

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

Planning IC Commission

Jan 6, 2014

work session

Charlotte-Mecklenburg
Government Center

Room 267
Noon

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Work Session Agenda

January 6, 2014 – Noon

CMGC – Conference Room 267

Call to Order & Introductions

Tracy Dodson

Administration

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Approve the December 2, 2013 minutes.

Attachment 1

Policy

Area Plan Policy Assessment

Alysia Osborne

Background: Staff will provide an overview of the Area Plan Policy Assessment process and receive input from the Commission.

Action: Provide input.

Information

Planning Director's Report

Debra Campbell

- Planning Department's Public Outreach Presentations

Attachment 2

January & February 2014 Meeting Schedules

Attachment 3

Committee Reports

Executive Committee

Tracy Dodson

- November 18, 2013 Approved Minutes
- Future Work Session Agenda Items

Attachment 4

Future Work Session Agenda Items	Work Session
1. Zoning Ordinance Process	February
2. Extended Planning Director's Report – City Council Retreat	February
3. Transit Station Area Design Issues – Terry Shook Presentation	TBD

Zoning Committee

Tracy Dodson

- Upcoming Rezoning Petitions
- Zoning Committee Agenda

Tammie Keplinger

Attachment 5

Planning Committee

Tony Lathrop

- November 19, 2013 Approved Minutes

Attachment 6

Historic District Commission (HDC)

Karen Labovitz

- December 11, 2013 Meeting Update

Attachment 7

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)

Andy Zoutewelle

Communication from Chairperson

Tracy Dodson

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Attachment 1

December 2, 2013 – Noon

CMGC – Innovation Station

Action Minutes

Call to Order & Introductions

Chairperson Dodson called the meeting to order at 12:11 p.m., followed by introductions.

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Tracy Dodson (Chairperson), Tony Lathrop (Vice-Chairperson), Emma Allen, Ray Eschert, Randy Fink, Karen Labovitz, Tom Low, Dionne Nelson, Deb Ryan, Mike Sullivan, Dwayne Walker and Andy Zoutewelle

Commissioners Allen and Walker arrived at 12:18 p.m.

Commissioner Absent: Steven Firestone

Planning Staff Present: Debra Campbell (Director), Kathy Cornett, Garet Johnson, Michelle Jones, Tammie Keplinger, Kent Main, Melony McCullough, Ed McKinney, Sandy Montgomery, Cheryl Neely, Alysia Osborne, Catherine Stutts, Mandy Vari and Michelle Barber (temporary employee).

Other Staff Present: Len Chapman (Charlotte Engineering and Property Management) and Benjamin Miller (Charlotte Department of Transportation)

Administration

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Zoutewelle made a motion to approve the November 4, 2013 work session minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ryan. The vote was 10-0 to approve the minutes.

Policy

University City Area Plan – Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plans Update

The Chairperson introduced Mandy Vari, who presented information on the University City Area Plan – Blue Line Extension (BLE) Transit Station Area Plans Update. The presentation focused on the following:

- Update on the BLE Project
- Overview of the Station Area Planning Process
- Coordination of the University City Area Plan and BLE Transit Station Area Plans Update
- Lessons Learned
- Planning Commission Ideas and Input
- Next Steps

Ms. Vari stated that the BLE project stretches 9.3 miles from 9th Street to the UNC-Charlotte campus. Service is expected to begin in March of 2017 and will serve about 25,000 daily riders. This project will also include improvements to North Tryon Street. The BLE will be very similar to the existing South Corridor Blue Line.

The BLE will include 11 stations – seven walk up and four with park and ride facilities which will include approximately 3,000 parking spaces. There will be an extensive connecting bus service and tickets may be purchased at the stations. Stations are designed to be safe and convenient for customers and include security features, bicycling parking and incorporate public art, trees and lighting.

Ms. Vari explained that a station area plan is a policy guide that provides a framework for future growth and development. These plans provide detailed land use, community design and transportation recommendations for each station area. Plans also identify public and private investments and strategies needed to realize the plan vision.

Ms. Vari further explained that a lot of ground work has been done toward station area planning for the BLE over the past several years. Charlotte adopted Transit Station Area Principles in 2001 which are the starting point in this process. These Principles make general recommendations for the type of land use, design and transportation facilities desired within a half-mile walking distance of transit stations. We also adopted land use plans, such as the University City Area Plan, which was commissioned by University City Partners and adopted by City Council in 2007. In 2011, the Charlotte Area Transit Systems (CATS) staff and Planning staff prepared the Environmental Impact Study and New Starts Plan as part of the Federal requirements for the project. Both of these documents look at the entire corridor and each station in great detail to analyze existing conditions of various components in the area and identify issues and opportunities. This information then became part of the BLE Transit Station Area Plans, adopted in May of 2013.

Station area plans were also adopted for three stations as part of the 2007 University City Area plan and prior to the final design of the BLE project. Since 2007, many changes were made along the alignment that affects the University area. These significant changes impact the adopted future land use, community design and transportation policies that are currently in place. The plan is being updated so that staff can revisit those policies and update them to reflect the current conditions. The Planning Department will lead this effort with assistance from CATS, Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT), Engineering and various other City and County departments.

Amanda Vari reported that there are five different station typologies:

1. **The multi-modal station** - the only facility like this is the Charlotte Transportation Center located Uptown.
2. **Urban stations** are those close into Uptown, typically walk-up or bike-up facilities and are surrounded by existing dense communities.
3. **Neighborhood stations** are also walk-up or bike-up, however they may also include a park and ride facility and serve a broader area. Existing stations of this type are East-West and Scaleybark. Many of the stations for this plan update are this type of facility.
4. **Community stations** all have a park and ride facility and rely heavily on bus connections to provide complete service to a larger population. These facilities can be found at Sharon Road West and Arrowood.
5. **Regional stations** have an added component of being located near major roads such as I-485 and I-85 which provide access to park and ride facilities. They tend to be in existing greenfield areas but due to access considerations, they are strong candidates for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) in the future. Tyvola, I-485, and Woodlawn are examples of these types of stations. TOD has not been built out in this area yet, relative to what has occurred in SouthEnd near the urban stations.

Ms. Vari presented additional information about the BLE initiative. Please click [here](#) to view the PowerPoint Presentation in its entirety.

The following is a summary of the discussion that took place after the presentation:

Commissioner Ryan stated that people would love to see a lot of change there, but she thinks they are having a very difficult time visualizing it. Density is a challenge because there is concern about having more renters, but students are very interested in more density.

