our city and in our region. We are searching desperately for our identity and our place among the nations' top tier cities. The challenges have become more complex, and they require a systems level approach. Tonight, we debate a corridor, next month nightlife, then arts funding, and then data centers. Each vote is treated as its own project, and I'm not sure how they all work together. They add up to Charlotte's identity, and identity is an economic asset. Multigenerational neighborhoods are where the food, the music, and the arts scene come from. That's what makes a visitor book a flight and helps an employer recruit talent. All of this works together, and we're only beginning to unpack that.

We have a 2040 vision, but a vision is only as good as its influence on a decision in front of us. To be clear, I am not against solutions. Congestion is real, and no matter where you land on this project, one thing we all want is for it to be solved. I caution us against solving it in pieces. Though we are a growing region, I take very seriously that our job around this dais is to represent the people who live with this decision, not the ones driving through it, and I want to speak to every resident who packed the hearing, who wrote a letter, who knocked on a neighbors' door, who sat through a slide deck, you didn't ask to become an expert in. You did that, not because you had to, but because you understood what was at stake in a way that a spreadsheet never will.

We have a long way to go, tonight doesn't finish this, but look at what's already true that wasn't true a year ago ya'll. This project came back to the table with an alternative scope, a community engagement framework, and a $300 million commitment on the table, because you asked for it and refused to let it be an afterthought. That is not how these projects have historically been brought to the people of this state, and you all changed that. Every corridor conversation after this one starts from a difference baseline, because you didn't stay quiet, and if this vote doesn't go the way some of you hope for tonight, hear me clearly, this is not a failure of the people. You showed up, and whatever happens next happens because of what this Council chose to do with the will you handed us, not because you didn't fight hard enough. We may be in a state where the odds are stacked against us, and frankly they may take our airport tomorrow, but thanks to your efforts, I'm grateful for what we did secure, and I note that that kind of thinking is only possible, because Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, and the surrounding towns sat down together and built it. We found common ground here, and that tells me something, that when it really, really matters ya'll, we can still get in a room together and move. We have those relationships now. We have that infrastructure now, and the next challenge, and there will be one, we'll start from further ahead than we did on this one. I'll be supporting the substitute motion. Thank you.

The vote was taken on the substitute motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Mazuera Arias, Johnson, Mayfield, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mayo, Mitchell, and Owens

Mayor Harrington said the substitute motion fails.

Councilmember Owens said so, as the passion in this room and at the dais attests.

Mayor Harrington said quiet please, quiet please. Okay, we're going to continue discussion on the original motion. Councilmember Owens, you have the floor. One more outburst from the same people, and I will ask to have you removed. This has been disruptive. This Council has worked very hard. It has listened to everyone who signed up to speak. We have been through motion, okay.

Ms. Owens said so, as the passion in this room and at the dais attests, what we've experienced over the life of the I-77 project has not been collaboration. It has felt as though it wasn't transparent, it has felt undemocratic, and simply put it just felt coercive and chaotic. From 2024's votes for the P3 model that were secured with promises of an ability to revisit the item in the future, to the late drop of maps that failed to account for the humans they impacted, this has not been a process designed to earn trust. It has been a process destined to create confusion, impede thoughtful decision making, and unfortunately leave the public frustrated. Layered amid all this chaos was something even worse, to my eye at least, a member of our own Mecklenburg delegation to the North Carolina Legislature inserted a penalty into the State budget to attempt to force Charlotte into compliance. For local government, your local government, this is not partnership. It is not democracy. It is an undue pressure backed by unfair punishment, and that pressure is felt far beyond on the dais. Last week, a 17-year-old high school student, Addie, wrote to all of us trying to understand, "How local government actually works." She asked the question none of us should ever force a young person to ask.

She asked, “If the State can fine Charlotte every time it wants something different, what do we call that?” Addie told us she will be paying the price of our decision until she’s 77 years old. Addie told us that the park she hangs out in with her friends will not be there for her new baby sister. She also believes what many of us believe, that the toll lanes are highly unlikely to meaningful address congestion.

