

**Mayor Patrick L. McCrory    Mayor Pro Tem Susan Burgess**

Michael Barnes  
Nancy Carter  
Andy Dulin  
Anthony Foxx  
Patsy Kinsey

John W. Lassiter  
Don Lochman  
James Mitchell, Jr.  
Patrick Mumford  
Warren F. Turner

## **CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP**

**Monday, May 1, 2006**

---

### **Room 267**

- 5:00 p.m.            Dinner**
- 5:15 p.m.            Economic Development: Planning Liaison Committee Status Report:  
Growth Impacts on Schools**
- 5:45 p.m.            Economic Development: Administrative Approval of Petition 2003-102**
- 6:00 p.m.            Transportation: Transportation Action Plan**
- 7:00 p.m.            Economic Development: Pedestrian Overlay (PED) and Transit Oriented  
Development (TOD) Updates**
- 7:30 p.m.            Citizens' Forum (Room 267)**
- 8:00 p.m.            Economic Development: Airport Briefing**
- 8:45 p.m.            Adjourn**

# ***COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY***

**TOPIC:** Planning Liaison Committee Status Report:  
Growth Impacts on Schools

**COUNCIL FOCUS AREA:** Economic Development

**STAFF RESOURCE:** Debra Campbell

**KEY POINTS:**

- The Planning Liaison Committee has been discussing the issue of growth impacts on schools.
- In November, City Council endorsed several Implementation Strategies suggested by the Committee, aimed at improving dynamics between the community's growth and the impacts upon school crowding.
- An update will be provided to Council, along with a presentation by the Charlotte chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), from whom the Committee requested reaction to the priority strategies endorsed by the Committee in January.

**COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:**

For information, and possibly referral to committee.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Implementation steps intended to address Growth Impacts on Schools  
Architects for Education

**Implementation steps intended to address Growth Impacts on Schools**  
**Planning Liaison Committee - January 20, 2006**

<b>Issue area:</b>	<b><u>Regulatory</u></b>
<b>Strategies:</b>	Identify standards that might be applied to larger geographies: an “overlay” or “template” consisting of a single set of development standards among Mecklenburg jurisdictions. (Strategy 2)  Evaluate ordinances and procedures (state and local) that may unnecessarily increase school development costs; identify costs of compliance; identify opportunities to standardize regulations, seek relief, or pursue creative approaches. (Strategy 3)
<b>Lead agency/agencies:</b>	CMS Capital Services and Planning Commission staff co-convene staff coalition consisting of planning staff from each of Mecklenburg’s seven municipalities
<b>Proposed timeline:</b>	For local initiatives, work should start in Winter, 2006 in order for considerations to parallel Martin Commission process (referenced below).  For state initiatives, work should commence in Fall, 2006; final strategy development will be driven by General Assembly calendar (presuming State regulatory reform is involved)....Spring 2007?
<b>Product:</b>	White paper containing list of modifications of standards, ordinances, and procedures that could reduce school development costs and/or time
<b>Strategies:</b>	Involve CMS in initiatives re. infrastructure & development approvals (begin with City’s Infrastructure GDP process) (Strategy 1)  Explore funding options for school construction (impact fees, real estate transfer fees, real property increases, and pay-as-you go options) (Strategy 4)  Consider measures to more closely link development approvals to school facility availability (Strat 5)  Examine school site reservations in connection with approvals of development proposals. (Strategy 8)
<b>Lead agency/agencies:</b>	Planning Commission staff is coordinating Infrastructure GDP project, with staff involvement from CMS and Mecklenburg towns
<b>Proposed timeline:</b>	Commenced in December, 2005. “Best practices” inventory should be available by June 30, 2006.
<b>Product:</b>	Recommendations regarding policies that might be applied to more closely link development approval process to availability of infrastructure (including schools). Product will also include comprehensive listing of “best practices” employed elsewhere, as well as potential alternative funding scenarios. (It must be stressed that the product of the Infrastructure GDP project will address a full range of public infrastructure issues, not just schools.)
<b>Issue area:</b>	<b><u>Financial</u></b>
<b>Strategies:</b>	Explore funding options for school construction (impact fees, real estate transfer fees, real property increases, and pay-as-you go options) (Strategy 4)
<b>Lead agency/agencies:</b>	CMS Capital Services staff supporting effort of the Martin Commission, charged with examining feasibility and scope of a November 2006 school bond referendum as well as exploring other funding options ( <i>note: Planning Commission staff has also been engaged in this process</i> )
<b>Proposed timeline:</b>	Martin Commission work is envisioned to be essentially complete in Summer, 2006
<b>Product:</b>	Martin Commission report
<b>Issue area:</b>	<b><u>Cost-containment</u></b>
<b>Strategies:</b>	Ensure fiscal accountability of capital investments made in schools for money we have, and money we are spending. (Strategy 6)  Explore “cost containment” of school construction expenses, including cost of unnecessary regulation and cost-containment measures (including non-fiscal) that may be available (identifying obstacles discouraging/prohibiting their use). (Strategy 7)
<b>Lead agency/agencies:</b>	CMS Capital Services staff
<b>Proposed timeline:</b>	This is to be an on-going effort inasmuch as conditions (construction costs, technologies, materials, regulations, etc.) are constantly changing. However, it should parallel the processes involving regulatory (above) and the CMS staff evaluation of the recommendations contained in the Citizens Task Force report.
<b>Product:</b>	This initiative is more process than product-oriented; however quarterly reports will be made available.