Commissioner Eschert asked how bus or transportation services can be provided to retail oriented areas during peak travel times. Ms. Vari said CATS is changing some bus routes in order to provide more efficient service to the transit stations. She stated that the desire is for future development to occur within walking distance of the transit stations to improve accessibility. Kathy Cornett added that a feeder bus network is part of the overall construction plan.

Chairperson Dodson noted that transportation services are needed in employment areas as well. She added that there is a growing employment center on the opposite side of I-85.

Commissioner Ryan mentioned that the issue of mixed use development is really important because when Wal-Mart relocated the shopping center appeared to decline. She further stated that to rethink this area as mixed use with light rail is great. She also stated that relative to accessibility; the road network is seen as a positive.

Commissioner Low suggested considering a reevaluation of the station types based on current market trends. He stressed that we cannot assume that the nice existing older subdivisions will go away, but suggested considering techniques and tools for retrofitting suburbia so it is still marketable. His next point was in relation to transportation and as part of a multi-modal strategy, he is interested in seeing how CDOT and the Planning Department think in terms of the way cars may actually transform into more smart cars and probably something that is going to allow suburban neighborhoods to flourish. Also, Commissioner Low noted that he did not see really the word “sustainability” in any of the PowerPoint slides. He cautioned staff to consider sustainability more, not only in terms of lifestyle, but also in terms of green infrastructure, retrofits or green building strategies. He also shared his concern about using chain link fences and big rock ballasts as a standard section along the main corridor with very limited opportunity for crossings. He suggested looking at more of a green track approach, which other cities have adopted. He noted that there are older businesses that currently have problems with accessibility because they are unable to cross the tracks. Green tracks would eliminate this problem.

Commissioner Sullivan discussed the importance of older shopping centers. He pointed out that the University area is different from the South Transit Corridor and SouthEnd. The University area is more suburban and some of the older neighborhoods may not benefit directly from the transit line. However, they may experience some development and he recommends including some of those areas in the plan.

Commissioner Ryan asked if there is a way to track the use of QR Codes. Ms. Vari stated that she created a bit.ly link (a link sharing platform on the web) for the Plan and thinks they can be tracked through that link.

Commissioner Nelson mentioned that on the BLE tour (earlier today) staff discussed working with some of the existing land owners. She asked if staff is having separate meetings with owners of particular parcels. Ms. Vari replied not as a part of the transit station area planning process, but other Planning staff has met with property owners about specific proposals. Commissioner Nelson suggested meeting one-on-one with owners of particular tracts or a few existing developments that are envisioned to change significantly in the future. Alysia Osborne said that staff has internally discussed reaching out to the owner of a vacant parcel on N.C. 49 and the owner of The Shoppes at University Place to come up with a development/redevelopment strategy.

Debra Campbell explained that there are a number of separate projects that overlap with the BLE and asked Ed McKinney to respond to this issue. Mr. McKinney stated that staff is essentially looking at the entire BLE corridor and working individually with key property owners in the station areas to begin looking at rezonings, land use changes and redevelopment; particularly for properties within a quarter mile of the stations. At the University City Boulevard Station, there is a 60-acre tract of vacant land across North Tryon Street from the station. Staff had discussions with this property owner over the last several months about how this property should develop. A part of staff's role is to understand who is in the community and with whom we should meet. Staff is trying to be more proactive in identifying key sites as we move forward in the planning process.

Ms. Campbell shared that being proactive and talking to property owners and the development community is actually not a role that the City has been very comfortable playing. The new City Manager has said that it is okay for the City to not only lead, but to set the table for the development, and to literally go out and negotiate with property owners to market our plans and vision for the community. Planning has accepted this challenge, starting with this corridor. However, it is a very new and exciting role for us. Staff is still trying to process this role and stay within legal boundaries. Ultimately, there may be rezonings, policy decisions or other changes that require property owners to work with Planning staff.

Chairperson Dodson asked if this is bringing back the role of the City's Economic Development Department which led the transit station development coordination before the economy slowed. Ms. Campbell answered yes, but from various departments. She said it gives the City a much more aggressive, assertive and proactive role in implementing our vision and ensuring that we are working with property owners that want to develop projects that are consistent with the vision for an area. It is also a way for us to get the infrastructure that we think is important, particularly for this geography, because the street network for this corridor is very limited.

Commissioner Nelson thinks this will help get rezoning requests that are consistent with area plans. She noted that we traditionally talk about the transit area as half-mile and that in this area the definition may need to be different from SouthEnd.

Commissioner Eschert asked if there is data that shows 60 percent of the ridership is within the half-mile radius and 40 percent is outside or is it just an assumption that they are within a half-mile. Mr. McKinney stated that CATS probably has that information. Kathy Cornett added that CATS does a lot of onboard surveys and staff can check on this.

Ed McKinney further added that when considering the half-mile/quarter-mile, we have always linked it to a five to ten minute walk to a station. In suburban areas, we are trying to attract development so that the percentages will change over time and ultimately more people work and live close to the station. SouthEnd had a higher percentage of that because of the form and nature of development.

We have a bigger challenge long term in some of the more suburban station areas that do not have the infrastructure or the development yet.

Debra Campbell said that sometimes we think “build it and they will come.” We think all that we have to do is put the light rail facility out there and all of a sudden transit-oriented development miraculously appears. We still have the same market conditions, with or without the rail as well as the same demands and lifestyle choices. She shared that some staff recently attended the Revolution Conference and learned that communities like Seattle and Portland are only getting transit oriented development close to town. These areas have pre-zoned land throughout their corridors, but the issue becomes how much of a market can you create at one time for this type of lifestyle. These stations will have a much more compact development pattern and development may not happen in the next five years. Development will probably happen in NoDa at the 36th Street Station or closer to Uptown.

Chairperson Dodson applauded staff’s efforts to be proactive. She thinks the biggest struggle will be getting mixed use. It is still a struggle in SouthEnd and given the economy, people do not want to develop that way. Debra Campbell added that people will be concerned that development is not dense enough but the area has to mature in terms of a market that can support that form of development.

Commissioner Low said that we should be concerned when making the assumption that some of these stations will be less compact and that we are not saying that they are going to be more suburban in character. As we all know, there is a huge amount of development interest in terms of building high density apartments. One of the concerns was that people do not want more rentals, but one question would be is it they do not want any more suburban, parking lot style, garden apartments; but they may actually like a town center with affordable housing and mixed income housing which includes apartments. If we just assume that these are just going to be suburban stations, we are missing the boat. That is why our zoning is going to be so important to actually establish and encourage mixed income/mixed use as we move forward. Block structure and connectivity are essential for the long term; we have to create good bones out there and I think it will come.