So, let me say this clearly to all of you, and especially to Addie. My vote tonight to go back to the table is not an endorsement, it is an indictment. It is a statement that while Charlotte deserves better than chaos and coercion, it also deserves a path that keeps power and money in the hands of the residents of Charlotte. I believe my vote is a step to rectify decades old wrongs to our neighbors in Districts Two and Three, because frankly there is a choice before us tonight. If Charlotte rejects this project tonight, West Charlotte gets nothing, no reconnection, no displacement protections, no affordability measures, no community investments, and the people who have carried the weight of past bad transportation decisions will be asked to carry it again, but if we move forward with eyes wide open, we secure $300 million in binding community benefits that are paid upfront to the City; $100 million in guaranteed regional transportation funding; caps and stitches to reconnect neighborhoods; food access investments in West Trade, Beatties Ford, and West Boulevard, health and wellness facilities, small business and housing stability, parks, tree canopy, stormwater upgrades, and because of the tremendous legal efforts of the City Attorney’s Office, these commitments are binding, enforceable, and cannot be removed without Charlotte’s consent. These are not promises scribbled in the margins, they are commitments written into a legal binding contract, and we have the power to enforce that contract right here in Mecklenburg County.

So, let me repeat, my vote is not an endorsement, it is an indictment, an indictment of a coercive process, an indictment of the State’s heavy-handed tactics, an indictment of the failure to respect local governance, an indictment of urban renewal and its devastating legacy across the City, but it is also a commitment. It is a commitment to the people of West Charlotte, a commitment to repair what highways tore apart, a commitment to take every dollar, every benefit, every protection available and turn them into real outcomes for real families. May what we do here tonight serve as a template for community commitment that unwinds the harms of urban renewal. Addie asked us to protect her voice, and today my vote is for her, and for every young person whose future will be shaped by this project long after our terms are over. My vote tonight is only a first step. As this project unfolds over the coming years, I intend to put the residents of West Charlotte first. Every meeting, every milestone, every design change. Tonight, on behalf of District Six, I side with the residents of West Charlotte and will be here for the long haul to ensure every available dollar is spent stitching your communities back into the fabric of the Queen City. Thank you.

Councilmember Graham said thank you for everyone who has come here tonight. Community building is hard work, it’s tough work. I credit my longevity of doing this work is by telling individuals/community members what they need to know, and sometimes they don’t want to hear that. I try to be truthful. I try to be honest, and I try to lean into years of experience representing this community. Since July of 2026, I’ve met with a number of individuals throughout the State talking about I-77. The Governor; the Governor’s legal representation, members of the General Assembly, the Mayors of all of the small towns directly and indirectly, the Chairman of the Mecklenburg County Commission, my colleagues, Councilmember Mayo, particularly, and last but certainly not least, the City Attorney who has become on my frequent call list.

Unknown said City Council, if you cared about the people you would vote against the toll lanes. No more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls.

Mayor Harrington said okay. There are particular individuals who are disrupting the meeting. This is a second warning that I will ask to have you removed if we are unable

to have Council do their job. Council listened to the audience and heard the audience. Council now has the right to proceed.

Unknown said did you listen to the people? Did you? It don't seem like you did.

Mayor Harrington said ma'am, ma'am, ma'am, ma'am, you have one more chance, and I'm going to ask the police to remove you.

Unknowns said no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls.

Mayor Harrington said you are disrupting the meeting. Please stop talking. You are violating statute 148.318(7). You're subject to being escorted out of the meeting chamber and charged with a misdemeanor if you don't stop talking. Officer, please escort.

Unknowns said no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls, no more tolls.

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Graham, please continue.

Mr. Graham said this is what democracy looks like and sounds like, and I accept that. I respect that. I don't respect being interrupted, but I respect people's passion, and I respect people's ability to advocate on behalf of their communities and neighborhoods and for themselves, and that's what I'm here to do for this community.

Unknown no more tolls, no more tolls. Fuck your tolls.

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Graham, please continue.

Mr. Graham said and that's what I'm doing here tonight, representing this community.

Unknown said doesn't sound like it.

Mr. Graham said can you ask him to leave?

Mayor Harrington said I'm sorry, sir, you are being disruptive. Under the statute that I read, if you continue, I will ask the officers to remove you. Councilmember Graham, please continue.