A Section of  
The American Institute of Architects  
North Carolina Chapter

## **ARCHITECTS FOR EDUCATION**

### **Charlotte City Council Workshop Presentation**

May 1, 2006

On March 24, 2006, the Planning Liaison Committee of the Planning Commission asked AIA Charlotte to comment on the Committee’s draft document “Implementation Steps Intended to Address Growth Impacts on Schools.” Mr. Lassiter and City Manager staff invited us to speak more specifically on the items relating to K-12 school construction that fall within the City’s purview.

## **I. ISSUES UNDER CITY COUNCIL INFLUENCE**

### **ISSUE 1 | Project Planning & Design Review**

- a. Delays in local permit processes have been costly.
- b. CMS has worked with LUESA (Building Standards) to create a “School Review Team,” which has positively affected a portion of the project review process.

#### **Recommendations:**

- a. Continue efforts to reduce permitting times with the following agencies:
  - Grading and Erosion Control
  - Charlotte Department of Transportation
  - Charlotte Mecklenburg Utilities (Backflow Prevention)
  - Urban Forestry
  - Charlotte Fire Department
  - Zoning
  - State Agencies (NCDOT, NCDENR)
- b. Allow for “fast tracking” of permit process.
  - Numerous review agencies could better work together to allow portions of a project to proceed while other portions are being resolved.
  - *Example:* Construction of a recent Elementary School was delayed during the prime summer months while details of the permanent driveway permit – not the one being used during construction – were resolved, adding more than \$120,000.00 in construction acceleration costs to remain on schedule.

- c. Reduce demand on City Staff by shifting responsibilities to Design Professionals.
  - *Example:* Explore and expand certification processes for professionals that would simplify governmental inspections (i.e., three governmental entities inspect trees on any CMS project (within City?): Street Trees, Zoning and Urban Forestry). The Design Team, most likely Landscape Architects, could be certified by the City/County to sign off on trees, providing a more efficient and economical service.

## **ISSUE 2 | Regulatory Restrictions**

State and local requirements sometimes restrict site development in ways that cause burdensome restrictions on school sites.

### **Recommendations:**

- a. Allow for flexibility in Bus loading/unloading requirements along streets to facilitate decreased site development cost, particularly in Urban settings.
- b. Study zoning ordinance requirements to reduce or eliminate burdensome or unnecessary requirements:
  - Buffers and fences that limit access to school sites from adjacent neighborhoods.
  - Sidewalks leading to nowhere.

## **II. ENCOURAGE PLANNING PROCESS COLLABORATION**

### **ISSUE 3 | Inconsistencies in Planning Requirements**

Planning, zoning and design requirements vary by jurisdiction resulting in a wide range of required site development and related costs.