Debra Campbell said staff agrees and that is why we have station area principles and set up that network during area planning processes. Because a station is identified as a suburban station, does not mean that it will not have similar features and characteristics to an urban station in some locations. There may be more emphasis on the quarter-mile than the half-mile at a suburban station but it will be contextual. It is important to convey that although we have fundamental baselines or principles, we will always look at the context when developing a station area plan. Because it is at the University, the context is very different than at 36th Street. We are not promoting or encouraging a traditional suburban character at any of these stations.

Chairperson Dodson thanked Amanda Vari for the presentation.

Midtown Morehead Cherry Pedestrian Overlay Amendment

The Chairperson introduced Michelle Jones who presented an update on the Midtown Morehead Cherry Pedestrian Overlay Amendment.

Ms. Jones stated that the Pedestrian overlay zoning (PED) was adopted in 1999. She explained that these development standards were revised with stakeholder input in 2011. The PED overlay zoning districts adds additional development requirements and design standards. The overlay district “sits on

top” of the existing zoning (e.g. B-1, B-2, O-1, O-2); however, it is not applicable to MUDD, UMUD and TOD zoning. This overlay district is intended for use on business corridors that abut established neighborhoods. The district allows most permitted uses (except billboards and outdoor storage) of the underlying zoning district while applying PED development and design standards. It also allows all accessory uses (except drive-thru windows for restaurants and retail uses).

There are currently 6 PED overlay districts:

1. Sunnyside
2. Plaza Central
3. East Boulevard
4. Midtown Morehead Cherry
5. West Morehead
6. West End

Ms. Jones stated that the purpose of the initiative is to amend both the PED zoning and area plans to better achieve the goals of each overlay district. Staff will work with residents and property owners to identify the unique characteristics of the PED overlay districts and develop limited standards which are not adequately addressed through PED zoning.

Ms. Jones reported that during the week of November 18th, Planning staff met one-on-one with residents and property owners to evaluate specific issues and identify areas of concern. From the feedback received at these interviews, Planning staff will develop a series of development standards. This information will be discussed and evaluated at community workshops on December 12th and 13th.

Michelle Jones indicated what resonated from earlier meetings with property owners was that PED should not be a “one size fits all” approach, since Charlotte’s PED districts are not all the same. The general character of East Morehead is different than that of Plaza Midwood or even Midtown, and what may be appropriate development for one area is probably not the same for another area. Ms. Jones said staff recognizes that there are numerous design elements and characteristics that are both desirable and applicable across the full range of Charlotte’s pedestrian overlay districts. This process of making amendments to both the PED overlay as a whole, as well as individual area plans, will be a multi-phase approach starting with the Midtown Morehead Cherry PED District and moving forward to the other districts from there. The *Midtown Morehead Cherry Area Plan* (2012) encompasses the area bounded by East 4th Street, Queens Road and East Morehead Street, including a PED overlay district along East Morehead and Kings Drive.

Ms. Jones presented additional information. Please click [here](#) to view the PowerPoint Presentation in its entirety.

The following is a summary of the discussion that took place after the presentation:

Commissioner Ryan asked why the Metropolitan area was not included within the study area boundaries. Michelle Jones replied that the Metropolitan was a mixed use zoning and PED does not apply to the urban districts.

Commissioner Low asked about looking at the study area as a whole. He thought a broader vision would be more beneficial. In particular he noted that there have been discussions about connectivity in the area including eliminating the I-277 ramps and relocating I-277 underneath a park.

Commissioner Low also noted that consideration should be given to edge treatment of the Cherry neighborhood as well as making the greenway more accessible by adding on-street parking to Kings Drive and other corridors.

Debra Campbell concluded by acknowledging that although Commission representatives are assigned to track and follow the BLE Plan and the Midtown Morehead Cherry initiatives, staff presented this information to allow the full Commission an opportunity for input. She encouraged Commissioners to be engaged in these initiatives and to continue to provide updates from the public involvement processes to the full Commission.

Chairperson Dodson thanked Michelle Jones for the presentation.

Information

Planning Director's Report - I-77 Noise Walls

Debra Campbell introduced the I-77 Noise Walls agenda item. She stated that noise walls are being constructed along I-77 to mitigate noise impacts from the proposed widening project. The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is implementing a public-private partnership to construct the noise walls. The Planning Department has been asked to help with the public input process because there have been a lot of concerns from some of the neighborhoods about the speed of the process and the decisions that need to be made. The Planning Department and CDOT are working with NCDOT to increase public awareness and facilitate decision making on the proposed noise walls along I-77 and I-277. Public meetings are scheduled for December 11th and 17th. Director Campbell introduced Ed McKinney who provided an overview of this project.

Mr. McKinney stated that the scope of the project is along I-77 from Uptown to Mooresville. NCDOT is proposing to widen I-77 in this area to create High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. NCDOT completed an analysis which indicated that there is a noise impact, hence the potential for installing noise walls along the corridor.

NCDOT has been working with residents and property owners on two key decisions:

1. Wall or no Wall – this decision is made only by property owners who have been identified as impacted/benefited residential property owners (based on NCDOT Traffic Noise Abatement Policy). These property owners received ballots and were asked to vote. If the ballot was not returned, it is counted as a “yes” vote.
2. Design of Walls (color & texture) – this decision is typically the City’s (for both sides of walls). The State Historic Preservation Office has determined that in historic districts or areas “eligible” for historic designation – impacted/benefited property owners should determine texture and color. Eligible historic neighborhoods are McCrorey Heights, Oaklawn Park, Dalebrook and Fourth Ward Historic District.

The Planning Director added that the actual reduction in noise is only five decibels with the noise walls. Staff wants property owners to understand that in an urban context the difference in a reduction of five decibels may not have much impact on the quality of life.

Mr. McKinney presented additional detailed information about the proposed walls. Please click [here](#) to view the PowerPoint Presentation in its entirety.

The following is a summary of the discussion that took place after the presentation:

Commissioner Low asked if staff could associate a cost to the different wall options. Mr. McKinney stated that he did not have cost information at this time, but staff is actively working on cost information. Typically, there is a standard treatment that does not have a cost to the City, but if the City wants to do something different, there will be a cost.

Commissioner Labovitz stated that she was confused as to why a homeowner would not want a noise wall. Ed McKinney explained that most neighborhoods want the wall, but that it affects the livability of their backyard. For instance, in Uptown there will be an incremental difference in noise weighted against the impact of losing a view of Uptown.

