

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, October 11, 2021, at 5:08 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

ABSENT: Councilmember Malcolm Graham.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles welcomed everyone to the October 11, 2021, Business Meeting and said this meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with all of the laws that we have to follow, especially around an electronic meeting. The requirements also include notice and access, and minutes are being met electronically as well. You can view this on our Government Channel, the City's Facebook Page, or the City's YouTube Page.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Winston gave the Invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag led also by Mayor Vi Lyles.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

ITEM NO. 7: CHARLOTTE WOMEN'S SMALL BUSINESS MONTH PROCLAMATION

Mayor Lyles read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, women-owned small businesses are an economic engine and own 40% of all U.S. businesses, employing 8% of the private sector workforce; and

WHEREAS, the Charlotte metro area ranks #1 for women-owned firms for growth in number and economic clout; and

WHEREAS, approximately 92,500 women-owned small businesses in the Charlotte metro area are generating \$13.3 billion in sales and employing 70,000 people; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte values local women-owned small businesses and celebrates the diversity of ownership and goods and services they provide as well as the contributions they make to our community; and

WHEREAS, October has been designated as National Women's Small Business Month to celebrate the achievements of women business owners and is also designated as Charlotte Women's Small Business Month to celebrate the achievements of women business owners in the Charlotte region:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim October 2021 as

“CHARLOTTE WOMEN’S SMALL BUSINESS MONTH”

in Charlotte and commend its observance to all citizens and urge all citizens, businesses, and community organizations in Charlotte to join this salute to women business owners by encouraging and promoting the celebration of the achievements of all women business owners as they contribute daily to our economic, civic, and cultural goals and livelihood.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 8: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DAY PROCLAMATION

Councilmember Egleston read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, throughout the centuries, American Indians have shared their knowledge of land and resources while continuing to play a role in the development of the City of Charlotte, the state of North Carolina, and the nation; and

WHEREAS, North Carolina is home to more than 122,000 American Indians and has eight historic tribes legally recognized by the state of North Carolina: Coharie, Eastern Band of Cherokee, Haliwa-Saponi, Lumbee, Meherrin, Occaneechi Band of Saponi, Sappony, and Waccamaw-Siouan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte enjoys a positive relationship with American Indian citizens, recognizes and encourages the acknowledgement of historic contributions and sacrifices of Indigenous People, and respects the cultural and economic contributions that American Indians have made; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte promotes the closing of the equity gap for Indigenous Peoples through policies and practices that reflect the experiences of Indigenous Peoples, ensure greater access and opportunity, and honor the nation's indigenous roots, history and contributions; and

WHEREAS, Indigenous Peoples' Day was proposed in 1977 by a delegation of Native Nations to the United Nations sponsored International Conference on Discrimination Against Indigenous Populations in the Americas:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim October 11, 2021 as

“INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DAY”

in Charlotte and commend its observance to all citizens.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: NATIONAL ARTS AND HUMANITIES MONTH PROCLAMATION

Councilmember Eiselt read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, the coronavirus has had a devastating impact on America's arts sector, with 99% of cultural organizations having canceled events and artists being among the most severely affected segment of the nation's workforce; yet notwithstanding this fact, the arts have helped collectively lead us throughout the darkest times of the pandemic - lifting our spirits, unifying communities, and jump-starting the economy; and

WHEREAS, the month of October has annually been recognized as National Arts and Humanities Month by thousands of arts and culture organizations, including the Arts & Science Council, the local arts agency of the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, and by communities and states across the country; and

WHEREAS, the arts and humanities embody much of the accumulated wisdom, intellect, and imagination of humankind and play a unique role in the lives of our families and our community; and

WHEREAS, the arts and humanities help community members explore their diverse history and culture with the support and creativity of large, midsize and small cultural organizations, creative individuals, educational institutions, and local businesses; and

WHEREAS, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg nonprofit arts industry strengthens our economy by generating \$243 million in total economic activity annually, \$21.6 million in state and local government revenue, and by supporting the full-time equivalent of 7,600 jobs:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim October as

“NATIONAL ARTS AND HUMANITIES MONTH”

In Charlotte, North Carolina and call upon our community members to celebrate arts and culture and to join in this special observance.

Mayor Lyles said I think that is very appropriate on the night we are beginning to choose our Arts and Cultural Advisory Group. We want to celebrate those groups and celebrate those recognitions.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said if you will take a minute and please let me know if you have any additional questions. I believe Mr. Winston and Mr. Phipps; did you have a chance to review the information to see if it's adequate?

Councilmember Phipps said well I think they've been addressed, but I still am curious as to know the multiuse paths. I'm trying to figure out, okay why do we favor one side of the street over the other from if we are trying to have safe streets for pedestrians. I thought it was an objective to have sidewalks on both sides of the street, but I see here we have these paths that are just going to be on one side of the street. So, I was just curious about that.

Ms. Harris said Mr. Phipps I believe it's cost prohibited, but we'll give you more information and a follow-up about how they're chosen.

Mr. Phipps said I realize that wasn't a consent item, but I had a question about it anyway. Otherwise, the other ones are I reviewed the responses.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Winston did you have a chance to see the responses to your questions. Some of them are Business Agenda items, but I believe items 34, 29, and 26?

Unknow said he says he's good.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda items 26 through 53 may be considered in one motion except for those items removed by a Council member. Items are removed by notifying the City Clerk.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 26: 2021 Urban Area Security Initiative Grant Acceptance

Authorize the Charlotte Area Homeland Security Director (Charlotte Fire Chief) to accept a grant for \$3,040,000 from the United States Department of Homeland Security for the 2021 Urban Area Security Initiative Grant Program.

Item No. 27: Fire Testing and Promotional Services

(A) Approve a contract with Industrial/Organizational Solutions, Inc. for testing and promotional services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager

to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 28: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center HVAC Replacement Design Services

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,733,085 with CMTA, Inc. for engineering design services, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 29: Heavy Duty Truck Cab-Chassis and Powertrain Component Repair Services

(A) Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for heavy-duty truck cab-chassis and powertrain component repair services for an initial term of three years: Carolina Auto Truck & Coach Services Inc., Carolina Tractor & Equipment, Clarke Power Services Inc., and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 30: Construct Storm Water Repair and Improvements

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,697,073 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development, LLC for the Storm Water Repair, and Improvement FY2022-A project,

Summary of Bids

Onsite Development, LLC.	\$3,697,073.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$3,890,689.37
Blythe Development Company	\$4,596,073.50

(B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,697,073 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development, LLC for the Storm Water Repair, and Improvement FY 2022-B project,

Summary of Bids

Onsite Development, LLC.	\$3,697,073.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$4,254,112.66
Blythe Development Company	\$4,596,073.50

(C) Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,903,251 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development, LLC for the Storm Water Repair, and Improvement FY 2022-C project, and

Summary of Bids

Onsite Development, LLC.	\$3,903,251.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$4,194,582.91
Blythe Development Company	\$4,509,197.25

(D) Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,856,448.09 to the lowest responsive bidder United of Carolinas, Inc. for the Storm Water Repair, and Improvement FY 2022-D project.

Summary of Bids

United of Carolinas, Inc	\$3,856,448.09
Onsite Development, LLC.	\$3,903,251.00
United Construction Company, Inc.	\$4,019,069.37
Blythe Development Company	\$4,453,647.25

Item No. 31: McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Nutrient Harvesting Design

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,098,500 with MEB General Contractors, Inc. for Design-Build design services for the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Nutrient Harvesting project.

Item No. 32: Mount Holly Pump Station and Force Main Construction

Approve a guaranteed maximum price of \$41,010,129 to The Haskell Company for Design-Build construction services for the Mount Holly Pump Station and Force Main project.

Item No. 33: Federal Aviation Administration Office Lease

Approve a two-year lease extension with the Federal Aviation Administration for office space at the Charlotte Douglas International Airport.

Item No. 34: 6900 Wilkinson Boulevard Property Lease

Adopt a resolution approving the lease of City-owned property located at 6900 Wilkinson Boulevard to CH-M HUB CLT, L.L.C. dba Crow Holdings Industrial.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 245.

Item No. 35: Set a Public Hearing on the Parkside Crossing Area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for November 8, 2021, for the Parkside Crossing Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 246-249.

Item No. 36: Resolution of Intent to Abandon a Portion of Kinghurst Drive

(A) Adopt a resolution of intent to abandon a portion of Kinghurst Drive, and (B) Set a public hearing for November 8, 2021.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 250.

Item No. 37 Resolution of Intent to Abandon Newell Farm Road

(A) Adopt a resolution of intent to abandon Newell Farm Road, and (B) Set a public hearing for November 8, 2021.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 251.

Item No. 38: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$40,426.99.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 252-253.

Item No. 39: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of August 09, 2021, Business Meeting, and August 23, 2021, Business Meeting.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 40: In Rem Remedy 9431 Dorcas Lane

Adopt Ordinance No. 158-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 9431 Dorcas Lane (Neighborhood Profile Area 84).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 64, at Page(s) 411.

Item No. 41: Property Transactions - Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #19

Acquisition of 11,801 square feet (0.27 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 8,610 square feet (0.202 acres) Utility Easement, 1,062 square feet (0.024 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 17,124 square feet (0.382 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3917 Sandy Porter Road from Dorothy Carol Gallant for \$457,500 for Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #19.

Item No. 42: Property Transactions - Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #21

Acquisition of 2,708 square feet (0.06 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 51 square feet (0.001 acres) Utility Easement, 20,844 square feet (0.479 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3950 West Arrowood Road from Olympic Corporate Center II LLC for \$92,000 for Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #21.

Item No. 43: Property Transactions - Clayton Drive 1511, Parcel #1

Acquisition of 3,983 square feet (0.091 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 5,129 square feet (0.118 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1305-1311 Corton Drive from Salem Village Apartments LLC for \$36,870 for Clayton Drive 1511, Parcel #1.

Item No. 44: Property Transactions - Corton Drive 1310, Parcel #1

Acquisition of 1,917 square feet (0.044 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 2,418 square feet (0.056 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1317 Corton Drive from Salem Village Apartments LLC for \$17,540 for Corton Drive 1310, Parcel #1.

Item 45: Property Transactions - Corton Drive 1310, Parcel #3

Acquisition of 1,517 square feet (0.035 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 889 square feet (0.02 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2507 Kenilworth Avenue from BHM Properties LLC for \$23,850 for Corton Drive 1310, Parcel #3.

Item 46: Property Transactions - DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #2

Acquisition of 129 square feet (0.003 acres) Utility Easement, 68 square feet (0.002 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 1,324 square feet (0.03 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 8625 Galena View Drive from Lindsay P. Hofferberth for \$14,875 for DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #2.

Item No. 47: Property Transactions - DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #9

Acquisition of 632 square feet (0.015 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 1,458 square feet (0.033 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 12013 Alabaster Court from Cassandra Rose Walker for \$14,200 for DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #9.

Item No. 48: Property Transactions – DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #18

Acquisition of 1,333 square feet (0.03 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 1,263 square feet (0.029 acres) Utility Easement, 326 square feet (0.007 acres) Slope Easement, 1,065 square feet (0.024 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement at 12311 Brianwood Court from George D. Kennedy and Florence K. Dennis for \$34,550 for DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #18.