Mr. Graham said thank you. Representing this community, listening to all voices.

Unknown said [inaudible] the whole time.

Mr. Graham said the long-term impact of our community. I'm leaning into 10 years of experience being a member of the North Carolina State Senate. I understand the power of the State, I understand the legislation that is written, and I don't agree with it either. When the State first announced this project in October of 2025, I was there, before the crowd showed up at the Council meetings, before the reporters showed up, before the socialists showed up, I showed up, showed up for the community, listening and learning about this particular project. I said at that time that this project from my perspective was dead on arrival, that it did not take into consideration the concerns of the residents, because there was little to no community engagement, that the designs that were prepared at that time did not meet the standards of what this community was looking, and that simply NC-DOT was just out of touch, out of touch in terms of what the growing urban community needed, and also said that two things can be true at the same time. That I-77 South needs to be widened, safety factors need to be incorporated, and it shouldn't be done, this is the full quote, "At the expense of black and brown communities," and that somehow, someway as a community that we needed to find common ground and finding a way to solve the problem. I'm a problem solver. I'm not a permanent no, because I understand that we have to do something to advance our

community. That's all of us. What the City Attorney has done is something that many folks said that we couldn't do. Let's get a document in place.

[Unknown] you'll never be Mayor Graham.

Mayor Harrington said I'm sorry, who was that?

Mr. Graham said I would rather be honest. I'd rather tell you the truth. Every small town is going to change their votes. So, this project will happen with or without the consent of the City of Charlotte. The principal stand is that we have a legal document that is legally binding, written in the contract, and the $300 million or more will be paid at closing. For the context, that's like $300 million is bigger than many of the cities of North Carolina's budgets, and will be earmarked specifically for West Charlotte, and here's what $300 million or more looks like. It means homeowners are protected. Every resident whose home is impacted by this construction is compensated at or above fair market value. No one is pushed out of their neighborhood without full and fair compensation. It means renters are protected. Every renter displaced by this project is relocated to housing of equal or greater standard at no cost to them, no family left without a roof over their head, no one left behind. It means small businesses are protected. Every small business owner forced to relocate receives full relocation expenses and business interruption compensation. The entrepreneurs who build West Charlotte are not casualties of this project. They'll benefit from the project. It means new investment along Beatties Ford Road and Nations Ford Road, a civic center or a recreation center, grocery store access to finally address the West Side food desert, land banking opportunities for small business, so they can own and not rent, greenspace investment that occur for people to play and live and work and raise their families. It means that cap and cover, a physical structure built over sections of the interstate that literally reconnects neighborhoods divided by this highway 60 years ago. We've been working on this in West Charlotte for two years. Now we have the funds to move forward and get it done. It means pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, safe crossing, greenways, a pathway to give residents access to the rest of the City without risking their lives crossing a 10-lane interstate. It means workforce development and corridor hiring, a contractual requirement that is selected to prioritize local hiring, small business contracting, and workforce training opportunities for residents along the corridor. It means a Legacy Community Advisory Board, a permanent representative body drawn from impacted West Charlotte neighborhoods with real oversight authority over every community benefit commitment made by the developer. Not advisory in name only, real authority, real accountability, reporting directly to the Charlotte City Council Transportation Committee for the rest of the life of this project. Everything that I mentioned is legally bindable and the Secretary of Transportation will sign it tomorrow before the CRTPO vote on Wednesday. That's standing up for the community.

Now we can fight, but sometimes a good run is better than a bad stand, and we're running towards benefits for this community for the long term, and I understand the history of West Charlotte. I'm a graduate of Johnson C. Smith. For 10 years I worked for the Carolinas Minority Supply Development Council helping support black businesses. Every major bank in the Uptown Charlotte I helped identify black contractors for, the Corporate Center, the IJL building, the TransAmerica building, the Gateway Center. I worked for Spectrum helping identify broadband internet connection for black communities. I worked at Johnson C. Smith University helping them put $40 million of economic opportunity building Mosaic Village and the Arts Factory. So, my question of supporting black communities goes without question, because of the action, the work I put into it, but part of this work is telling people the truth.