Commissioner Low asked if the brick wall will be a brick texture or real brick. Mr. McKinney clarified that the wall is concrete and it will be stamped and colored to look like brick. Commissioner Low asked for the cost difference in the plain concrete wall and the stamped, colored concrete. Mr. McKinney indicated that he did not have this information, but there is a cost difference.

Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if the addition of the noise wall will make the existing brick wall along I-77 obsolete. Ed McKinney explained that the existing brick wall does not function as a noise wall. It is an aesthetic treatment so residents do not have to view of the interstate. However, it creates a challenge because there will be space between the existing wall and the noise wall.

Commissioner Ryan voiced concern with the proposed noise walls. She thought it was a waste of money and was concerned that property owners in the area have substantial input when the noise wall impacts the entire city. She shared that a study on the impact of noise walls indicated that these walls do not significantly decrease noise. In fact, a wall of trees has more impact on mitigating noise. She suggested that trees be considered to be more consistent with the City's image. Mr. McKinney explained that several hundred feet of space is needed to plant and create the right kind of density to make a landscape option effective.

Chairperson Dodson asked for clarification regarding a non-returned ballot. Director Campbell clarified that a non-unreturned ballot is counted as a "yes" vote for the wall.

The Chairperson asked if properties with renters or transient populations, such as Alpha Mill have a vote. Ms. Campbell stated although they get to vote, a formula is used to calculate their votes so that it does not count as much as a property owner's vote.

Commissioner Nelson asked if NCDOT provides an audible distinction to the five decibels reduction in noise. She thought that if impacted property owners and residents could hear the difference, it could impact their opinions. Debra Campbell stated that staff will try to provide an audible test of the different noise levels.

Commissioner Low asked about the current decibel level without the noise walls. Ed McKinney replied that a typical freeway is approximately 60-70 decibels.

Commissioner Eschert had concerns about the maintenance of the walls and does not think the noise walls are very effective. He mentioned that having a wall in some areas and not in others can actually cause the noise to be amplified. Commissioner Eschert said that in some areas in Ballantyne along I-485, the noise is louder on the side with the noise wall than the side without the wall.

Commissioner Low expressed concern about how the information was presented. He thought it would create controversy, in particular with organizations like the Friends of Fourth Ward.

Commissioner Low also mentioned that a study that was done to consider removing the elevated section of highway near Fourth Ward. He thought the noise wall would add a “Band-Aid” and is a bad solution. He asked about the work that a consultant is doing to look at making the highway a boulevard in that area. Ed McKinney replied that he is familiar with the Loop Study and one of the options from that study is a boulevard, but there are a range of options, including ramp relocation. Commissioner Low thought it should be considered as a long term solution.

Commissioner Low expressed concern about the aesthetics of the noise wall. He recommended using green walls with ivy, Virginia Creeper or another low maintenance plant. Commissioner Low also suggested that staff look at some of the green walls in the coastal South Carolina area. He also had concerns about CDOT designing the walls and suggested that staff consult with Lauren Blackburn, former Planning Director for the Town of Davidson, who is now a planner with NCDOT.

December & January 2013 Meeting Schedules

The Chairperson stated that the December and January meeting schedules were distributed. She noted that due to the holidays, there are several changes to the regular meeting schedules.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee

Chairperson Dodson directed Commissioners to the Executive Committee’s approved minutes and the future work sessions agenda items list.

Zoning Committee

Chairperson Dodson announced that Commissioner Ryan is going to continue as the Zoning Committee representative for the Blue Line Extension initiative. However, she still needs a Zoning Committee member volunteer for the Midtown Morehead Cherry PED Overlay Amendment.

Tammie Keplinger reported that there are 17 cases scheduled for public hearing on December 16th. She informed the Commission that as part of the City Manager’s Paperless Environment Initiative, staff is moving towards having paperless zoning agendas for the Council Meeting in January. She asked the Commission to inform staff if they need a paper copy of the agenda. She also reminded the Commission that the December Zoning Committee Work Session was moved to January 6, 2014 at 9:00 am, prior to the work session. The January public hearing date is Tuesday, January 21st, because of the Martin Luther King Holiday.

Planning Committee

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop thanked Planning Committee members and staff for attending a very informative tour of the Blue Line Extension area earlier this morning. He stated that Commissioner Nelson had agreed to be the Planning Committee representative for the BLE community involvement process.

He stated that there were three mandatory referrals on the November agenda and there will be six mandatory referrals on the December agenda.

Historic District Commission (HDC)

Commissioner Labovitz said that there were not many cases on the November agenda and the meeting was relatively short compared to previous meetings.

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)

Commissioner Zoutewelle reported that CRTPO is engaged in several activities such as the transportation improvement grant plan and the strategic prioritization. Since there is a lot going on CRPTO has moved to a monthly meeting schedule.

Communication from Chairperson

The Chairperson wished everyone happy holidays.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

Community Outreach Presentations

#	Date	Presentation	Staff
1	10/08/13	Knight Foundation - Bus Tour, <i>Charlotte in Black and White....and More</i>	J. Howard
2	10/22/13	Charlotte Regional Realtor's Association - Bus Tour, <i>Charlotte in Black and White....and More</i>	J. Howard
3	10/24/13	Neighborhood Leadership Awards - Planning	M. McCullough/K. Young/ J. Howard/M. Sigmon/ S. Kennedy
4	11/12/13	Cherry Neighborhood - Local Historic District Designation	J. Howard/W. Birmingham
5	11/14/13	Statesville Airport Commission - Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO) 101	R. Cook
6	11/19/13	Davidson Town Council - Enlarging their Local Historic District	J. Howard/W. Birmingham
7	11/20/13	Geographical Information System (GIS) Day	M. Sigmon/P. Aphayarath/Z. Duhaney/J. Kinley/C. Lyte-Graham/J. Prescott/C. Stutts/J. Taylor
8	11/21/13	Town of Mooresville Board of Commissioners - Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO) 101	R. Cook
9	12/02/13	Greater Enrichment Program (Ashley Park Elementary) - Introduction to Local Government and Urban Planning	M. McCullough/K. Young
10	12/02/13	Marshville Town Council - "CRTPO 101"	R. Cook
11	12/04/13	UNC Charlotte School of Architecture - Guest Design Studio Juror	J. Howard
12	12/05/13	CATS Public Meeting - Blue Line Extension Construction Update	K. Cornett/C. Stutts/A. Vari
13	12/06/13	Cherry Neighborhood - Local Historic District Designation Strategy with Preservation Partners	J. Howard
14	12/09/13	Greater Enrichment Program (Ashley Park Elementary) - Introduction to Local Government and Urban Planning	M. McCullough/K. Young
15	12/09/13	Historic Charlotte Board of Directors - Historic District Commission Update	J. Howard
16	12/10/13	Blue Line Extension Public Meeting - University City Area Plan Update and CATS Construction Update	K. Cornett/C. Stutts/A. Vari
17	12/10/13	New City Council Members - Rezoning Orientation	T. Keplinger
18	12/12/13	Mallard Creek Community Organization - Prosperity Hucks Area Plan	K. Main
19	12/16/13	Greater Enrichment Program (Ashley Park Elementary) - Introduction to Local Government and Urban Planning	M. McCullough/K. Young
20	12/18/13	Chamber Land Use Committee - Blue Line Extension Area Plans	K. Cornett