Item No. 49: Property Transactions - DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #22

Acquisition of 1,406 square feet (0.03 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 2,070 square feet (0.048 acres) Utility Easement, 2,732 square feet (0.063 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 753 square feet (0.017 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 12452 DeArmon Road from Diann Mock for \$53,125 for DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #22.

Item No. 50: Property Transactions - DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #25

Acquisition of 2,416 square feet (0.06 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 3,878 square feet (0.089 acres) Utility Easement, 4,571 square feet (0.105 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 988 square feet (0.023 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 9217 Benfield Road from Gloria H. Phillips for \$83,600 for DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #25.

Item No. 51: Property Transactions - DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #32, 33 and 34

Acquisition of 20,179 square feet (0.46 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 1,622 square feet (0.04 acres) Storm Drain Easement, 5,753 square feet (0.13 acres) Utility Easement, 7,446 square feet (0.17 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 8,002 square feet (0.18 acres) Temporary Construction Easement, 2,282 square feet (0.05 acres) Slope Easement at 12015, 12029, 12121 DeArmon Road from Dorothy G. Hucks and Charles Calvin Hucks for \$24,600 for DeArmon Road Improvements, Parcel #32, 33 and 34.

Item No. 52: Property Transactions - Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #13

Acquisition of 969 square feet (0.02 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 1,788 square feet (0.041 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 402 East 19th Street from Terry Ann Stokes for \$35,000 for Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #13.

Item No. 53: Property Transactions - Shade Valley Road Realignment and Roundabout, Parcel #17 and 19 (Revised)

Resolution of Condemnation of 95 square feet (0.002 acres) Fee Simple, Plus 3,569 square feet (0.08 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 8,834 square feet (0.20 acres) Temporary Construction Easement, 1,017 square feet (0.02 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, and 7,417 square feet (0.17 acres) Post Construction Controls Easement at 2200-2218 and 2301 Shade Valley Road from Lake Hills Apartments LP for \$134,575 for Shade Valley Road Realignment and Roundabout, Parcel #17 and 19.

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I know over the course of the past couple of months we've been given you updates as it relates to the Charlotte Future 2040 Policy Map and Unified Development Ordinance or the UDO as we know. So, tonight we want to provide you with where we are as it relates to those two items. I believe that Councilmember Eiselt may do lead in with this. If not, I will turn it over to Taiwo and his team.

Mayor Lyles said let's recognize Councilmember Eiselt who is chairing the TAP (Transportation Action Plan) Committee that has been doing a deep dive and developing the interest that we are having in this area.

Councilmember Eiselt said yes, we have. The TAP Committee met on August 23rd, September 22nd, and September 27th to discuss the items that we are going to be talking about this evening that Taiwo will go into. Both of these items were on the TAP agenda for August 23rd, and we had an in-depth presentation of the UDO by Planning, C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation), and Stormwater on September 22nd. The Fiscal Impact Analysis of the 2040 Policy Map was discussed on September 27th and as always, we always encourage other colleagues to come and attend those meetings or listen in on them so that they could get the really in-depth detail that we come before Council. Then it also was presented to the full Council in September as well. So, we've had a few opportunities to get this information. I'll turn it over to Alyssa.

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director said actually Councilmember Eiselt thank you so much. I'll go first. Good evening Mayor and Councilmembers. I appreciate the opportunity to come before you again tonight. The last time we were before you for the Comprehensive Plan was back in June of this year. So, I want to thank you very much for working with us. As you know the Policy Map has been in the works since July 2021 right after the adoption of the Plan Policy the previous month of June. This 2040 Policy Map which Alyssa will share with you tonight is the first step to implementing the adopted Plan Policy. This 2040 Policy Map is going to replace what we have known before now as our Future Land Use Map. It's going to translate the place-based policies that we have in the Adopted Plan into a map. Which will then be used in decision-making processes and will inform future zoning mobility and capital investment decisions.

So, tonight you are going to hear again from our Project Manager, Ms. Alysia Osborne about the faces of community engagement that started back in July and that will continue throughout this process. We just concluded one and we are about to get into another phase of engagement. You're also going to hear from our consultant Matt Prosser of Economic and Planning Systems, who is going to share with you the preliminary findings from the Fiscal Impact Analysis that we've conducted to determine the likeliness of plex

units or duplexes and triplexes in our City subject to goal #2 in the Adopted Comprehensive Plan. So, after the presentation, before we move to the Unified Development Ordinance, we will be here to answer your questions. Thank you very much.

Alysia Osborne, Comprehensive Plan Project said thank you Taiwo for setting up the conversation tonight to really just bring about three key pieces to the Policy Map process. We will do a quick overview of the Policy Map process itself. This might be a refresher as Councilmember Eiselt mentioned we have been having these conversations for quite some time, but we wanted to make sure those who were following us online today for the first time would get that information firsthand. We also included a brief summary in your packets, and we hope you had a chance to just look at those and refresh your memories on the process. In the second piece of information, we'll talk about how we've engaged the community so far and share a little bit about how we plan to engage them in the future. Then again, my colleague Matt Prosser who's our consultant will share the fiscal part. I also wanted to share that I have other members of the Project Management Team in the room, Kathy Cornett and also Catherine Mahoney. She's on the line as well to answer any technical questions we might have.

The first step in the Policy Map process is implementing the actual plan. The Policy Map is implementing the plan. It's also a companion document to the Comprehensive Plan itself. We've always thought about this process as being a part of the Comprehensive Plan and it began that way. Those who have been on Council for a while remember that, but we wanted to take it out of the Comprehensive Plan so we can make sure that we engage the community and our elected appoint official in a more intentional way about the mapping process itself. So, one wouldn't get lost in the larger document that you guys recently adopted in June.

So, it's a translation of the Comprehensive Plans Placed-based Policy. So, what is a placed-based policy? Here are two really good examples of that. So, for goal #2 there is a goal about increasing the possibility of middle-density housing around transit station lines and major thoroughfares. How that would translate to a Policy Map example is, it could occur in neighborhood two, Community Activity Center or Regional Activity Center. That's an example of how the policy would translate from the Comprehensive Plan to the Policy Map exercise. The other example is supporting the growth of jobs in our community. That may be in the mapping process of caring around the Campus Designation, Light Industrial Mixed-use, Community Activity Center, and Regional Activity Center. So, the policy says support or create more job opportunities and the placed-based solution to that in the Policy Map would be to translate those into these place types and describe those in the next slide, please.

So, why is this map important. Again, it provides more transparency and predictability and how we think about growth in our community. It translates and provides designations and informs the zoning designations within our UDO, our Unified Development Ordinance, which my colleagues will talk about a little bit later. It also helps us think more about mobility decisions where if we are providing a land-use, how do they connect and how do we plan to connect our residence to those uses and places of employment and other opportunities. I also think about capital investment decisions as we grow, as we are providing these opportunities how might we invest more intentionally in those areas to make sure we're maximizing and leveraging capital investment decisions throughout the community. It also links to other projects like our Silver Line Station Area Plan. We've partnered with them throughout this process and plan to continue to do so in the future.

So, here is a process. I just want to pivot a little bit to the process part of the presentation. Place Types is a tool and there's three steps to that and I just wanted to really highlight where the financial component fits into that two-step process and Matt will dive into that a little bit later. So, Place Types are a new land use classification just as a reminder. They are not zoning districts. I think sometimes the two are confused rightfully so. It's a new tool that we are using, and it provides us with a better comprehensive and holistic way of organizing patterns of development in our community. So, our current land-use classification strictly talks about land-uses on a parcel-by-parcel basis. How you might use residential, retail, schools, or institutions, but never really speaks about how those

uses work together and how they connect together and how that formal development can respect each other moving forward and as you grow. What Place Types does is think more holistically about it and really speaks to the land-uses for portions of those land-uses building form and character and how you move about those uses and provide open space in a more holistic manner as opposed to parcel specific basis. So, it really thinks about complete communities as adopted within the Comprehensive Plan and the community also provided extensive feedback into the place type pallet that we are using in this Policy Map process.

So, here is the three-step process. We just wrapped up the first phase that maps the existing development. The community was able to participate and pop-up events, workshops, individual community meetings via a survey about their preferences around land-use patterns. So, if you work in a place, how might we create a relationship that is more desirable and then learn a lot about what is least desirable in terms of land-use patterns. This is all to inform the methodology. Remember we are providing land-use guidance for almost 300,000 parcels. So, we're really leaning on our methodology and asking the community to help us make it better and perfect it as we meet the plan goals.

The second step is mapping our adoptive policies, looking at our area plans, strategic policies, and entitlements, and translating that into a map. That kicks off our phase two of the engagement process. In phase three we will map the Charlotte Future 2040 Policies within the plan. Then share that with the community and give feedback on that as well.

So, here there are mapping inputs. I kind of lauded it a little bit on the last slide but I really wanted to just share the existing map, what were the considerations for each phase of the map. Notice how we build from what's on the ground today looking at how we look at the future now and then really taking the area plan, the policies within the Comprehensive Plan to achieve that equitable vision for growth and development moving forward. The checks as a priority process is making sure we work with folks like Matt Prosser to understand in our regional growth policies and growth model to better understand growth projections, what our capacity is in terms of infrastructure, understanding the impacts of the environment, and then what is the market realistically saying about this growth moving forward.

So, we get this question all of the time. How does the Place Type relate to the zoning districts and this slide shares an example of what that looks like? So, if you're in neighborhood two designations there are three zoning districts that will implement that particular Place Type. So, the policy mapping process will not designate parcel-specific zoning districts. It will inform that process and the zoning districts will be mapped after the UDO is adopted. Our team will likely share some of those specifics in the presentation to follow.

So, how will the work be completed? I think the biggest question we get is, is this it? Will we make amendments? Will we have area plans? Where does all of that fit? What our response is, is that in the policy mapping process it's a citywide effort and we're taking citywide input. We will continue to do community area planning or area plans in the future to have that more granular look at specific neighborhoods or a collection of neighborhoods in the community that have similar interests or concerns so we can respond in a more systematic approach to resolving those issues. Also, it helps us to keep a post on the community as we plan moving forward. Then it provides a planning opportunity in between updates to the Comprehensive Plan.

So, here is a summary of our phase one engagement. I mentioned before we had workshops and presentations and pop up, but I wanted to share. Also thank you all for sharing on your platforms. Council thank you for sharing on your platforms the survey link and invitations to specific presentations. Just really helping us to get the word out. We've had a tremendous response to our survey responses. Over 4,200. Half of those were because of the citywide mailing to the postcard that we sent out to the residence. Folks really responded once that card went out. So, that was a good addition to our toolbox, and we've had over 1,900 interactions via social media, email outreach, and our events.

So, phase two kicks off this week. We will be sharing the first draft of the Policy Map and getting feedback from our residence. So, we're having a bit of a hybrid approach to engagement. Live events with an evening and a noon slot to make a sure residence can participate when it is convenient for them, having a recorded copy of those meetings online. Then having five in-person regional office hours sessions where the staff will be available to answer in real-time, questions for any residences. While also including makeup days on the weekends for those who are working and want to participate in the process, but we are providing that opportunity on the weekends to make sure we hear from everyone. We'll be using the 15 planning areas to make sure that we have outreach across the community.