### **Recommendations:**

The City will work with the county, the six towns and CMS to:

- a. Develop consistent site development standards on pertinent issues.
  - *Example:* Parking requirements for a typical 1200 student middle school:
 

City of Charlotte:	56 parking spaces
Town of Mint Hill:	246 parking spaces
CMS Guidelines:	188 parking spaces

- b. Develop zoning that allows schools to better engage their neighborhoods. A greater variety of buffer sizes should be developed based not only on grade level of the school but also on intensity of use of different areas of the site.
  - *Example:* City Ordinance requires the same size buffer at an elementary school playground as it does for a lighted parking lot for 24 buses. Adequately buffer items like parking and service while reducing buffers at those areas the community uses like playgrounds and athletic fields.
- c. Develop flexible planning, zoning and design requirements to allow governmental agencies to deal with specific location requirements without requirement for an expensive variance process. As Charlotte and Mecklenburg County continue to grow, schools will be built or expanded on sites that vary from denser, urban locations to open, suburban sites. One “size” will not fit all.

#### **ISSUE 4 | Site Selection Process**

Schools are often planned and built on sites that are less desirable and have been rejected for other types of development.

##### **Recommendations:**

- a. Require formal collaboration between Zoning and CMS during review of proposed school sites.
- b. CMS should define acceptable site criteria to provide guidelines for site selection during a rezoning or subdivision approval process.
- c. Include DOT in CMS project planning reviews before site selection and schematic design are finalized.
- d. Improve coordination and communication between all local regulatory agencies involved in school site review.

## **ISSUE 5 | Site Acquisition Costs**

Land acquisition costs are higher after an area has started to be developed.

### **Recommendations:**

- a. Land-banking in anticipation of future school needs will help reduce the land acquisition and construction costs. It should also assure that more buildable sites are selected.
- b. Techniques, such as Adequate Public Facility Ordinances, may be able to reduce the public financing of site acquisition and school construction.

## **ISSUE 6 | School Construction Budget & Project Scope**

School projects are required to provide public utility and amenity infrastructure costs as part of the project costs.

### **Recommendations:**

Treat schools as infrastructure. Provide relief to schools as to the degree of public utility work required, including roadway improvements, sidewalks, utilities, buffers, etc.

## **ISSUE 7 | Project Planning Process / Shared Joint-Use Facilities**

Some inefficiencies occur from separation or duplication of public institutions.

### **Recommendation:**

Continue to align school construction between different public entities, such as Parks & Recreation, Public Libraries, Health and Human Services and Law Enforcement.

## **ISSUE 8 | Project Delivery Process**

The current design process does not allow for input from all stakeholders, including neighborhood residents, parents and faculty, early in the design process. This results in revisions to the design later in the process which causes delays and affects project cost.

### **Recommendations:**

- a. Collaborate with the community, parents, and administration early in the design process to determine a scope of work that addresses the needs of all stakeholders.
- b. Design each project based on specific requirements.
- c. Allow for greater flexibility within CMS design standards.

## **III. UNIVERSAL ISSUES**

### **ISSUE 9 | Public Perception of Construction Costs**

Many public perceptions about the excessive cost of school facilities are not based upon fact. Our AIA Charlotte members believe that the school system actually does a good job of managing the project budgets and real costs.

### **Recommendations:**

- a. CMS project costs often include infrastructure costs such as roadways, water, sewer, sidewalks, etc., that benefit future developments and that may appropriately be considered the responsibility of the municipality. Other school districts often do not include these costs as part of the project; differing project scopes can lead to misconceptions when trying to compare costs.
- b. CMS and the AIA need to better quantify and explain facility costs to the public, including first costs versus long-term operating costs.
- c. CMS and the AIA should collect, and summarize in a study, a comparison of CMS facility costs with those around the state and the country.
- d. Help the public understand correlations between the quality of the educational environment and students' ability to learn and achieve success.
- e. AIA Charlotte is in the process of gathering and comparing public and private development costs across numerous building types.

## **ISSUE 10 | School Construction Funding**

Methods to fund schools are limited by North Carolina Law.

### **Recommendations:**

- a. Explore Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances, similar to one used in Cabarrus County and being discussed in Union County.
- b. Explore Public /Private Partnerships (currently being implemented in Greenville, SC).
- c. Investigate school board taxing authority or develop reliable funding process from Mecklenburg's taxing authority.