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Attachment 3

Meeting Schedule

January 2014

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
01-06-14	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Executive Committee			
01-21-14	4:00 p.m.	Work Session ¹	Conference Room 266 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
01-21-14	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Zoning Committee			
01-06-14	9:00 a.m.	Work Session ²	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
01-21-14	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
01-21-14	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
01-29-14	4:30 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committee(s)			
01-08-14	Historic District Commission Meeting Cancelled ³		
01-08-14	5:00 p.m.	CRTPO New Member's Orientation	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC
01-15-14	7:00 p.m.	CRTPO Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings			
Midtown • Morehead • Cherry Pedestrian Overlay Amendment			
01-09-14	6:00 p.m.	Public Workshop	Mahlon Adams Pavilion Freedom Park 2435 Cumberland Avenue
Prosperity Hucks Area Plan			
01-14-14	6:00 p.m.	Public Forum	Crossway Community Church 6400 Prosperity Church Road
Nightclubs, Restaurants, Bars and Lounges			
01-16-14	6:00 p.m.	Public Workshop	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC

¹ Due to the MLK Holiday, the January 20, 2014 Executive Committee meeting was changed to January 21, 2014.

² Due to the Holiday, the December 25, 2013 Zoning Committee Work Session was rescheduled to January 6, 2014.

³ The January 8, 2014 Historic District Commission meeting was cancelled.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Meeting Schedule

February 2014

Date	Time	Purpose	Location
Full Planning Commission			
02-03-14	Noon	Work Session	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Executive Committee			
02-17-14	4:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 266 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Planning Committee			
02-18-14	5:00 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
Zoning Committee			
02-17-14	5:00 p.m.	Dinner with City Council	Conference Room CH-14 Basement – CMGC
02-17-14	6:00 p.m.	City Rezoning	Meeting Chamber Lobby Level – CMGC
02-26-14	4:30 p.m.	Work Session	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor – CMGC
Other Committee(s)			
02-12-14	3:00 p.m.	Historic District Commission	Conference Room 280 2 nd Floor - CMGC
02-19-14	7:00 p.m.	CRTPO Meeting	Conference Room 267 2 nd Floor – CMGC

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Meetings

University City Area Plan (UCAP) Blue Line Extension (BLE) Transit Station Area Plans Update			
02-11-13	4:30 p.m.	Public Workshop	Oasis Shriner's Temple 604 Doug Mayes Place

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

Executive Committee

November 18, 2013 – 4:00 pm

CMGC – Conference Room 266

Minutes

Attachment 4

Approved

December 16, 2013

Call to Order & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Tracy Dodson (Chairperson), Tony Lathrop (Vice-Chairperson) and Ray Eschert.

Commissioner(s) Absent: Emma Allen

Planning Staff Present: Debra Campbell (Director), Cheryl Neely and Michelle Barber

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Vice-Chairperson Lathrop and seconded by Commissioner Eschert to approve the October 21, 2013 Executive Committee minutes. The vote was 3 to 0 to approve the minutes.

Follow-up Assignments

Planning Commission Potential Impact Areas & Impact Priorities

Chairperson Dodson asked if the Area Plan Policy Assessment discussion is on the December work session agenda. Cheryl Neely replied that staff is suggesting that this discussion be moved to the January work session agenda because the Midtown·Morehead·Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Text Amendment was added to the December work session agenda. She further explained that since the process for the Midtown·Morehead·Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Text Amendment had already started staff wanted to update the Commission on that project. Therefore, staff is proposing that the Area Plan Policy Assessment discussion be moved to the January work session. The Committee agreed to place this item on the January agenda.

Chairperson Dodson asked Director Campbell to provide a debriefing from the City Council Retreat at the February work session. She also asked if the Zoning Ordinance discussion could take place in February, if staff is ready. The Planning Director indicated that staff will update the Future Agenda Items List to reflect these changes.

Attendance Requirements for Involvement in Public Input Processes

Cheryl Neely stated that Chairperson Dodson reviewed the Planning Commission's attendance requirements for public involvement processes at the November work session; however she noted the current policy applies to area plan processes and Planning Committee members only. She explained that when the process was created Commissioners were not assigned to text amendments, but now that Commissioners are assigned to text amendment Citizen Advisory Groups (CAG), she asked if the Executive Committee would like to consider revising the policy to apply to all Commissioner assigned projects for consistency.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if the policy should also apply to the Charlotte Regional Transportation Organization (CRPTO). Cheryl Neely explained that CRPTO and the Historic District Commission track attendance and it is not counted twice.

Chairperson Dodson stated that she thought this attendance requirement should only apply to area plan and text amendment processes. She did not want to make a lot of changes to the policy and suggested that only one meeting be mandatory.

The Planning Director stated that the policy should not be too narrow and not focus on the type of initiative such as area plans and text amendment processes. It should also be applicable to other projects such as the Zoning Ordinance Policy Assessment. She suggested that the policy be directed at participation when staff has created a CAG or a public input process. Chairperson Dodson agreed that the policy should be broad and apply to CAGs when Commissioners are assigned to them.

Director Campbell suggested that the current policy be tweaked to reflect these proposed changes. Chairperson Dodson agreed that references in the current policy to the Planning Committee should be replaced with Planning Commission. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop agreed and suggested that the text be changed from Planning Committee to apply to any CAG process so that the policy will be consistent for all Commissioner assignments.

Commissioner Eschert asked for clarification. The Chairperson explained that the current policy is specific to the Planning Committee and the area plan process. She further explained that since Commissioners are now assigned to CAGs and are accountable to provide reports back to the full Commission, the policy should apply to all public input processes.