So, what happens after the map is adopted in February of 2022? Three months after adoption we hope the map will become effective that's our goal. The future land-use tool that we have today will be replaced by the Policy Map and then we will begin our Community Area Planning Process to have those more granular conversations about how do we update and provide more guidance in between the Comprehensive Plan updates in 10 years. Before I turn it over to Matt, we will be happy to take any questions you may have.

Ms. Eiselt said thank you Alysia, in that first phase, how did you handle residence that have said they identified parcels that were identified wrong?

Ms. Osborne said the first thing we did was look at the methodology to make sure if there were any opportunities to correct the thresholds, the designations on a more holistic approach. For example, a conversation and comments were received from the Dilworth community about the designation for East Boulevard. It shows it as commercial. So, what we did is, we took that feedback, went back to look at the methodology to see why. Was it the entitlements? Was it the OPED overlay that wasn't designated? Was it because of the zoning category? Most of it is O-2 and then that's vastly different than what's actually there. It's mostly retail, kind of a neighborhood center. So, we made those corrections to the methodology to produce the draft map that will come out this week.

Ms. Eiselt said so if I can just make sure I understand it. So, the methodology was adjusted and that allowed for a change in the actual Place Type on the map that will come out different from what they originally saw.

Ms. Osborne said yes because that condition likely occurs in more than just that street.

Ms. Eiselt said yes, I was going to say there was another street.

Ms. Osborne said possibly 7th Street. Possibly other areas with PED overlays where there has been some design designation for a particular area. So, we went back and tweaked the methodology and told the community we would.

Ms. Eiselt said did that impact, I know there was one that they were concerned about? One parcel that has a single-family home on it. The street is single-family. It's zoned multi-family 22, but it was mapped as commercial. Did that change as well?

Ms. Osborne said yes that one too. Also, the one that they mentioned around neighborhood 2. It's a collection of duplexes I think, and we mapped it as neighborhood 2. So, we looked at the thresholds, made those adjustments. So, it should occur on the map. Again, the methodologies for 300,000 parcels. We might not get it all right. That the point that we want to make is that it's not perfect. That's why this engagement is so important. It's important for us to communicate how those changes will be made moving forward as well.

Ms. Eiselt said okay and that was my second question that once it comes out then what's the process for doing that on a parcel by parcel or on a section basis?

Ms. Osborne said so, again the community can provide their feedback, and then we'll meet with them or address their concerns directly.

Ms. Eiselt said okay thank you.

Mayor Lyles said I'd like to follow up on Councilmember Eiselt's question because and this may be just how do we do something to help people as we're going forward. Not exactly for now, but when we did the rezoning a long time ago all of Scott Avenue, while it was single-family bungalows, cottages, all of it was MF-22. That was because of not having the tools and opportunities that we have today for automation. Whatever wasn't done in specific was just name, multi-family-22. It dropped all kinds of places. So, one of the questions I have is, I'd like to get some legal research on whether or not as people buy houses, you know you come in you see the nice granite counters and all of these other things and you never think about the zoning and I'm not sure if zoning is included in any of our real-estate documents that you have to have. There are a lot of covenants in there they put it, that still even remain today that are offensive. But I wonder how do we get people to understand that if you bought that bungalow on Scott Avenue, you are buying a multi-family property even today. So, how do we get it so as we advance this that people have the opportunity or at least ought to be able to visualize or see what the zoning is so that they can look it up when they purchase a property. Especially as we began to change our own zoning. So, I don't know the answer, but I do think that there is a problem when people are buying the house and do not know what the land is zoned as. So, if we could get something about that Patrick and if there is a way to do it in a positive way, I think that would serve us well in the long term.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said certainly we will do that, yes.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said I was going to say maybe it an opportunity to work with our developers. Especially our realtors in the community. Somebody that [inaudible] information that they can provide in their listing. They can help us to distribute that information because you are right that is a great point. People don't realize what their buying. So, I think this would be an opportunity again for some of our realtors to [inaudible] and start to provide that information about the zoning of the property that individuals [inaudible]. I think it's a great idea Mayor. That's the place where REBIC help us out in our [inaudible] brokers.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Baker is going to do some research for us. I'm not sure if it's a state law. Real estate is often governed by state regulations versus what's local. So, let's get the research and figure out where our ground level is, where we are now current state, and see what we might be able to work out and advocate or choose to try to accomplish.

Matt Prosser, Economic, and Planning Systems said good to be with you all tonight. As you heard from Alysia, we, EUPS are doing a number of economic analyses to support the policy mapping process, but also the UDO process. We wanted to share with you the preliminary findings from one of those analyses tonight. We had previously presented this analysis to the Planning Transportation Environment Council Committee a few weeks back, wanted to bring it to all of you tonight. So, as a reminder, the Comprehensive Plan has many goals to address many of the issues within the community. Three of the ones that are impacted by this analysis include goal two, which is focused on neighborhood diversity and inclusion, and goal three that focuses on housing and access for all. So, I think it's important to reiterate within the Comprehensive Plan, there are two specific goals related to housing, and that was done intentionally to highlight the importance of the issue in the community, but also realize that there are multiple ways to address the concerns around housing.

Whereas goal two talks about neighborhood diversity and the need to increase the number of housing units in the community, but also the diversity of the housing units as a way to increase access to housing for all residents. Goal three more speaks specifically to affordability and how do we ensure that we're preserving naturally occurring, affordable housing, but also creating the opportunity to build and provide more affordable housing to the community as the community grows? Doing so in a way that's fiscally responsible and meets with goal ten. So, one of the bigger moves in the plan was the adoption of

policy 2.1 under goal two, which was the directions to provide the opportunity for duplex and triplex units on all single-family lots throughout the community. So, you all had asked us to evaluate what potential impacts that policy would be on the community as we move into this policy mapping phase as well as the implementation of the plan. So, we developed an approach to evaluating. We first looked at national and international case studies of cities that have inaccurate similar up zonings of neighborhoods to identify potential changes that they've experienced. Then also did an evaluation of existing conditions within Charlotte. So, first talking through our methodology and our approach to evaluating conditions in Charlotte, what we did is we evaluated all the single-family lots within the neighborhood one Place Types and looked at two things, first its physical capacity to allow for an additional unit or units on a lot. Then the second thing was the market support for the market, I should say, the feasibility of allowing for another unit on a lot.

So, we developed a methodology to score all parts of the state on both its physical capacity, but ultimately its marketing support or feasibility. To gauge where we think it's more or less likely that an existing single-family home could be bought, torn down, and built into two or three units. So, first, we looked at physical capacity and developed a number of tests based on the proposed zoning categories that would be within the N-1 Place Types. What we found was there are two things that may be impactful. First was the width of the lot frontage. Is the lot wide enough to allow for two units, a building with two units, but also allowing for parking and access to the lot for the vehicle? Then we also looked at lot coverage and is the parcel large enough to allow for two or three units based on the lot coverage and setback requirements within the zoning that is being proposed. What we found is the physical capacity to allow for additional units wasn't a barrier to this type of conversion in most cases. Ninety-six percent of the lots that we analyzed do not have a potential constraint, at least in our mind, to allow for this conversion, and this really speaks to the design of the zoning districts and the intent of trying to allow this to occur. So, we are not creating regulatory barriers to this change.

But the major impact on potential change of parcels is really a market barrier. We also looked at the ability for a lot to allow three units and we found that a greater percentage of lots would likely have some sort of fiscal constraints that may prevent three units from being built. So, 22% of lots have that potential constraint. But looking at the next slide, we next dove into the market support assumptions or inputs that we developed to try to identify lots that are more or less likely to convert from one unit to multiple units, from a market feasibility standpoint. So, we developed a prototype of a potential duplex, it's an average unit size of 1,500 square feet. That's slightly smaller than what we're seeing citywide for new units, which are about 1,900. We have an estimated construction cost for a new duplex unit being \$200 per square foot. We have an assumption that land cost is typically at least 15%, the total cost of a duplex. Then we also had to account for the cost of capital for investors, but also profit within sort of the capital stack for a duplex. That's illustrated here in the chart on the right. Using this simple proforma, we identified a couple of number of thresholds to identify what we think the potential likeliness on different lots would be based on both this purchase cost, the land of being at least 15% or less of the total project cost. Then the estimate that a new duplex at a minimum could generate \$900,000 in total revenue. That's \$450,000 per unit. Those being the parameters we use to map within the community.

So, we have four scores, or each parcel has scored on four different measurements. First was looking at if there are existing home sales or existing attached home sales within a neighborhood that are at or above that \$450,000 threshold that we identified. The next was looking at the value of existing parcels and whether or not they are 15% or less than what we think the highest achievable price for a duplex would be in each different neighborhood. We use a variety of inputs from home sale data throughout the community to derive at those numbers. What we found on the map on the right illustrates our findings that parcels identified in the darker purple and pink are the ones that are more likely to potentially change from one unit to two or three. We found that 6% of the single-family lots we looked at had that score before for the highest likely, 18% were considered either moderately or highly likely. That's a score of three or four out of a possible (Inaudible).

Then we also looked at areas that might be vulnerable to displacement. So, as you remember the Comprehensive Plan and the Equitable Growth Framework, we identified places within the community where residents were potentially vulnerable to displacement-based on changing and market conditions. What we did is we overlaid these lots with that vulnerable displacement area, which is shown in gray on this map, and found that about 7% of the single-family lots that were either moderate or highly likely to redevelop into two units were within this carnival to displacement area, at least based on current market conditions. Now we do know this could change in the future as conditions in these neighborhoods change and impact the likeliness. So, with some feedback from you all and others, we've added some additional data related to the percent of lots that are either city-wide or within that carnival to displacement area to give an illustration of how many scored by which number.

So, the top part of this table shows that the breakdown of how many lots scored either at 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. Again, zero being least likely four being most likely. As you can see 62% of a lot scored at one. So, a majority of lots have a lower likeliness city-wide for conversion. If we look at the vulnerable displacement area, that's the second half or the bottom half of this table, we find that an even higher percentage of those lots scored with a lower score of one or zero in terms of their likeliness to redevelopment. I think that's largely a reflection of the achievable prices currently in those neighborhoods, but also that comparison of land value to achievable home price in those areas too. One of the comments we've heard from some of the Councilmembers was the desire to look at multiple prototypes for different duplexes to see if there'd be any variation in the likeliness. There was this suggestion looking at sort of the most cost-effective or most cost-efficient duplex unit. Then also looking at what the cost and prices would be for more of a luxury unit would be. So, what we're going to do going forward is kind of revise this analysis to factor in low, medium, and high sort of prototype duplex and see what changes that might occur to the map based on that analysis. So, that will be forthcoming, and we'll bring that back to you all in the future.

So, these two maps overlay a couple of different considerations that were brought up in our presentation to the Council Committee. First, the map on the left shows the market's score of zero to four of lots that we believe do not have an HOA (Homeowner Association), or CTNR intact in them. But once they do have that, or at least are estimated to have that are shown in gray. So, this shows a better representation of ones that wouldn't have a covenant or an HOA restriction on that subversion. The map on the right overlays single-family home demolition permits in the community over with its likeliness score. What we found is there's a really high correlation between the areas that we identified to be the most likely to redevelop and where these permits are being pulled currently. It was a good indication to us that now it's really at least in line with where the market conditions are currently. The next slide is a summary of all of our findings.