## **ISSUE 11 | Sustainable Design:**

Design schools to minimize their impact on the natural environment and improve the learning environment.

### **Recommendation:**

Incorporate sustainable design strategies such as:

- Daylighting
- Indoor Air Quality
- Recycling Materials
- Reduced Water Usage
- Thermal Comfort
- Renewable Materials

All of which will decrease long-term costs and provide better environments for students and staff.

***COUNCIL WORKSHOP  
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY***

**TOPIC:** Administrative Approval of Petition 2003-102

**COUNCIL FOCUS AREA:** Economic Development

**RESOURCES:** Debra Campbell  
DeWitt McCarley

**KEY POINTS:**

- At Council's direction, staff will review the current status/recourse specific to 2003-102.

**COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:**

This presentation is for information only.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Memorandum from the City Attorney will be included in the April 26, 2006 packet.

# ***COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY***

**TOPIC:** Transportation Action Plan

**COUNCIL FOCUS AREA:** Transportation

**COMMITTEE CHAIR:** Pat Mumford

**RESOURCES:** Norm Steinman & Dan Gallagher, CDOT

**KEY POINTS:**

**Summary of the Transportation Action Plan (TAP) Process**

- At the February 2004 annual retreat, Council directed that a long-range, comprehensive transportation plan be developed to integrate and refine existing transportation policies and to identify long-range transportation improvements necessary to make Charlotte “the premier city in country for integrating land use and transportation choices.”
- On December 12, 2005, City Council unanimously approved the Transportation Committee’s recommendation to accept the draft Transportation Action Plan (TAP) for public input and discussion. The Plan was formally released with that action.
- On February 2, 2006, at the annual retreat, the Mayor and City Council received a presentation on the TAP.
- During February and March, the TAP was presented in community workshops and through electronic venues, such as the City’s website.
- The Mayor and City Council received a subsequent presentation on the TAP, including the results of the public input process, at the April 3, 2006 workshop.
- On April 10, 2006, Council’s Transportation Committee unanimously recommended the TAP for adoption by the full Council.
- On April 24, 2006, Council deferred consideration of the TAP for 30 days and placed the TAP on the May 1 workshop for further discussion.
- At the workshop, staff will address the issues raised by REBIC at the April 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. The remainder of the allotted time will be devoted to answering remaining questions that the Mayor and Council members may have about the TAP.
- The TAP is currently scheduled to be considered on the May 22, 2006 Council meeting.

**COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:**

This presentation is for information only. Council will be asked to adopt the plan at the May 22, 2006 business meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Additional copies of the TAP, as well as copies of the TAP Technical Document that was referenced on April 24<sup>th</sup>, will be sent with the Friday, April 28, Council-Manager Memorandum.

# ***COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY***

**TOPIC:** Pedestrian Overlay (PED) and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Updates

**COUNCIL FOCUS AREA:** Economic Development

**STAFF RESOURCE:** Debra Campbell

**KEY POINTS:**

- Planning staff hired the Lawrence Group, a local consulting firm specializing in form-based zoning, to review the PED and TOD zoning districts and to recommend improvements to the districts.
- Craig Lewis of the Lawrence Group will present their findings and recommendations.
- Planning staff will respond to the consultant's recommendations and will identify additional potential changes. Staff will also outline process for reviewing and implementing changes to these districts.

**COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:**

This report is for information only. Any changes to TOD or PED zoning would be brought to the Council for approval at a future date.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

None.

# ***COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY***

**TOPIC:** Airport Briefing

**COUNCIL FOCUS AREA:** Economic Development

**RESOURCES:** Jerry Orr, Aviation Director

**KEY POINTS:**

- The Council Budget Committee requested presentations on the City's enterprise funds. Presentations on three of the funds, CATS, Utilities, and Stormwater, were provided during recent Budget Retreats. At the Workshop, Jerry Orr will provide information about the Aviation enterprise fund.
- The Aviation presentation will include:
  - Highlights of business goals and Balanced Scorecard
  - Financial structure of Airport as an enterprise fund
  - Airport revenue sources
  - Airport operating costs
  - Highlights of CIP
  - The presentation will also include the Airport Annual Report to the Community

**COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:**

This item is presented as information only.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

None.