Commissioner Eschert asked if the Chairperson was proposing that this policy apply to zoning community meetings. Chairperson Dodson replied no, just the larger text amendments which have a citizen engagement process. Debra Campbell clarified that this policy should apply to processes initiated by Planning staff. The Chairperson agreed.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if the Commission needed to take action on the proposed changes or if the Executive Committee could make the changes. Ms. Neely suggested that it would probably need to go back to the full Commission. Director Campbell noted that since it was originally approved by the full Commission, it would have to go back to the full Commission. She also noted that the current policy makes references to the Chairperson of the Planning Committee making appointments, so that may need to be addressed as well. Chairperson Dodson asked Cheryl Neely to send the document to her electronically so that she could make the proposed changes. Ms. Neely stated that she would insert the proposed revisions and send the policy to the Chairperson for review.

Cheryl Neely noted that this policy is also incorporated into the Operating Agreement, so that is another reason why any proposed changes should go back to the full Commission for action. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if it was just incorporated by reference in the Operating Agreement. Cheryl Neely replied yes. The Vice-Chairperson stated that the Commission should not have to amend the Operating Agreement if it is just referenced.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked about the timeframe for incorporating these proposed changes. The Chairperson replied that she would like to review the proposed revisions, forward them to the Executive Committee for review and take them to the full Commission at the December work session. The Planning Director noted that staff is getting ready to kick-off two efforts where Commissioners are assigned.

Commissioner Assignments

Chairperson Dodson stated that a Commissioner assignment is needed from the Zoning Committee for the Midtown·Morehead·Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Text Amendment. Since no one has volunteered, she may have to assign a Commissioner.

Cheryl Neely asked if a Zoning Committee member had been assigned to the University City Area Plan – BLE Transit Station Area Plans Update. Chairperson Dodson replied that the BLE Commissioner assignments will come from the Planning Committee. Cheryl Neely reminded the committee that they previously discussed assigning a Zoning Committee member to this initiative as well. Vice-Chairperson Lathrop indicated that he would get someone assigned from the Planning Committee.

Chairperson Dodson mentioned that Commissioner Phipps will be resigning from the Commission soon and this could impact quorums and Commissioner assignments.

Future Work Session Agenda Items

The Committee agreed on the following future work session agenda items:

Future Work Session Agenda Items	Work Session
1. University City Area Plan – BLE Transit Station Area Plans Update	December
2. Midtown Morehead Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Amendment	December
3. Area Plan Policy Assessment	January
4. Zoning Ordinance Process	February
5. Extended Planning Director's Report – City Council Retreat	February

Approval of the December 2, 2013 Work Session Agenda

Chairperson Dodson reiterated that the University City Area Plan – BLE Transit Station Area Plans Update and the Midtown·Morehead·Cherry Pedestrian Overlay District Text Amendment would be on the December work session agenda.

November and December 2013 Meeting Schedules

The Committee reviewed the November and December meeting schedules. The Chairperson noted that there were two I-77 Noise Walls community meetings scheduled on December 11 and December 17, 2013. She asked the Planning Director to explain this project. Debra Campbell explained that as a result of the proposal to add high occupancy toll roads on I-77, between I-277 to beyond the County line, noise walls will be constructed to mitigate the noise impact of the additional lanes. There have been concerns about the aesthetic appearance of the walls as well as the location of the walls. Staff will facilitate discussions with property owners in these areas to help decide whether or not they want a wall and the design of the wall.

The section of I-77 between I-85 and Sunset Road will have a noise wall on one side only. The issue in that area is whether or not the wall should be the same as the other areas. If the wall is different, the City will pay for the different type of wall.

The State Historic Preservation Office has designated several neighborhoods along the portion of I-77 from I-85 to I-277 eligible for Historic District Designation, so the neighborhoods will decide on the wall texture and color as well as whether they want a wall. So far, ballots submitted by property owners indicate that they want a wall. Staff has been asked to facilitate a meeting to help determine what type of wall will be installed. Also, there may be dual walls in this area because there are currently aesthetic walls on both sides of the interstate.

From I-277 in town, the issue is whether property owners in Fourth Ward want the noise walls. They originally voted to have the wall, but they were some technical changes in the way the NCDOT calculated the walls on the bridges, so they need to revote. In either section, only property owners who are directly impacted by noise get to vote. Staff will meet with the property owners to support, help their decision-making and inform them in terms of the overall impact.

Commissioner Eschert asked if a property owner does not return their ballot if the vote is counted as a “yes” vote. Debra Campbell confirmed that is correct. If a ballot is not returned, it is counted as a “yes” vote and that is generally how the walls have been decided. The majority of the property owners have not returned their ballots. She further explained that is why several neighborhoods asked the City to assist with this initiative. The City will define the texture and the color on the side of the wall facing the interstate and the neighborhood will decide on the texture and color of the wall facing the neighborhood. The City is trying to facilitate a common response versus having a two-colored, two-textured wall. Staff will facilitate this discussion at the community meetings on December 11 and December 17, 2013. Decisions will be made by January 3, 2014.

Vice-Chairperson Lathrop asked if the noise wall can be placed where the current aesthetic wall is located. Director Campbell replied no, because it will not have the same impact in terms of mitigating noise.

Chairperson Dodson asked the Planning Director if she could provide a brief overview at the December work session. Ms. Campbell replied that she will have Assistant Director Ed McKinney present information about this project as part of her Director’s Report. The Committee agreed to add this item to the December work session agenda.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

AGENDA
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
ZONING COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, Rm. 280
January 6, 2013
9:00 A.M.

Please click this link: [December 2013 map](#) to see a map showing the location of all rezoning cases on this agenda.