So, I did mention that we did some analysis on national international case studies. We looked at five communities within the US (United States) and one internationally. What we did is we tried to find studies where the communities had one, did enough zoning on a significant portion of their community, and then tracked what the changes were over time. There are a ton of examples of that. But what we found is most often this tool or using up zoning is a tool that's successful in producing more housing supply. So, the purpose of policy 2.1 being trying to increase housing supply and diversity within our community. Using this approach of allowing more units on a lot will likely lead to an increase in housing supply. That has been found in the studies that we looked at.

Now, when we looked at sort of the findings related to affordability, we found two things. First, lower value lots, lots that have a lower-than-average value may see an increase in their value to match with the increased developed potential with those. So, some of our really lower value lots, and maybe some of these vulnerable, or even non-vulnerable to displacement areas could see an increase in their lot value as a result of this change. It's something that speaks to the need to be proactive in identifying tools to mitigate potential displacement issues.

The other thing we found was in these communities that the average cost of housing in neighborhoods that were up zoned versus ones that were down zones, the change in those home prices over time weren't measurably different. So, areas that were up-zoned didn't see an increase in their home prices or a decrease relative to areas that weren't up-zoned. So, what's this telling us is that its policy approach is really meant to try to increase the housing supply. At least based on these studies, doesn't necessarily create greater affordability problems within the community? So, with that, that is the summary of our presentation. I'd love to take any questions or comments that you have at this time.

Mayor Lyles said this really good information, very helpful for us.

Councilmember Bokhari said this is just a comment and I've already gone through this in-depth and really grilled the consultant here on this. But I just want you all to be aware of a couple of things. One, this is exactly the kind of exercise we should be doing. One of which I've been wanting us to do for a while. So, I want to definitely kind of put an asterisk next to a couple of comments that I'm going to make that is really about this is the right thing for us to be doing. I am grateful that we are taking this approach. I also though think, and I did warn them in our private meeting that I think it's a bit dangerous to come out with some of these statements and assumptions that are just riddled with issues to come to some conclusions, whether we've prefaced it with, we have work to do, and this is a starting point or not. The community is going to look at this and think certain things.

I'll tell you that map if you could go back to that map, the heat map that showed the wedge as having (the one before that the individual one), the wedge as having all of the market support and where you are going to see essentially duplexes and things of that nature pop up in East and West and North Charlotte is not where it is. I got to tell you, that is based on a very flawed underlying assumption that we had seen just before this. To make it really simple, we can make these proformas make any kind of results show in the end that we want. In this case, an assumption was made that \$200 per square foot is the standard citywide construction cost of all the units, basing it on then the percentage, then weeds the properties out if the property value cost percentages in a certain amount and shows how much they're going to ultimately cost. So, yes, if you think about a neighborhood where you could buy a \$300,000 house and lot and demo it to build a duplex in East or West Charlotte, and then you assume in some of these neighborhoods that have those price points that a 2,000 square foot duplex is going to cost \$400,000 as a price point to build. So, two of them side by side \$800,000, that's the cost. Of course, this map is going to show us that East, West, and North Charlotte are not in danger. It's South Charlotte that's going to get them, which conveniently happens to line up to the narrative of those pushing for abolishing single-family zoning.

But in reality, I've talked to many experts, the assumptions need to be different. It's more like \$50 per square foot would be about a 2,000 square foot, a duplex, a cost that's all in, in those parts of town, which would be around a hundred, \$115,000 cost per unit. That is what ultimately would completely change the color of that map to be what you would see, large impacts and floods of duplexes happening in East, West, North Charlotte. So, I think that's something we can fix, but I warn them and unfortunately, we're presenting it as here are the results folks, see it's okay and it's not okay. We can make these maps and numbers show anything we want. I believe there are flawed assumptions that make these maps show exactly the wrong thing that will ultimately happen if we don't approach this in a very thoughtful manner. The final thing I'll say is the last statement was about as misleading as I can possibly muster up. It was stated that affordability is not an issue in this approach. Well, what was actually stated to me in the closed session meeting was this does nothing for affordability, it actually is really more about capacity, about the number of units. I still firmly believe it will have a negative impact on affordability. But stating the opposite of that, which is there is no affordability problem here is about as misleading as it gets. I don't want anyone to walk away. This is the kind of work we need to be doing. I love what this consultant is doing here with us, but we can't present something that happens to fit a narrative when we haven't done the work yet. That's, unfortunately, what's happened to me.

Ms. Eiselt said just one question first, can we all somehow get this online so that we can zoom in and see more specifically the breakdown between the colors? Then my second question is the methodology you spoke of had to do with lot size for the building, I think, what about parking? I think there had to be a driveway for each duplex, is that correct? So, does this map also take into account that in parts of town that already have a lot of duplexes and because they're old, they don't have driveways? For instance, if a house with no driveway turned into a duplex, would they have to add two driveways?

Ms. Osborne said so, Matt can answer this if I miss it, but the performer used the development standards within the new zoning districts, and it has parking as a part of those development standards. So, the typical lot, I'm not sure if it were, I think it was for the infield. So, it has made some assumptions around how the current development standards or the new development standards for N-1 would help produce the like in this map. So, he did use the development standards within the zone and classification.

Mr. Prosser said there are two maps, the slide previously, two shows the physical constraint. We didn't find a ton of those. We did factor in that a new lot would have to be able to park that has a minimum number of spaces that need to be provided on the parcel for each unit. And that's different between if it's a duplex or triplex. So, that was factored in. Also factored in consideration was the addition of a driveway or a drive aisle to access to parking with the realization that you're not allowed to put the parking in front of the building between the street and the building based on the proposed zoning districts within one. There are five of them that are being proposed and each of those has different standards related to lock coverage. So, we did factor in the differences between those lot original requirements throughout the community. It is a point that parking is one of the biggest constraints in terms of trying to put a duplex on a single-family lot that you do have to provide those spaces on the parcel. We did factor that into looking at the width parcel and that was one of the bigger factors, whether or not they're wide enough to allow for those drive aisle in addition to a building that's wide enough to have two units. You know, you can consider that there are units that can be built stacked and that they're not home right next to each other. They're vertically stacked on top of each other, and that creates more efficiency. So, that there's the possibility that people would try to build those units. I think from a market's perspective, those are less attractive than the side-by-side duplex. Not saying that they would be something that people would want in the market, but that creates sort of a condo ownership situation which is more complicated in terms of financing, but also in terms of attractiveness to buyers. But it is a consideration that if you do stack units, it allows you to have a lot more flexibility in how you design a duplex or triplex within a lot.

Councilmember Newton said Matt, thank you so much for that presentation. That's the second time I've heard it. I heard it the first time in the TAP committee. I don't know I might've misunderstood something before, So, I just wanted to get some clarification. When you had mentioned single-family zoned areas, are you talking about all single-family zoned areas throughout the entire City, including undeveloped land, or are you only talking about land that is currently developed?

Mr. Prosser said This analysis, I believe only looks at currently developed single-family lots.

Mr. Newton said okay. That was my understanding from before, and that's where my concern arises because there is an awful lot of undeveloped land throughout the City, particularly outside of the inner ring or inner core of our City that I think is subject just like all other properties within the City that is currently developed is still subject to duplex and triplex development. Maybe even a much more intensive up-zoning because duplexes and triplexes could be installed by right, in a vast number in a very small area or space. So, as I mentioned before, I would be very interested in understanding and knowing the impacts in undeveloped areas of duplex and triplex development. I don't know what challenges that presents. It's something that I have been asking about for quite some time and something that I've hoped that we would focus more on as well because I know that I'm not the only one that has those concerns.

Councilmember Phipps said I would think that \$450,000 or \$400,000 duplex in some areas would be a non-starter in terms of trying to develop some affordable housing in some of those areas. So, I would hope that we could come up or we could find some of those developers, which I know there are some that exist. One such developer that I've had an opportunity to talk to said he ran into considerable problems trying to put a duplex on a lot. I know you said that it was 96% of all the lots would be able to accept a duplex unit. But I guess he must've run into that 4% or whatever. In the case where there is an area that's close to transit, would we have to have a provision for parking if a unit was located next to public transit, the Light Rail, or whatever? Because I know we did an experiment in one local, I think it was, I don't know if it was Smallwood or one Seversville, or one of those communities where we vote not to have parking. So, is that a barrier that we could potentially eliminate, and are there other barriers that maybe we have not talked about that exists in trying to put duplexes in some of the areas where we might need them most?

Mr. Prosser said I think that some things that the UDO team has been running through and perhaps they'll be able to talk to that going forward. Parking is a challenge, or it's a cost, I would say, for a lot of developments and sort of a question of where you feel like you need parking to support the development or not. I mean, this is looking at only those single-family neighborhoods, and not necessarily some of those denser areas that were re-zoned or designated differently without that N-one designation, these are only looking at just specific N-one designation. I mean, one thing to consider in this is that we're looking at the potential of an existing home, a lot with existing home on it being bought to having that home, either being renovated or torn down to make two units. I've just wanted to iterate that there's a lot of costs of being able to do that. Not only in terms of buying a single parcel that has value and then having to construct two units and then being able to sell those two units that are priced that can overcome that land cost. That's what the purpose of our analysis was to try to illustrate. So, I think we're open to looking at others perhaps trying to find a lower-cost proforma and maybe a higher-cost proforma to evaluate these lots with. But I do think there's a significant challenge of cost, of finding the feasibility of buying an existing home and tearing it down and trying to construct two units for a price point that is much below the price that we had. So, the realization that this policy 2.1 is part of multiple policies within Comprehensive Plan, (Inaudible) aimed at addressing both either housing, accessibility, but also housing affordability. In my presentation tries to iterate what this policy, 2.1 has the potential to have the impact of increasing housing supply and the diversity of housing types. I don't necessarily want to intimate that it is some solution to creating an increase in affordable housing for lower-income residents. The goal or the outcome that you might be able to see through this policy change is helping to stem the tide of housing growth by increasing housing supply, but not necessarily the silver bullets or a direct effort that would create affordable housing. There are multiple goals, policies, and actions that are inside of the Comprehensive Plan that are gained at that specific question of housing affordability, specifically goal three, and the policies within it. So, I don't want to say that I'm intimating that this is the solution to affordable housing. This is a solution to increasing housing, diversity, and accessibility.

Mr. Newton said anyhow, just to briefly sum up, I guess my comments from before, and I don't know when I got cut off there. But you know, I would be interested in knowing a little bit more about the impacts in undeveloped areas. I know that we talked about this before, Matt. So, any additional analysis there particularly impacts from the standpoint of infrastructure, transit and the educational opportunities, jobs, et cetera, or possibly lack thereof in areas where we might start to see more up-zones growth due to duplexes and triplex where we have undeveloped land. So, thank you again, Mayor, and any additional information or analysis there would be much appreciated, Matt. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said I just got a couple of questions, just trying to make sure I understand what these maps are saying. I'm not sure what slide number this is. I'm sorry, but it's got the market support score for the estimated lots without HOA, and then next to it, it's got the single-family demolition permits and market support.

Mr. Prosser said yes. So, that'd be two slides down from what I'm (Inaudible).