As a State Senator, I'm letting you know right now there are other things in front of the State government that the City of Charlotte all of us need. I want to keep the airport. I don't want to lose it. We've got NC-DOT projects throughout the City that we need funding for that are in progress that we have to work forward to. We have economic development projects in front of the State right now that we need funding for. We have to be smart as a community and work together. I don't trust the NC-DOT. I'm going to build confidence with them, and the confidence that we have is the document that we

have right here from our City Attorney that they will sign tomorrow, legally bindable, enforceable, $300 million or more benefiting black communities up and down Beatties Ford Road and Nations Ford Road. What has changed? This has changed. This is a marathon, not a sprint. It won't be resolved tonight. The highway is only designed 10 to 15 percent. A number of the answers that people have cannot be answered until we take another step forward. I don't want to destroy the skyline with an elevated bridge or highway, but we have to answer that question, and we can't answer it tonight. Only by identifying a developer can we answer that question.

So, yes, we have to take a step forward. No, I don't like why we're here. No, I don't like Senator Sawyer putting the poison pill in the budget, but I was the State Senator heading the delegation when they tried to take the airport and fought against it and won. Sometimes you fight. Sometimes you negotiate. We negotiated a plan in the best interest of the community, all of us.

Ms. Mayfield said not all of us.

Mr. Graham said what we do everyday, no one gets a hundred percent of what they want. I didn't get everything I wanted in here. Community members will not get 100 percent of what they want. Do they deserve it? Yes. Will they get it? No, because the environment we work in doesn't make that a reality sometimes, but what we have is a giant step forward, and more work to do. I'm here for the work. I'm here for the work. I am here for the work. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Harrington said sir, you are disrupting the meeting. Everyone had an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Graham said I am here for the work.

Mayor Harrington said I'm sorry, sir in the red shirt.

Unknown said people that are living in McCrorey Heights and Wilmore that will be displaced. Those homes, those histories, the people that live there, they will be displaced.

Mayor Harrington said ma'am, ma'am, we have to continue this meeting. You're disrupting the meeting. I'm asking that you be escorted out.

Mr. Graham said enforce the rules.

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Graham, are you finished?

Mr. Graham said and in summation, I get it. I get it. I also get that we have to move forward, all of us. We're all better together, and if we start dividing ourselves as a community, rich, poor, black, white, corporate, community, then we lose our identity. We have an identity. I'm fighting to keep it. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I just have two very brief comments. For one, I believe that people who oppose this project held the feet to the fire, NC-DOT, and obtained major concessions. This is very different from the way it started because of the engagement of the community and the various issues that were raised in opposition. Dr. Watlington was right. I think this establishes a new paradigm. NC-DOT will have learned a lesson from this; however, if we reach this point having obtained those concessions and didn't proceed, that would be gone. What would be their takeaway from that, don't bother. So, I think we need to regard this as a milestone in terms of how the community engages with authorities like NC-DOT. We need to look upon it as a success for the people who voiced concerns about it and about the fact that it wouldn't really benefit. Three-hundred million dollars in cash at closing, there's no uncertainty about that. At that point, if they don't write that check, they're in breach, and so we're not speculating about their compliance with the terms later than that.

I will just say then, in conclusion, I do hope and believe that as we move forward, the benefits to West Charlotte will be apparent, $300 million. We spent less than $200 million over years on our Corridors of Opportunity, of which only about $50 million or $60 million was actually City money. This is huge, and I think we shouldn't completely discount the fact that it will create jobs. It will create all kinds of facilities and benefits to the community, and the cash is going to be put out there in advance. We're not relying on anybody to do anything beyond that point. They just put the money up, and after that the disposition of the money, according to the terms of our contract, will be worked out in further detail basically by us, by us, the community, in discussion and negotiation with NC-DOT. So, I believe this is a good result, and I look forward to continuing to work with the community in order to ensure that we prioritize in alignment with the wishes of West Charlotte. Thank you.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said no comment.

Ms. Johnson said I've already shared my comments.

Councilmember Ajmera said I agree with what's been said by my colleague, Councilmember Owens. Very well said. I'm not going to repeat what she has said, but I will add, I just want to ask a few questions to the City Attorney. Madam Attorney, I know that there has been a trust issue with NC-DOT, and I know that your office has worked very hard to get this agreement. Could you speak to, will the community benefits be part of the RFP, and are they legally enforceable?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said thank you, Councilmember Ajmera for the question. Yes, it's part of the Memorandum of Agreement. The community benefits will be part of the RFP and contractually binding upon a successful developer.