1.	Petition No. 2013-061 by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department for a Text Amendment to the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance to add conference centers, convention centers and halls, exhibit halls, merchandise marts and similar uses as a use permitted under prescribed conditions in B-2 (general business) and I-1 (light industrial) zoning districts.
2.	Petition No. 2013-069 (Council District 7 – Driggs) by The Ryland Group, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 5.0 acres located on the north side of Providence Road West near the intersection of Tolliver Drive and Providence Road West from R-3 (single family residential) to UR-1(CD) (urban residential, conditional).
3.	Petition No. 2013-071 (Council District 6 – Smith) by The Presbyterian Home of Charlotte, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 24.80 acres located on the west side of Sharon Road between Eastburn Road and Hazelton Drive from R-3 (single-family residential) & INST(CD) (institutional, conditional) to INST(CD) (institutional, conditional) & INST(CD) SPA (institutional, conditional, site plan amendment).
4.	Petition No. 2013-072 (Council District 4 – Barnes) by Aventine Development, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 5.94 acres located at the intersection of Eastfield Road and Prosperity Church Road from R-3 (single family residential) to NS (neighborhood services).
5.	Petition No. 2013-079 (Council District 1 – Kinsey) by Joseph Okoye & Sylvia Okoye for a change in zoning for approximately 1.59 acres located on the west side of Eastway Drive near the intersection of Audrey Street and Eastway Drive from R-17MF (multi-family residential) to INST(CD) (institutional, conditional).
6.	Petition No. 2013-084 (Council District 5 – Autry) by Charles C. Davis, Jr. for a change in zoning for approximately 1.54 acres located on the south side of The Plaza near the intersection of East W.T. Harris Boulevard and The Plaza from R-3 (single-family residential) to B-1(CD) (neighborhood business district, conditional).
7.	Petition No. 2013-091 (Council District 7 – Driggs) by Shea Anniston, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 11.38 acres located on the north side of Marvin Road, east of Johnston Road, between Donnington Drive and Wilkee Drive from R-3 (single-family residential) to MX-1 (mixed use district).
8.	Petition No. 2013-092 (Council District 1 – Kinsey) by FMF Morehead, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 2.77 acres located on the north side of East Morehead Street and south side of Kenilworth Avenue, between East Morehead and Harding Place from MUDD-O(PED) (mixed use development district, optional, pedestrian overlay), MUDD(CD) (PED) (mixed use development district, conditional, pedestrian overlay) & O-2(PED) (office district, pedestrian overlay) to MUDD-O SPA (PED) (mixed use development district, optional, site plan amendment, pedestrian overlay) & MUDD-O (PED) (mixed use development district, optional, pedestrian overlay).

9.	<u>Petition No. 2013-093</u> (Outside City Limits) by Laurel Oak Farm, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 1.23 acres located on the south side of Youngblood Road between McKee Road and Watermelon Lane from R-3 (single-family residential) to MUDD-O (mixed use development district, optional).
10.	<u>Petition No. 2013-095</u> (Council District 7 – Driggs) by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership for a change in zoning for approximately 7.23 acres located on the west side of Weddington Road between Simfield Church Road and Portstewart Lane from INST(CD) (institutional, conditional) to R-12MF(CD) (multi-family residential, conditional).
11.	<u>Petition No. 2013-096</u> (Council District 2 – Austin) by Second Harvest Food Bank of Metrolina, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 15.13 acres located on the west side of North Graham Street and Spratt Street between Music Factory Boulevard and Oliver Street from I-1 (light industrial) & I-1(CD) (light industrial, conditional) to I-1(CD) (light industrial, conditional) & I-1(CD) SPA (light industrial, conditional, site plan amendment).
12.	<u>Petition No. 2013-097</u> (Council District 1 – Kinsey) by Sugar Creek Charter School, Inc. for a change in zoning for approximately 15.16 acres located on the south side of Glory Street and Hunslet Circle and generally surrounded by West Craighead Road, Glory Street, West Sugar Creek Road, and North Tryon Street from R-12MF (multi-family residential) & B-2(CD) (general business district, conditional) to B-2(CD) (general business district, conditional) & B-2(CD) SPA (general business district, conditional, site plan amendment).
13.	<u>Petition No. 2013-099</u> (Council District 6 – Smith) by Michael T. Whitehead & Elizabeth M. Whitehead for a change in zoning for approximately 2.70 acres located on the southeast corner of the intersection at Rama Road and Sardis Road from INST(CD) (institutional, conditional) to INST(CD) SPA (institutional, conditional, site plan amendment).
14.	<u>Petition No. 2013-100</u> (Council District 5 – Autry) by SMA Carolina, LLC for a change in zoning for approximately 1.20 acres located on the south side of Central Avenue between Rosehaven Drive and Winterfield Place from R-22MF (multi-family residential) to O-1(CD) (office district, conditional).
15.	<u>Petition No. 2013-102</u> (Council District 1 – Kinsey) by Wajahat & Ferah Syed for a change in zoning for two parcels approximately 2.13 acres in total located on the south side of North Davidson Street between East 33rd Street and East 35th Street from R-5 (single-family residential) to TOD-M (transit oriented development mixed use) and MUDD-O (mixed use development district, optional) to MUDD-O SPA (mixed use development district, optional, site plan amendment).
16.	<u>Petition No. 2013-103</u> (Council District 2 – Austin) by Thomas Keith for a change in zoning for approximately 5.02 acres located on the north side of Old Statesville Road across from Spring Trace Drive from R-17MF (multi-family residential) to I-1 (light industrial).

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission
Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
November 19, 2013 – 5:00 p.m.
CMGC – Second Floor, Room 280

Attachment 6
APPROVED
December 17, 2013

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Tony Lathrop, Vice-Chairperson Raymond Eschert, Randy Fink, Dionne Nelson, Michael Sullivan and Andy Zoutewelle

Commissioner Absent: Gregg Phipps

Planning Staff Present: Kathy Cornett, Laura Harmon, Garet Johnson, Alysia Osborne, Sonda Kennedy, Kent Main, Melony McCullough, Catherine Stutts, Bryman Suttle, Amanda Vari and Jonathan Wells

Other Staff Present: Judy Dellert-O’Keefe (CATS), Ben Miller (CDOT) and Jacqueline McNeil and Katie Ross (Mecklenburg County Asset and Facility Management)

Call to Order and Introductions

Chairperson Tony Lathrop called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

Approve October 15, 2013 Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Vice-Chairperson Eschert to approve the October 15, 2013 minutes. The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes.

Overview of the Planning Process for the *University City Area Plan – Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plan (BLE Transit Station Area Plan)*

Amanda Vari (Planning Staff) provided a brief overview of the planning process for the *BLE Transit Station Area Plan*. She stated that the *BLE Transit Station Area Plan* for the first six stations was adopted earlier this year. She explained the reason for the update and reviewed the plan area boundaries. Transit station area plans were completed for four BLE stations as part of the *University City Area Plan (UCAP)*. However, since that time, some of the stations were renamed and combined.

Planning will lead this process and will work closely with Charlotte Area Transit (CATS), Charlotte Department of Transportation (CATS) and City Engineering. CATS will hold a progress update meeting in the community to provide an update on the LYNX Blue Line Extension (BLE) light rail project, share information and answer questions about construction, business, real estate and more on December 5. Planning will host the first public workshop about the transit station area plans on Dec. 10. Ms. Vari encouraged commissioners to attend the meetings.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if staff is aware of any particular interest in the area. Ms. Vari replied that Planning is working with organizations in the area such as University City Partners and UNC Charlotte.

Commissioner Fink asked what type of outreach efforts have been made in the area. Ms. Vari stated that the public outreach process includes social media and mailing notices to more than 13,000 area property owners and residents, including renters. Commissioner Fink asked if CATS riders were targeted. Judy Dellert-O'Keefe (CATS) stated that meeting information is displayed on buses in the area. Commissioner Fink also asked about lessons learned in the previous BLE planning process. Ms. Vari stated that there is a need to better engage citizens online.