Ms. Watlington said I recognize Councilmember Bokhari's comments from before that there's some opportunity here to go back and look at the assumptions, but based on what it has here, I just want to make sure I understand. What I'm seeing is the deep blue is the markets, were you basically saying that prices are high enough that someone could build and recoup their dollars?

Mr. Prosser said yes. Most likely, yes.

Ms. Watlington said then in the map next to it, where you've got single-family demolition permits, this is for just 2020, right. So, I'm trying to understand, I see places where there's HOAs and I see places where on the map next to it, where there are green dots, which would lead me to believe that some neighborhood that has an HOA, somebody submitted for a demolition permit, correct?

Mr. Prosser said yes. That would be the assumption. I will caveat the location of the HOA or the CCRs (Consumer Confidence Report). There's an estimate based on previous research that they've done. So, I can't necessarily speak to this parcel by parcel, the validity of it, but it's a general estimate of those areas. That is an indication that there may be demolitions that are occurring in those neighborhoods.

Ms. Watlington said so, one would have to assume that those buildings that are coming back are also going to meet the requirements of the HOA. So, I'm just curious, do you have the information to know what's being built in place of these demolition permits?

Mr. Prosser said we could try to do an analysis of that. I'm sure that the city has building permit data that we could try to match up a comparison of where the demo permit was to a new construction permit. That's something we actually did in an analysis that we did in Denver for their Comprehensive Plan was evaluate what the change in certain neighborhoods were in terms of net new units. Some lots or some neighborhoods in Denver were either down zones, and some were even up zoned. We were illustrating neighborhoods where they're producing two units for every demolition permit or one unit for every demolition permit, in that community there was a goal to at least, if we're allowing for these demolition activities to occur, we should be trying to get more units out of the reconstruction and homes of those units. So, that might be something that we can evaluate here, at least in the last few years, are there more often or not people tearing down a home and replacing it with one, were they tearing it down and replacing it with two or three.

Ms. Watlington said gotcha. Then the only other question I have as it relates to this is, do we have any view to what might not be demolition permits, but maybe construction permits at existing buildings?

Mr. Prosser said so, modifications or renovations, fixing homes?

Ms. Watlington said right.

Mr. Prosser said yes. I mean the City should have data on that that we might be able to show spatially. We'd have to probably dig through it to get what specific changes are being made.

Ms. Watlington said I'm just curious, cause I'm trying to understand the nature of what's happening here. I realized that these dots are only for 2020. But yeah, I don't want to create more work for you, but I'm trying to wrap my mind around what we're actually seeing because I know what I'm seeing when I'm riding through these neighborhoods. I want to make sure that I'm understanding the data and that data reflects what is happening.

Mr. Prosser said It might be also that these dots are, you know, they may appear kind of big so that you can see them. So, that might make them look like there's more than there perhaps is. So, that's something that we can try to get some raw data in terms of the number of permits have been pulled that might be helpful.

Mayor Lyles said one of the things that you make me think of Ms. Wallington is if we have one with just the green, you know, when you used to do the math and you could add the dots to it, then you could see it a little bit better. Right now, it's just like there's so much on that one map. So, if there's a way to help us visualize this, that might be helpful. As all of us are riding around we can see. I drive on Park Road and it's got three houses down, nine houses coming, and the nine houses are all over 3,000 or 4,000 square feet. But at the same time in other places, the townhouses are coming.

Councilmember Driggs said I just bought an upgrade to my internet connection. So, can you guys see me? I will chime in with Mr. Bokhari. I think we need to be careful, I guess is the best way to put it. Matt, you know that this is basically a modeling exercise, and what that entails is you make a bunch of assumptions and you establish certain relationships and then you derive certain conclusions. So, if you go back to your market support assumption slide.

The point I want to make is that this list a set of assumptions and in a good modeling exercise, what you would do is you would associate with these assumptions, a kind of sensitivity analysis to get a feel for how critical each of them is in relation to the conclusions you're drawing. So, don't want to get deep into that, but all I'm trying to get across is we need to do more work here to make sure we have our arms around the relationships that this exercise is trying to demonstrate and establish. Again, I agree with Mr. Bokhari there, I don't think this was done with any particular outcome in mind, but I can tell you having developed models professionally for 30 years when people said would you create a model and show me how much you cost and such and such. I would tell them what answer do you want? There is a huge amount of scope within the way you frame your model to influence the outcome. So, the best way to avoid any unintended consequences there is to just tinker with this model a little bit, create a couple of scenarios based on changes in these critical assumptions and see what the picture looks like when you do that.

I did also want to go, if you could go to the heat map, which I think is the next one, that's page 21. So, you see that picture, in the Committee meeting, I raised the question about what happens when you take the HOAs into account, the deed restrictions, things like that. if you go down to page 23 on the left, you see what that looks like and notice how little there is now on the likeliness score. So, I guess part of my question is what happens if you overlay these maps if you take out and now you start to do the percentage calculations that you did for all the data, without respect to HOAs, and you do those same percentage calculations on what remains after you exclude the protected sites because I think that will give you quite a different picture. And that's really the picture that we need to see.

The last point I want to make is going to the next slide, please. This is further also to Mr. Bokhari's point. The average cost of housing was not measurably impacted. I mean, that's a pretty significant statement and I don't think we should bury it on one slide in this whole deck. A key objective of the 2040 Plan, as I understood it, was to create more affordable housing, to make housing more accessible. I think the plan will certainly do a number of things as Councilmember Eiselt has pointed out to diversify housing and promote certain kinds of density. But we have to recognize that some of the things we're talking about doing will have the effect of causing the housing to go up or have the effect of causing more expensive housing to be created, to accommodate growth, and won't necessarily be responsive to our key priority of bringing housing costs down or making more affordable housing available. So, I think we need to pay close attention to this one and be careful how we represent to the public, what they can expect as a result of the plan that the key initiatives that we have on this are of course the anti-displacement commission and we talked about community benefits and things like that. So, I hope we'll be able to implement those things successfully, but the economic forces at work here are powerful. if we're not careful, we will find that we're not able with anything that we do in the area of policy to offset a kind of tsunami that could occur once we free up land use this way and take City Council out of decisions about how some of these properties are redeveloped. So, I think this is great bones of a model and certainly great work, Matt but I think it needs more work and we need to be careful about drawing conclusions from it at this point.

Councilmember Ajmera said this is exactly the type of analysis we need to address the concerns that have been raised around displacement. So, I appreciate your work here, Matt. A couple of questions. So, on this slide where you have the second bullet, the value of land likely to increase to match the value of greater development potential. So, wouldn't the value of land likely increase throughout the City, or is it just in that map that you're showing?

Mr. Prosser said I think it's more related to parcels where there is a change in the development potential. So, those single-family lots that previously wouldn't allow two units now, can have two units. The lower value parcels in those would be the ones that could potentially see an increase in value to match with what the greater development potential is. So, the illustration would be, we found for our typical proforma that \$150,000 was sort of the land cost that could be supported based on that proforma. So, if you had a parcel that was worth \$125,000, per se, you could assume that its value would increase to 150 now that there are two units to be built on it. So, it's the recognition that sort of those lower value lots likely are seeing an increase in their value in the market because of that development change. Now obviously the context of each lot is different, whether it has a home on it that has value or a dilapidated home or no home at all. So, that could vary, but it's more likely those more value lots within the parcels that we were coloring that would see that increase.

Ms. Ajmera said to follow up on that, where there is greater development potential. So, there are a couple of maps, which maps should we be looking at where we can focus on lots, where there is a greater development potential?

Mr. Prosser said all of those single-family lots that we've colored in that map, under the new policy you would be able to have two units. So, those all have greater development potential as a result of that. We could do some maps and a set of maps to show what the existing assessor value is for those lots to give you an indication of where the lower value lots are, and that would be one sort of signal where likeliness could occur that's built into our analysis. What I haven't shared with you all is we sort of have a map for each score that we used and that provides some more context. Then our final deliverable to you all that'll be provided. A previous comment we heard in the Council Committee was this is data we can start to use to identify the neighborhoods that are perhaps in those vulnerable to displacement areas, where we might need to pilot programs that come out of the work of the displacement working group. So, it could be a guide for those efforts in terms of specific geographies to focus on to start testing ideas and solutions.

Ms. Ajmera said right. I think it would be helpful to have that map where there is a value associated with greater development potential So, that we can see where there could be a value of land that could increase, and that ultimately helps us understand a displacement and how we need to address that to our policies. Second, there is a map, I think there are two maps on one slide, one with the single-family demolition permit. Yes. Right here. So, when you say single-family demolition permits plus market support. So, I don't know if I understand when you say market support. Can you elaborate on that, please?

Mr. Prosser said yes. So, the analysis that we did sort of, we test the physical capacity and then market support. Those are the two tests that we did. So, that map shows our market support scores from zero to five, that's that yellow into the red and purple-blue colors. So, it's that initial map that we showed, and what we wanted to do was to show where there already was demolition activity of single-family homes occurring in the community. those are those green dots that are put on top of that map. So, what we're trying to do is to correlate where we think likeliness would be with where those demo permits have been to see if our analysis is identifying the same places where the market's already looking. This map to me indicates that there is a pretty high correlation between where we identified opportunity or likeliness and where at least currently demo activity is going on with the presumption that those single-family home demolitions are done so, in a desire to create either larger homes or multiple homes, depending on the zoning.

Ms. Ajmera said so, to summarize, really where the wedge is, where we see demolition paired with the market support. Is that correct?

Mr. Prosser said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said so, if we were to, I know a couple of my colleagues had asked this question, if we were to overlay the map without HOA, which is on the left, with the single-family demolition permit and market support, where would we end up?

Mr. Prosser said we can do that. It was basically taking the green dots on the map to the right and putting them on the map from the left and just illustrating how, if there's a lot of demo activity occurring in places where we think there's HOA or CCR restrictions or not. that's something we can do. It's an easy thing to produce.

Ms. Ajmera said I think ultimately, we can have multiple scenarios, but I think from what I see here, the outcome is not going to change. Even if we were to build an assumption, I'm interested, there are multiple assumptions that some of my colleagues had raised around price per square footage and other assumptions that if we were to change, what would the outcome be? So, I think it's important for us to also explore some of those other scenarios and see because ultimately our goal is to ensure that we are not increasing, or we are not expediting in any way the displacement that's occurring at this point. So, I'm interested in further analysis, but certainly, I think this is a great analysis that really helps us understand and address the issue of displacement. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you so much. There's so, much information on these maps. Matt, can you go back to the map that highlights the areas of vulnerability, please? How did you define those as areas of vulnerability?

Mr. Prosser said so, within the Comprehensive Plan, we have the Equitable Growth Framework. one of the measures in the Equitable Growth Framework is vulnerable to displacement areas. We evaluated the folks living throughout the community, looking at the key social and economic conditions that may make them more vulnerable to displacement. Those are most often household incomes, educational attainment levels. I think race and ethnicity was a consideration as well as the presence of renter home, renter households versus homeowner household. I believe those are the key input. I need to double-check the Equitable Growth Framework specifically to make sure that I have it correct, I believe those are the ones that were used to identify areas that had residents within them, that met those characteristics that would make them more vulnerable to displacement if land values and home prices were to change significantly in their area.