Ms. Ajmera said and they are enforceable?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said and they are enforceable.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you. Also, just like Councilmember Owens, I've received emails, calls, messages from our residents asking us to take a stance. How much would it cost to defend the City if we were to take a stance against the General Assembly?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said litigation challenging the constitutionality of legislation is quite expensive, and it could cost up into the millions. I would talk to several law firms, including combining that defense with the City Attorney's Office. It would still be significant. The other point that I would make with respect to challenging legislation, as I said before, we would reserve all of the defenses that the City Attorney's Office would advance on any Council action that you would take, but again it's a challenging legal action to advance, and so much so that it actually requires a beyond a reasonable doubt finding by the court that the General Assembly acted inconsistent with the constitution.

Ms. Ajmera said I know you talked about challenging. Could you tell us more about it, and why it would be difficult?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, yes, Councilmember Ajmera, just as I was stating, any facial challenge or as-applied challenge even to legislation, is beyond a reasonable doubt standard, which is actually more stringent than most civil claims. It is a standard that you would typically apply in criminal cases, and so it's not impossible, but certainly it is challenging.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you. Next, I would like to have Mr. CFO (Chief Financial Officer) at the podium. I mean, you expect an accountant to ask questions to CFO, right?

Matthew Hastedt, Chief Financial Officer said Matt Hastedt, CFO. I apologize, I stepped out [inaudible] question.

Ms. Ajmera said I haven't stated my question yet. So, Madam Attorney mentioned that it would cost millions to defend the City, and then on top of, there is a penalty that we are looking at anywhere between $40 million to $70 million. Could you talk about the budget impact and what would that do to our residents?

Mr. Hastedt said sure. As we discussed last week, when we looked at sort of about a $60 million payment as sort of an example, that would require approximately a sort of 0.1 penny tax increase permanently to basically refill the funding source, which would be our Municipal Debt Service Fund, which is currently used to fund our steady state debt model, which is what supports our public facilities, such as our police and fire stations and affordable housing program. Alternatively, one of the other options would be to reappropriate approximately $2.35 million back into the Debt Service Fund, which requires to find other things that are currently obviously being sort of services for our citizens that would have to sort of program against. The other alternative would be to reduce our future borrowing needs by reducing our future public facilities or affordable housing bonds, approximately about $8 million in a two-year bond cycle. Because essentially what we're having to do is either raise revenues to refill the fund balance that we would be reusing for this payment or reduce future expenses to basically offset that.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you. So, from what I hear, what I understand, either raise taxes or reduce our bond capacity, whether that's affordable housing, neighborhood improvements, or community investment area plans. Am I correct?

Mr. Hastedt said correct.

Ms. Ajmera said the reason I asked these questions, because these are the questions that's been asked of us, what it would cost for us to take a principal stance. That's all I have for CFO, thank you.

This is one of the toughest decisions I have made in nearly 10 years on this Council. People I deeply respect are on opposing sides, Robert Dawkins, Shannon Binns who left. Robert Dawkins, a policy hawk who asked very tough questions. Shannon Binns, a fellow environmentalist who has fought with me for our carbon free goals, and someone I deeply admire and respect, and Rickey Hall, a West Side leader I have known since my days on the Charlotte Housing Authority Board. I've listened to all of you, and I've listened to many more voices, and Rickey said something that really stuck with me when we met one on one. He said that doing nothing is not an option, and I agree. For too long the West Side community has carried the burden of transportation decisions without receiving its fair share of its investment. So, for me this comes down to two words, repair and reconnect, that Mr. Hall, you shared those with me. You shared with me that repair the past decisions and repair what's broken, reconnect neighborhoods and that's what Minister Mack had told me, improve safety, and make sure this time investment reaches the very communities that have waited far too long, and that's exactly what we have been able to do with the help of our Madam Attorney, her staff, Rebecca Hefner, and an entire City of Charlotte team. I make this decision with humility, knowing good people will disagree, and with a commitment to keep fighting for the best possible outcome for our community. I know that many of you will disagree with me on this decision, but I've thought about this for many, many days. I've lost sleep over this for many weeks, I've done my homework, and this is the decision that I am making using my conscience. That's all I have, thank you.