M.R. #13-22: Proposal by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Storm Water Services to Acquire Property Located on Slater Road

Ms. Vari presented Mandatory Referral #13-22, a proposal by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Storm Water Services to accept the donation of a vacant parcel of land located on Slater Road and along the west bank of Kennedy Branch. Storm Water Services may consider stream improvements along the creek. Ms. Vari stated that the use of the property for flood management and stream improvements is consistent with the adopted plan. Acceptance of the proposed donation will contribute to a reduction in property damage and potential loss of life as well as improve water quality and add to the community's open space needs.

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Vice-Chairperson Eschert to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-22. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-22.

M.R. #13-24: Proposal by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation to Acquire Property Located off Walkers Ferry Road

Alberto Gonzalez (Planning) presented Mandatory Referral #13-24, a proposal by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation to purchase approximately 9 acres located off Walkers Ferry Road for the expansion of Berryhill Nature Preserve. This acquisition is consistent with the County's 2008 Parks Master Plan which encourages the expansion of existing nature preserves. Commissioner Fink asked for clarification on using a portion of the site as a buffer. Ms. Jacqueline McNeil (Mecklenburg County Asset and Facility Management) stated that the buffer area is a part of the preserve.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nelson and seconded by Commissioner Zoutewelle to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-24. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-24.

M.R. #13-25: Proposal by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation to Acquire Property Located on Old Statesville Road in Cornelius

Jonathan Wells (Planning) presented Mandatory Referral #13-25, a proposal by Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation to purchase approximately 43 acres located on Old Statesville Road (Highway 115) in the Town of Cornelius for park land and a recreation center to serve the northern Mecklenburg County towns. Commissioner Zoutewelle asked how far are the nearest transit stations. Mr. Wells answered that the distance is more than one-half mile. Commissioner Zoutewelle then asked if this use is consistent with the Cornelius policy regarding transit lines. Mr. Wells stated that it is and that the other closest transit station is in the downtown area. Commissioner Nelson asked for clarification about transit plans for Cornelius versus Charlotte. Mr. Wells explained that if there are area plans for a station area, you refer to that plan. Otherwise, you refer to the plan for the town. Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if the property is under contract. Ms. McNeil said that it is not because the Board of

County Commissioners has to approve the contract before negotiations can begin. Commissioner Zoutewelle asked if the possible rewrite of the Cornelius land use ordinance will impact this proposal. Ms. McNeil stated that the property is zoned industrial which does not allow recreation centers by right. The County went through the process to have a text amendment approved by the Town Board to allow the recreation center. The text amendment was approved and the conditions have been satisfied for a recreation center at this location.

A motion was made by Commissioner Zoutewelle and seconded by Commissioner Sullivan to approve Planning staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-25. The vote was unanimous to approve staff's recommendation for Mandatory Referral #13-25.

Area Plan Status and Meeting Report

Chairperson Lathrop, Commissioner Nelson and Commissioner Phipps toured the Prosperity-Hucks area with staff on November 4. Commissioner Nelson reported that the tour helped put previous discussions and information in perspective in terms of the area size, type of development, proposed town center and I-485 connections – overpasses and round-a-bouts. She noted that staff pointed out examples of development consistent with plans for the area and identified other areas where current developments are inconsistent with adopted plans. Chairperson Lathrop echoed Commissioner Nelson's comments and said that the tour was very interesting. He said that it was useful to be on the grounds and see the mixed character of development in the area that includes farms, a golf course community and a range of development.

Chairperson Lathrop stated that another commissioner will be appointed by Council when Commissioner Phipps leaves the Planning Commission. Once a new commissioner has been appointed to the Planning Committee, a representative will be assigned to the Prosperity-Hucks Area Plan. After consultation with Planning Commission Chairperson Tracy Finch-Dodson and Debra Campbell (Planning Director), it was decided that the *BLE Transit Station Area Plan* should have two representatives and one should be assigned at this meeting. Commissioner Zoutewelle moved to appoint Commissioner Nelson and Commissioner Sullivan seconded. The vote was unanimous to have Commissioner Nelson as one of the representatives assigned to the *BLE Transit Station Area Plan*.

Ms. McCullough stated that a tour has been scheduled for the *BLE Transit Station Area Plan* Monday, December 2 at 10 a.m. She said that once the members of the Planning Committee confirm their interest, she will extend the invitation to the full Planning Commission.

Adjourn at 6:55 p.m.

MEETING AGENDA

DECEMBER 11, 2013

3:00 PM

Applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness

A.	1700 Heathcliff Street, Wesley Heights Local Historic District Demolition Scott Edwards, NBS, Applicant	HDC 2013-172	APPROVED
B.	1716 Wickford Place, Wilmore Local Historic District Window/Door Replacement Jason Murphy, Daedalus Properties, Applicant	HDC 2013-182	DEFERRED
C.	1917 Wilmore Drive, Wilmore Local Historic District Window/Door Replacement Jason Murphy, Daedalus Properties, Applicant	HDC 2013-183	DEFERRED
D.	315/317 East Tremont Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Demolition/New Construction Matt Majors, Axiom, Applicant	HDC 2013-191	DEFERRED
E.	618 N Graham Street, Fourth Ward Local Historic District New Construction Terry Lietz, Applicant	HDC 2013-070	DENIED
F.	800 East Worthington Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition Jessica Hindman, Applicant	HDC 2013-166	DEFERRED
G.	1936 Park Road, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition Jessica Hindman, Applicant	HDC 2013-186	APPROVED
H.	425 East Worthington Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Garage Courtenay Buchan, Applicant	HDC 2013-190	APPROVED
I.	723 East Worthington Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition/Enclose porch Chris Scorsone, Applicant	HDC 2013-189	APPROVED
J.	621 East Tremont Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition Chris Scorsone, Applicant	HDC 2013-187	APPROVED
K.	2309 Dilworth Road West, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition Nancy Mullins, Applicant	HDC 2013-184	DEFERRED
L.	2019 Dilworth Road East, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition/Garage Joe & Patricia Mynatt, Applicant	HDC 2013-181	APPROVED
M.	1711 Dilworth Road East, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition/Garage Kenny Craft, Applicant	HDC 2013-188	APPROVE GARAGE CONSERVATORY/DEFERRED
N.	323 Rensselaer Avenue, Dilworth Local Historic District Addition/Garage Adam Getchell, Applicant	HDC 2013-192	APPROVED