Ms. Johnson said so when you compare the vulnerable neighborhoods to the most comprehensive map, and I don't know what to be a map, you would consider the most comprehensive map, maybe the one with the green dots. But if you compare those areas if you can advance the slide. Okay, so, the areas of vulnerability, if we had an overlay on the map to the right it looks like the most impacted area is an area of vulnerability. Is that what you see as well?

Mr. Prosser said well, no, I mean, I think we identified that about 7% of the single-family lots had a color of dark purple or blue so, that three or four score. They are highly concentrated in a couple of different areas just to the east of downtown and then to the northwest of the town. There are some definitely of the presence of demolition permits in those areas as well. So, those are indicators of areas that are in that vulnerable displacement areas that are seeing change currently. To my previous point, I think those are areas that potentially could be good candidates for targeting initial policies and programs to address displacement issues.

Ms. Johnson said so, thank you. So, I guess this comment is for the staff. A couple of things. These maps are very complicated. Even the Councilmembers have had to ask for the overlays and three different views. We've asked for simple information numerous times for it to be simplified. I know that we had over 4,000 survey responses, but in a City with almost a million people, people aren't getting it. They're not understanding the

complexity of this data. So, if we could have narratives on how this information applies to them, people want to know what does this mean to me? So, if we can have very simplified information so people understand this data. There are individuals in vulnerable neighborhoods where there's an influx of demolition permits and when you talk about a tsunami and those of us that were concerned with 2.1, because it would not improve the affordability and it would expedite gentrification, this appears to illustrate that and people need to understand. So, I would ask again for maybe if this were on a website, simplified information, a Charlotte redevelopment plan, and a narrative, what this looks like, maybe per zip code something. Cause this is complicated information, but it's important. It's important that our residents understand.

If we do have the opportunity to be intentional about pilots and about helping the vulnerable and about the displacement committee and about what we're really going to do because the information is right here in front of us. When you talk about expediting gentrification, if we're demolishing single-family homes and constructing duplexes and changing the fabric of the neighborhood, increasing the prices, that's what's going to happen. We know the tax rates are going to increase and that's the cycle. So, I think this is important information that cannot get lost and cannot be misunderstood. So, I would just ask again for simplified information of this important information, and I appreciate your presentation, Matt. I know this is your language and all of that, but even with Council asking as many questions as we have for the average resident, this information is complicated but it's important and it needs to be understood. So, I would just ask for a narrative, what does this mean? If we have a comprehensive map, these are the vulnerable areas. This is what this means to you, Mr. Joe public. Thank you.

Councilmember Winston said yes, were duets counted in consideration of the building of duplex units?

Mr. Prosser said yes so side by side, yes. Is that what you mean?

Mr. Winston yes, that's all of the questions I have. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said I think we've heard from everyone. The thing I think as Ms. Johnson said, this is probably some of the most important work that we are going to be doing and there are great expectations for it. I want to say to Matt, thank you for the expertise that you are bringing to us today. I agree. I had six things that I heard the Council say. I would like to suggest the staff figure out how to do this. I think that these maps are based upon the assumptions that we have. So, what are the assumptions that each Councilmember would like to see redrawn or rediscuss? I think we ought to go through as many of those maps as you have the need to create an understanding of what you would like to see. Then I also heard a question on the undeveloped land. I'm not really sure if we answered that, but that's something to get back to.

Mr. Phipps talked about the barriers to affordability and what are they if we have this current map, what will they be? I'm sure they would be the same for almost any map that we have because they are taking place right now. Then vulnerable with demolition was another request. Simple narratives and I'd like to make one. I'd like to see the maps of the current state because if we don't do something else, we're going to do what we have now, and I wonder what that looks like. I think the demolition shows it right now. It shows you where people are already tearing down in areas and creating new models and new types of housing. Sometimes that is just as difficult to try to manage. So, it would be great for me to have a better understanding of what we are right now with a map like this, to be able to say, what are my assumptions that I want to see change? So, if that's possible. I think that wraps up the section and time that we had today. It was a really great discussion. I think everybody had time to really express their concerns, but if you still have something and as you continue to find out ideas, that's what the staff is here to get done as we said, when we adopted this plan, it's one of the most important that we have. So, let's make sure that we get it done. Matt, thank you, Alyssa, thank you very much.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: POLICY MAP UPDATE

There was not a Policy Map update.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE UPDATE

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director said so, I just quickly say that on the last one, just so you know, we trust the work that our consultant is doing, but in the next week, we'll be sharing this work with the UNCC (the University of North Carolina at Charlotte), Urban Institute to take another look at the data. So, we'll be coming back to you with what we find eventually. Well, on the Unified Development Ordinance. If you recall last month, our Deputy Directors, Alyson Craig, and Tony Lathrop the Chair of our Ordinance Advisory Committee came before you to provide a summary of the work that the staff in the Committee have been doing for more than three years. So, the first draft of that work, the Unified Development Ordinance, hit the streets last week Thursday, October 7th. So, while the document itself consolidates multiple regulations and ordinances into one streamlined user-friendly document, and Alyson will talk a whole lot more about that. The major goal really is to provide regulations to implement divisions established by the Adopted Comprehensive Plan. So, what you're going to hear tonight from our Deputy Director, Alyson Craig, and our Project Manager, Laura Harmon, is about the extensive engagement process as well as what you will expect to see in upcoming draft releases.

Looking forward, the goal is at July 2022 Council decision. However, before Alyson steps forward to present, I like to make a recognition of Laura Harmon, who is our Project Manager. She's not in the room, but she's virtual. She's the only one on our team who remains and has worked the longest on the Unified Development Ordinance, I believe since 2013. When the pre-work was done, I think Councilmember Phipps remembers that very well. I'll say that that's before Alyson and I jumped into this and I just want to publicly thank Laura for her diligence and her hard work and her willingness to pivot every time we make some changes to the Comprehensive Plan that will result in the UDO also have been impacted. So, I'd like to just publicly acknowledge Laura for the good work she and her team have really done. We take the credit a lot tonight, but there's a lot of other staff who have put in so much effort into this work since 2013 to get us to this first draft.

Alyson Craig, Deputy Director Planning, Zoning & Development Department said so, the draft UDO, the first draft came out last Thursday, October 7th. We're very excited, as Taiwo said. It's a very long time in the work. A lot of staff have been working on this very heavily over the last few years. So, it's a major accomplishment to be able to issue this first draft. Kind of similar to Taiwo, I'd like to take a few minutes just to say thank you. There has been a great deal of people involved in developing this first draft. First and foremost, our Planning staff led by Laura Harmon and her team have really spent a great deal of time. We've had an interdepartmental staff team that has worked on this from the different departments from CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System), C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation), Economic Develop, Charlotte water. I mean really all the different departments have been involved in helping to develop this first draft. As Taiwo mentioned, we have the Ordinance Advisory Committee. This group has been meeting with us regularly. It's made up of neighborhood leaders, folks from the development community, and residents to really help shape some of the thoughts that went into creating this first draft and the concepts that we presented to them. Of course, our consultants, we've got Camira online and our attorneys. When you delve into it and process and digest the 608-page document it is quite lengthy and there's a lot of really important things in there. What we're really trying to do with direction from the Comprehensive Plan is balance a lot of City priorities. So, the environment, sustainability, affordability, what it costs for development. So, please understand that when you read this draft that this is the beginning, this is the first draft and there'll be others to come.

So, we're here in October and it's the first draft that's come out. So, we've got a road ahead here where we're going to be working with City Council, with the community, with

the development industry, and really talking through what is in this document and how it's shaping the built environment in Charlotte going forward. We've had a lot of people ask if we could have a red-line version of it because it is a lot to digest. It's very drastically different than what we have today and it's taking ordinances that have been developed over 30 years that are in completely different documents and bringing them together in one ordinance. So, going forward, after this draft and when we hear comments and we come back in March with the second draft, everything future will be redlined. You'll be able to see what has been changed, what's been added, and what's been taken away. So, hopefully, that'll provide some clarity going forward. You can also see too that we'll be doing an Economic Impact Analysis. So, that work we're anticipating will begin at the end of October. So, we'll convene a group to really dive into the numbers and see how this impacts affordability, the feasibility of development here in Charlotte. So, that work will go through January and if we find a need to continue that beyond that based on comments and changes that are made, then we'll do that. You'll see too, that we're going to be continuing to work with the Ordinance Advisory Committee, we're going to be coming regularly for Council before the Council Committee, the Planning Commission. We have a number of public comment periods that we'll talk about a little bit later in the presentation. We're hoping to come before the Council in July for the adoption of the document. So, with that, I will turn it over to Laura Harmon who's the Project Manager for the UDO, and as Taiwo said, has done a tremendous amount of work leading her team to create this first draft.

Laura Harmon, Project Manager said I'm also going to present with Chris Jennette with Camira our UDO consultant this evening. I think many of you all have seen this, we've been in different forums, but we have a number of new zoning districts that are coming with the UDO or that we're proposing with the UDO. They offer aligned with the place types from the Comprehensive Plan. So, as an example, we have the manufacturing and logistics Place Type and the ML-1 (Manufacturing & Logistics) and ML-2 (Manufacturing & Logistics) zoning districts that go with that and you can see for this range of Place Types are mixed-use and non-residential Place Types, we have at least one zoning district for each Place Type and in most cases more than one.

Similarly, for our neighborhood zoning districts, with the Neighborhood 1 Place Type, we have six zoning districts, and you can see underneath that, that many of them are related to current zoning districts. So, our Neighborhood 1-A zoning district is comparable to our R-3 district, and that we will actually have that translate to our R-3 district translate to the Neighborhood 1-A. Same for Neighborhood 1, B, C, D, and E. Also, for Neighborhood 2, we will have three zoning districts, this is our more intense residential, we'll have Neighborhood 2- A, B, and C zoning districts.

Again, these relate to, or zoning districts come from the Comp Plan or come from the policies, and the Comp Plan or based on the policies in the Comp Plan. So, talked a lot about policy 2.1, probably don't need to read that to you guys, but out of that we have Neighborhood 1 Place Type being related to policy 2.1 and the zoning regulations from Neighborhood 1-A, B, C, D E, and F. You can see, again, all of this flows from Comp Plan to the more specifics in the Place Type and then the regulations being based on that.

A little bit more we wanted to talk about with the Neighborhood 1 districts because this is a big part of what we're doing in the UDO. Two goals with these districts from the Comp Plan first is increased housing opportunities. So, again, in addition to single-family, duplex, and triplex allowed on any lot is what you'll find as you look at these districts in the initial draft of the UDO. We'll have accessory dwelling units allowed on lots with single-family dwellings. We allow that now, but we have adjusted the standards. So, the construction of ADUs (Affordable Dwelling Units) is more feasible in a lot of cases. Then we're also proposing that quadruplexes be allowed on arterial streets when an affordable housing unit is provided. We also think that as we're adding these housing types into these zoning districts, that it's important to respect the established neighborhood character of the districts. So, ways that we're doing that is maintaining minimum lot sizes and they do vary by district, which we can match with the existing context. But they will be the same for all dwelling types. So, if you, for example, require a 15,000 square foot lot, now you could put a single-family home, a duplex, or a triplex on that lot. So, the same

requirement for all of those. Similarly, for our front side and rear setbacks, they will vary by district based on context, but be the same for all dwelling types.