Ms. Mayo said when people raised concern about this question, they were heard. When Council took action, the State and NC-DOT responded. More resources came to the table, more flexibility came to the table, and today there's a much clearer opportunity to shape what this investment can mean for the people actually living along this corridor. I opposed the P3 when it came before us, because I believe we needed more. Today, we have more work to do, and more to work with. I believe my responsibility is to evaluate what is in front of us today, not simply where we were several months ago. Eight of the 11 miles of the project run through District Three, that matters. For generations our communities have carried the weight of this infrastructure. We have seen significant investment in highways, industry, economic development, while too many of our

neighborhoods alongside these investments have waited for the same level investment in their quality of life. We have an opportunity to reconnect neighborhoods, improve pedestrian roadway safety, strengthen access mobility, support community stability, and make investments for the people that live there that they actually see and feel.

I am looking beyond the 77 corridor itself. As this work moves forward, I want us to use every opportunity available to address the transportation challenges surrounding this corridor. One of the main reasons why I will be voting for this P3 is because 17 out of 22 bridges will be redesigned. That is not part of the community benefits. That was always in the plan. I don't think that everyone was maybe paying attention to that part. That redesign is so impactful. On my way to work, which is an eight-minute drive from my house to my job, I cross 77 three times, how I'm really still not quite sure, but I have counted, and I've been able to figure that out. I cross it on Nations Ford, I cross it on South Tryon, and then I cross it again on Pressley Road. As I said on Monday, oftentimes I see a gentleman in a motorized wheelchair trying to cross Pressley Road. One of the reasons why I am voting for this is because it will improve those bridges for people who maybe don't have cars, because we know everyone in our City does not have that luxury. Some of the improvements to those 17 bridges will include multimodal upgrades. So, we will have bike lanes, we will have sidewalks, and we will also have streetlights. Those are things that we would not be able to provide to our residents any other way, and I am proud that we are providing that support for our residents who need the most when it comes to mobility.

I have also pushed NC-DOT to think through bus rapid transit. So, for our advocates regarding mobility, there are opportunities for us to not rely on one person being in a car. We have talked through having Park and Ride opportunities, so that people can park and get on a bus to go to Uptown and other places. These are the things that we have been told people want. We know the PAVE Act passed, and we had many environmental organizations that supported it because of this reasoning, that there would be opportunities for additional mobility options.

In addition, I've worked closely with NC-DOT surrounding Highway 160. That is a pain point for District Three residents. They have committed to hiring two new staff people to help with easement agreements with Duke Energy. So, I have really been thinking through, we know when they're working on 77, that means that people are going to take the other roads that are not the highway. So, how do we think through how can we ensure that the system improves.

So, we know this vote is one step. Now the real work begins. It's time for the City, NC-DOT, and our State partners, and our community to sit at the same table and turn commitments into action. That means clear expectations which we have in the MOA, which is available for anyone to read. If you go to our agenda, and you go to the topic for 77 tonight, you can see it for yourself. It means continued community engagement, and it means making sure the investments we are discussing actually reach the neighborhoods that have carried the weight of this infrastructure for generations. We have an opportunity to do something different here. We can invest in infrastructure and invest in people. We can improve mobility and reconnect communities. We can make sure that when this project is finished, the people of District Three can look around their neighborhood and say, we benefited too. My colleagues and I meet this moment with the people of Charlotte, and particularly the people of District Three at the center of this decision. For people who oppose this project, I hope that you will continue to stay engaged. There are opportunities. I mean, all of that is in the contract if you read it. There are opportunities for you to stay involved, so that you have a seat at the table to minimize impact, to maximize benefits. Now it's time to get ready to get to work. Thank you.