A couple of other things that we're doing to maintain character is one driveway allowed per street frontage. So, that for duplexes and triplexes, we're not looking at multiple driveways on a street but that they do consolidate driveways for duplex, triplex and quadplexes parking to the side rear of a dwelling to be consistent with our typical context in Charlotte. Also tying maximum height for those housing types to the height of nearby dwellings. So, again, we think really that we want to expand the housing opportunities, but we also want to respect the character that exists in our neighborhoods. So, trying to balance those. We do talk a bit ago about other zoning districts, our base zoning districts. We also have some overlay and special purpose districts. We'll continue with the Historic District Overlay, but we are adding Cottage Court Overlay, Neighborhood Character Overlay. Chris is going to talk about some of these in a minute, Residential Infill Overlay. We're adjusting our districts for manufactured housing with a Manufactured Home Overlay and a manufactured home park district, and also updating our Airport Noise Overlay that we have currently, but we'll be adjusting that. Chris is going to talk about some of the alternative development options either through overlay or for provisions in our Neighborhood 1 districts. I'm going to turn this over to Chris now.

Chris Jennette, UDO said I apologize right away. I sound a little hoarse, I've had kind of a frog, so, I'm my pause for sips of water. Hadn't done too much talking today until a little bit earlier. So, as Laura mentioned, I'm going to cover a couple of the alternative development options and Overlays that really can be used to augment the form of development and intensity of development on the character really of development within the N-1 districts. The ones that I'm going to cover are the Neighborhood Character Overlay, the Residential Infill Overlay, and the mixed-income bonus. So, the first of those is the Neighborhood Character Overlay District. This is an overlay district that's really intended to, as the name would imply, protect, and acknowledge the particular or distinct character.

So, there are a couple of factors that play into the eligibility for a Neighborhood Character Overlay District. The first one of those is that it needs to meet a series of criteria. So, the first one of those is that there has to be something distinctive and consistent within a majority of the properties that are going to be designated as the NCO area. that can be anything in terms of, you know, the scale of development, the proportion, the rhythm, as you're walking along a street in terms of lot width and width with structures or similarity in onsite elements. So, say all of the parking is located behind houses in this particular area, there's a predominant sort of pattern of landscape upfronts. They all have porches as accessory structures in the front. So, there has to be some sort of unifying element within the area that's going to be designated. Then in addition to that, they have to meet a series of sort of substandard and the first one of those is a minimum so, the area must be in a minimum of one block face, which is essentially all the lots on a block facing the same street. The general pattern of development has to be at least 25 years old and a minimum of 75% of the lots within the area needs to be developed. So, you can't really use this, tool the Neighborhood Character Overlay on areas that are largely undeveloped. Finally, you can't apply an NCO on top of anything that's currently within a Historic Overlay District. Also, important to note that this is a tool that can be used in N1-A through the N1-E district only, So it's not available within N1-F.

So, as a tool to really acknowledge the character, the NCO provides a series of options for augmenting the standards of the underlying districts. So, what it allows to happen is for modification of things like bulk and area control. So, maximum lot area can be addressed through here, things like lot width, frontage requirements, setbacks. The maximum height of structures, both principle, and accessory as well as maximum building coverage. And then there are a couple of other things that can also be modified. The first of those is surface parking. So, how much square footage of surface parking can I have as well as the location of any surface parking. Then tree standards, tree planting, and protection standards can also be enhanced as a component of a neighborhood character overlay. Important to note that not all of these have to be addressed within a Neighborhood Character Overlay, but anything that is would override the bay standards.

Anything that isn't was just defaulted back to whatever the underlying zoning district is. There's also an approval process that accompanies the NCO plan. It's a seven-step process. I'm going to go through it as briefly as possible. So, the first step is initiation, which can happen either through action at council or through a petition representing 25% of the property owners and 25% of the land area within the proposed NCO. It would then go to the Planning Director for determination of eligibility, at which point it would move into a public meeting that would need to be noticed for all the property owners within the area, as well as adjacent to kind of let them know that this is happening and process from move forward. Step four is a development of a Neighborhood Character Plan. So, the staff along with representatives from the neighborhood would actually determine, and then one of the things we want to modify in here, present that at step five, which is another public meeting again, noticed. Then move to a petition for a map amendment. So, at this point, the threshold to move for that petition is elevated to 51% of the property owners. So, once you get to see what the NCO has in it, then the bar is raised a little bit to move it to the actual map amendment stage, at which point, just kind of undergoes the normal map amendment process. So, as opposed to the NCO, which is, as you can see, a very sort of intentional tailored process, we've got Residential Infill Overlay district, which is a little bit more of a blunt instrument. Really intended to facilitate compatible info development within certain areas of the City.

So, the RIO (Residential Infill Overlay) allows you to modify really three main things; height, the unit size within an area, and the front setback. Those are all based on sort of a series of standards that are calculated as averages based on the existing character within an area. So, for instance, the building sidewall height is limited to 12 feet where the average of the adjacent structures, the maximum building size within an RIO is the average square footage for single-family structures on a block face or 800 square feet per unit, whichever one of those is greater. You must have at least 50 continuous lots in order to be eligible for an RIO designation. This one can be again, sort of similarly initiated by a majority vote at City Council or by 51% of the property units. Also, important to note, since it's a little bit of an odd one that the maximum building size can actually be exceeded for single-family dwellings by an additional 25%.

Then finally, the alternative development option that we wanted to kind of highlight here was the mixed-income residential development. So, this is a tool that really allows for an increase in the intensity of development in exchange for providing some affordable units, a mix of affordable units and market-rate units, or heterogeneously throughout the development. You can use it in any of the N-1 districts, A through D on a site that's at least one acre in size. So, the way that this one works is it essentially bumps you up to the next district in intensity. So, say I was looking to develop a property in the N1-B district, and I wanted to take advantage of the mixed-income residential development. If I met the standards I'd be allowed to develop under the standards of the N1-C district. So, I'd get a little bit of a bump in intensity and potential as a result of that. The one thing that I would need to do is provide 50% of those additional units that I'm granted as a result of that increase in intensity to households, set them aside for households earning 80% of the area of BD and income.

So, want to quickly talk about our approach to our vehicle parking standards in the UDO. So, as we all know, Charlotte developed as an auto-oriented City in the 20th century. There are some really good recent policy work that is aiming to kind of move that orientation calling for sort of a more multimodal transportation emphasis throughout the City. The UDO is really trying to implement that and work as a transition tool between sort of the historic pattern of the City, as well as where the City wants to end up with these multimodal options. So, you know, we're really moving in the direction of requiring fewer (Inaudible) and placing less emphasis on automobiles as development moves forward. To kind of implement this we've developed a three-tiered approach. So, tier one, tier two, tier three based upon zoning districts, and those districts have kind of been slotted into separate tiers based upon their identified character, what we think that they're going to be transitioning to in the future, as well as the City's transportation and development goals. So, just as kind of a cheat sheet, the way that this works is that I could have one particular use in three separate districts, and that might put me in three different tiers of required parking. So, if I had used it in tier one, I might be required to provide a minimum

amount of parking spaces. if I had that same exact use in a tier-three district, there might be no minimum, but instead of maximum.

So, that's the way that it works. So, here you get just kind of a glimpse at the tiers themselves. What we've done is try to match the character of the zoning districts to the tiers of parking that would be required. So, tier one would be minimum off-street parking requirements in place with no maximum parking. So, these are kind of what you would expect, it's the manufacturing and logistics. It's the institutional campus a little bit more suburban in nature. It's the office flex campus, again, the sort that same or an orientation, things like the manufactured home park. All of the Neighborhood 1 districts would fall in tier one and N2-A and N2-B would fall within tier one as well. Tier two would require, in many cases, both a minimum of parking spaces, as well as a maximum amount of parking spaces. These are some of the centers, the commercial, sort of the innovation areas of town. So, the innovation mixed-use would be included in tier two, the institutional campus, the sort of more urban campus form, the neighborhood center and community activity center one, both of the commercial districts, the CG (General Commercial) and the CR (Regional Commercial), and then the Neighborhood 2 C would get bumped up to tier two. Then tier-three these are the ones that would have no parking minimums, except for a very limited number of uses and specific cases. Then maximum parking limits would apply to uses within tier three. So, these would be sort of the most intensely developed areas of the City. So, the CAC2 (Community Activity Center), the Regional Activity Center, uptown, both uptown edge and the uptown core, and all of the TRD districts would be included in tier three.

Ms. Harmon said we've given you kind of some of the highlights out of the zoning portion of the UDO and I will walk in the light of time, pretty quickly through a couple of other sections of the UDO, and then turn things back over to Alyson. So, we have a component that is subdivision streets and other infrastructure, and I just wanted to talk briefly through some of the concepts and we will be back at your retreat talking a bit more about some of these as well. So, one of our goals out of this section is to increase connectivity. So, we are applying street connectivity standards, also typically known as new streets, not only to subdivisions but to all development that meets the minimum threshold. We're also adding a cross-access drive standard for certain types of development if they meet the threshold and certain again, the types of development will determine whether or not cross access is required. With respect to walkable and transit infrastructure, we're proposing in districts that we have a minimum six-foot-wide sidewalk, some districts we're looking for greater than that, depending on the anticipated pedestrian level of activity. We have created though flexibility in the streetscape standards, the standards for planting strip and sidewalk based on constrained conditions. We know in a lot of circumstances, there are existing buildings that are being reused. We want to support that, and there's just not enough room to get the full streetscape in place. Other things we're doing in this area is rapid transit corridor reservation. We have that in our TOD (Transit Oriented Development) districts, so expanding that, proposing to expand that, to protect right of way needs until CATS has the ability to purchase. Though there is a limited timeframe for that. So, it's not in perpetuity, but in a short term to give CATS the opportunity to purchase. Also [inaudible] for bus shelters and transit amenities based again on meeting certain thresholds for development.

Also making sure that we are planning for our future street needs. We are developing a citywide or C-DOT is developing a citywide streets map that will address our arterial streets. We'll look and see what is really needed for those streets. Well, where will the curb line be? What will the facilities in the streets be? Then we are through the UDO, making sure that we are getting buildings placed. So, that those streets can be built and the law, even if they can't be, or aren't being widened or improved to the full extent during development, we want to make sure that we are preserving the area to do that. There are also proposed standards for installation of the curb where it's missing or in some cases relocating the curb to the ultimate curb location. Again, if you meet basic thresholds. Then finally some other changes being brought forward by C-DOT is a new transportation impact study approach that is for by-right development, as well as rezonings. Currently, we are getting the transportation impact study and mitigation through the rezoning process. Almost exclusively the exception of that TOD zoning, but we will be proposing

to expand that. So, that we're treating people more equitably and it's not only applying to rezoning and also hitting by right development when appropriate. It's not going to be for every development, but again, if you meet a certain bottom threshold. Also, C-DOT is looking at, and they'll be talking more about at their retreat, having these standards incentivize multimodal and transportation demand management mitigation.