Councilmember Anderson said colleagues and residents, this has been quite an evening, and I respect everyone who has come out and taken the time to speak to us and to meet with us over the last several months and to exercise your leadership in a variety of different ways. Thank you for that, because through your leadership we have something that is really unprecedented in relation to working with NC-DOT. We have a

document that codifies our community benefits, laying out $300 million to directly impact underrepresented communities throughout the City of Charlotte in Districts One, Two, and Three. These are areas that have been food deserts forever, but yet could not attract retailers to come and set up shop there. They've had areas where there have been no recreation facilities. There's been no place for young people to gather or any kind of civic programming for community members. Now, based on this document that our City Attorney has worked so ardently on over the last several weeks, we have laid out specific minimums to address those areas, facilities on the West Side, along Beatties Ford, along the Statesville Avenue corridor, and that will impact a variety of communities who would never, ever have that opportunity to get those buildings. Ms. Mayo, you've been asking about recreational facilities forever, and what we have heard is that there's no money for that from our county counterparts. Now, we have money to build a building, and then we have the latitude to think about staffing and programming, and to bring some excitement to our communities, potentially like, we're one of the largest cities in the United States that doesn't have a brick-and-mortar Boys and Girls Club. What if we could bring a Boys and Girls Club to the West Side or to the Statesville corridor, to directly impact those young people who have been impacted over the years, and their parents and their grandparents have been impacted by previous projects like the original 77.

So, other communities throughout our State are looking at us and the leadership that we have exercised. We saw what happened with the PAVE Act, and now other communities throughout the State are looking to do the same thing, because they want to invest in multimodal mobility for their region, and we have something that's before us now where you all, the community members, have advocated along with us to access $300 million. That's hard dollars that will go into escrow, and only generate additional interest that'll allow us even more latitude for investment. It's been unprecedented and it will necessitate continued leaning in from all of you. So, I hope you're not going home tonight thinking that the work is done, it's really only beginning, because we need you to help shape how this money will come to light, and positively impact our communities.

I want to say that this work is not easy, and there's been a lot of passion that's been demonstrated in this room, but I think what you see on this dais is a group of Council members who are leaning into the difficult work, and we have the opportunity to disagree. We can just respectfully disagree. It doesn't have to be at a moment of discord, because everybody really and truly up here and many of you in this chamber want what's best for the City of Charlotte. We just have to collectively work together to get across that finish line.

So, thank you for coming out, and again I want to expressly thank our City Attorney for this work. I've met with her a number of times, and she'll tell you I've said, if we don't have a way to codify this, it's over. We have to be able to codify it, and it has to be defensible, and so we have that now in a document, but it will also then reappear in the RFP and reappear in the contract for the developer. So, thank you, Madam Attorney. I know you worked extremely hard on this to make sure that our residents can have some faith.

Mr. Driggs said let's give her a hand.

Ms. Anderson said and your staff and the rest of staff. As a true leader, she's trying to put it on the rest of staff of course. This has been a team effort, but you can have some sense of belief and not think that this is dubious because you have a legal document in front of you that will be signed by the Secretary of Transportation for the State of North Carolina. That's a big deal. Thank you.

Councilmember Mitchell said first of all, let me say to all the speakers who attended tonight, thank you for your passion and for your voice. It did not fall on deaf ears among these 12 members who sit down here and represent you each and every day. Let me say thank you to President Corine Mack and Rickey Hall and for those who took time to have community engagement in community to hear loud and clear what's some of the benefits that the community wants. A minimum of $300 million community benefit is

something I'm very excited about. In this document, there's opportunities called economic advancement, and let me thank my Council members, District One, Councilmember Anderson, District Two, Councilmember Graham, and District Three, Councilmember Mayo. This was not an easy decision for them. Continue to hold us accountable. This is just the first day of taking action that we hope will move Charlotte forward. So, my vote will be to support the motion that was made by Councilmember Anderson, and as always as I sit down here for the last 20-some-odd years you've given me the opportunity to represent you, I've always tried to represent you in the best way I know how, and that is continue to move Charlotte forward. Let's do that and let's do that working together.

Dr. Watlington said I've already spoken.

The vote was taken on the original motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mayo, Mitchell, and Owens

NAYS: Councilmembers Mazuera Arias, Johnson, Mayfield, and Watlington

* * * * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Mayor Harrington said thank you everyone for joining us for a long evening.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 4 Hours, 46 Minutes
Minutes completed: October 14, 2026

pti:pk