So, not only looking simply at moving people and cars but looking at mitigation that may be more related to how do we help people move around on foot, by transit, by bicycle just a shift in an approach consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and all the work that C-DOT is doing. Another big part of the proposed UDO is Stormwater and Natural Resources. Some of the things that are being done there are with respect to stormwater requirements, particularly the post-construction section is to align the ordinance to make sure that it complies with 2018 session law changes. So, there were changes made at the legislature in 2018, want to make sure we're compliant with those. With respect to reducing flood risk and protecting surface water quality, we're looking at a new approach for dealing with on-site drainage, how that works with respect to where our property drains to, making sure they don't drain onto the neighbor's property, and cost flooding there and connecting into the public infrastructure system.

So, more standards for that, just make sure we're all on the same page. Then in this arena also aligning the approach and the standards for residential and commercial development. So, that they are consistent and are consistent again, across all land use types as well. Then with respect to trees, some new thoughts on how to address trees. First, we want to protect and mitigate the loss of our large, healthy, mature trees. That's really important. Heard a lot about that from the community. So, a provision to protect native trees that are 30 inches or greater, also called heritage trees, and regulations that will address the trend of significant trees canopy loss on smaller infill development? So, looking into the opportunity of replanting for that development, again, this is another topic that we will have an opportunity to discuss further at the retreat. Then a new approach to Tree Save. Currently, in the ordinance, it's fairly narrow. We did a text amendment a couple of years ago to provide more flexibility on urban sites, we're looking at expanding upon that proposing to you all that we expand upon that. So, that there are more options on how we protect and preserve trees or alternatives to the traditional save this patch of trees at the corner of your site approach that we have used before. So, giving credit for higher quality trees and revise applicability and exemptions for doing this. So, again, trying to add flexibility and also equity in the requirements as well.

Ms. Craig said as I mentioned earlier, we will be doing an Economic Impact Analysis just to see what the financial impacts are of the regulations that we're proposing here in the UDO. These, we imagine there may be some things that cost more, but there's also things that we think will help on the cost side in terms of improving the process, as well as creating a more clear set of development regulations. We are working on this with Planning with Economic Development as well as our consultant, Matt, who you heard from earlier today, and we are anticipating kicking off this work on October the 27th. So, going to look at different development prototypes, probably look at specific sites. We're also trying to look at different development categories. The development performers for a small infill project are very different from an urban high-rise office or mixed-use development. So, really trying to dive into different development types, as well as test some specific sites. So, we'll convene a stakeholder group that will be able to help inform us of what these costs are and really provide some information about their proformas to really be able to test some of these concepts. If we find that there are substantial feasibility challenges for a particular development prototype, then this modeling will help inform what changes to the regulations may come. So, as I mentioned, we're planning to kick this work off at the end of October, and really the bulk of the work will be done through this first public comment period in January. But we know that as changes occur with the drafts that come out, that we may need to revisit this model.

We are offering a number of different ways to engage people. The first thing we typically have heard in the last few days since the draft is been issued is can you give us a quick summary of what's in the document and the 608 pages that's there, it's very tough to consolidate a regulatory document of that size into a quick little, couple pagers. But what

we are going to do is issue a series of introductory videos. We're calling them kind of a to choose your own adventure, where if you are in an existing neighborhood you can go and look at this particular video and get more information about things that are important to you or if you're a business owner, you can go to a different set of videos and understand what the ordinance might mean to you. We're also going to issue a user guide later this month, just to help walk you through the ordinance and what it looks like and where you can find the information that's of use to you. So, hopefully, those things will help navigate the document. We'll certainly have videos and information on our website, Charlotteudo.org, as well as on our website. We'll have a number of public common opportunities, as well as in-person and virtual meetings. I'll show a snapshot of those in the next slide.

We started a social media campaign. Please follow us on Instagram and Facebook. We'll be posting things there as updates occur and where our upcoming community meetings are. As I said earlier, the future drafts of the document will be red lined. So, you can see very clearly what has changed as we review the comments that we received. The UDO Advisory Committee will continue to serve to help talk through issues as they come up and help with making what future changes may occur in the document. So, this is just a quick snapshot, and this is a tentative schedule. We're still looking to add additional meetings to this. this is really even just through December is all that we could really fit on the screen, but a number of different in-person and virtual opportunities to meet with staff and ask questions and really just even inform and educate those that may not work in this ordinance from day to day. So, there's also a public website, public input.com/charlotteudo. That's where you can go and actually enter in comments that you have on the draft. So, please be sure to share that with your colleagues and with your constituents, that that's the best way to get feedback to the team.

So, just wanted to end here real quick with key UDO dates just to have on your screen, because I know the schedule that we provided, in the beginning, is very detailed. But as mentioned before, the draft came out on October 7th, if you weren't already aware, we'll start the economic analysis later this month, the first comment period will conclude on January 14th, and we'll take some time just to process those comments and talk through with staff, our consultant, as well as our Ordinance Advisory Committee and then issue the second draft out in early March. We'll go through another comment period in mid-April and in mid-May issue the third draft for public hearing. We'll go before City Council for a public hearing, as well as the Planning Committee who actually makes the recommendation to the Council, and then issue the fourth draft in July and look for Council decision in July. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. So is Laura and Chris.

Mayor Lyles said Alyson, if the staff will hold on, we've had two people that came online at 5:30 p.m. to speak with us at six o'clock and it's almost 7:30 p.m. So, what I'd like to do is actually have the two speakers that we have for the public forum who are really commenting on a Center City, 2040 Vision Plan. That's another one that we are still perusing and working on and then we'll come back, and I've got the following Councilmembers, Eggleston, Eiselt, and Newton to follow up for questions. But can we go to the people that have been waiting for a long time?

PUBLIC FORUM

ITEM NO. 7: PUBLIC FORUM

Center City 2040 Vision Plan

Martin Zimmerman, 1616 Bonnie Lane said thank you, Mayor, City Manager Jones, City Council, and others for the privilege of speaking with me tonight. Okay. I'm speaking in the context of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Climate Leaders Group and our efforts to encourage specific text changes to the Center City Vision Plan. I serve as a member of the Steering Committee of that group, along with June Blotnick of Clean Air, North Carolina, Steve Copulsky from the Sierra Club, Angela Gray from the West Side Coalition,

and last but not least [Inaudible] as many of you know, we're supposed to go to a Council consideration this month actually. I thank Julie Eiselt and others on the Transportation Planning and Environment Committee for asking the right kinds of questions to Michael Smith of Center City Partners. Carbon dioxide emissions are the central issue for climate leaders, but we also contend that it's tied to other critical aspects of Center City development and investment, including housing equity, energy conservation, tree canopy, and last but not least transportation. Parking of course is an integral part of the overall transportation picture. In May the Planning staff recommended parking maximums from uptown and parking in the South End. This idea is based on the premise that our urban core suffers from excessive parking, especially near the light rail stops. As some of you may know, the data tells us that for every 10 square feet of office space, another 6.7 is added for the privilege of parking on valuable, urban real estate. Mr. Smith's reaction, unfortunately, is that parking maximums would cause massive unintended consequences. He says I guarantee no developer comes to Charlotte to build excessive parking. This means we need to talk some more to Mr. Smith and the business community, and the Charlotte Climate Leaders intend to do just that. We especially invite the participation of Malcolm Graham on the City Council, who is a member of the Board of Directors. On that note, I defer to Eric Zaverl who'll speak in a little bit more detail about the parking maximum issues with respect to the UDO, especially. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

Center City 2040 Vision Plan

Eric Zaverl, 828 East. 36th Street said I work for Sustained Charlotte and also help with the Mecklenburg Climate Leaders. I'm speaking again on another plan. I know you have had a heavy load of plans tonight, but this is the vision plan draft for Center City, and as a quick reminder, I've served on the Moves Task Force and currently serve on the Ordinance Advisory Committee that you heard about from staff tonight. My work and my education have given me an understanding of the connections that happen between parking, transportation choices, and land use regulation zoning. The current wording that exists in the Center City Vision Plan draft in this section two, I won't get too much into details, but the main point of what I'm speaking about tonight is that wording needs to change. It says to eliminate parking minimums for new development. Once the region and the City has built out a more comprehensive transit system, consider establishing parking maximums. I'm changing this what I had written up a little bit because of what you've heard already tonight, but as you have already seen in the presentation from the staff, the tier three parking already includes parking maximums for the Uptown Center and a lot of the other centers that we have. And all we're asking for is the City Council and Center City Partners to keep parking in check and work on shared parking solutions to reduce the space that is devoted to parking, especially in Uptown, South End, and in areas like that. If we can get those maximums in place and that wording change in the plan, we absolutely support minimums being removed, they need to be removed from those areas. But that work would save millions of dollars that otherwise would go towards private parking garages in every new development. And that money could be saved and used for affordable housing and leases in those spaces that we so desperately need. So, I would also recommend a comprehensive parking plan for our centers, our regional centers, community centers, neighborhood centers, TODs, and other areas like their single-family housing, where it's adjacent to those centers. Having more public parking and less private parking with dynamic pricing and possible neighborhood parking permits in specific locations will go a long way to solving our parking problems. Because even in cities that have high residential densities already and great transit systems, ample parking encourages, more driving that would not occur without that easy, cheap parking. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said I believe that The Center City 2040 Plan is being discussed in Council Committee. I believe that it is not necessarily aligned with some of the thoughts that we believe around and that there's certainly a lot to be discussed and defined in what we were included and presented. So, we've got a lot of work to do, but that work will be done, and you'll certainly have an opportunity to engage and comment further. So, thank you very much for bringing it to our attention tonight.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE UPDATE CONTINUED

Councilmember Egleston said so, I don't know if this question is for Ms. Craig or Mr. Jaiyeoba but whoever wants to field it. Understanding that, and I'm glad we talked about the mapping and the UDO at the same time. It's obviously all part of one larger effort that was started with our Comprehensive Plan, or at least this portion of it was started with our Comprehensive Plan. The documents formally known as volumes two and three, which are now implementation strategies and Place Types Manual and metrics. With the fact that we've just put out a 600-page UDO and asked the community to dig into that and provide us feedback. And obviously, that's something that's going to take a lot of heavy lifting on anybody who wants to undertake that. Is there a need for us to simultaneously be trying to refine those documents, formally known as volumes two and three, or can we kind of narrow our focus to, obviously we know that the mapping has to take place before the final UDO can be put forward and adopted but, do we need to be doing the other documents at the same time as well or can we tell everyone to zero in on this UDO now?

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director said before Alyson pitches in, I'll say that yes, I would rather that our focus be on the Policy Map right now, that we are bringing to you in February for adoption, because that's really what informs the completion of the Unified Development Ordinance. What we previously referred to as volumes two and three, which is the implementation strategy, the manuals, and metrics, Council can take action on that at any point in time that you choose to. They do not impact the completion of the UDO as much as the Policy Map because I see where you're going with this. That allows the community to focus on the Policy Map, shaping that and the UDO, the 608 pages. I should quickly say that Alyson is probably the only person in this room who read the entire 608 pages already. So, it is possible. But I think that helps us to be able to narrow the focus of comments and engagement.

Mr. Egleston said I agree. I just think that there are so many organizations, we just heard from a couple, some of our biggest environmental advocates in the community. They're undoubtedly going to want to pour over this. I think asking people to try to be doing that and trying to provide feedback on three or four documents at once is probably not the best way to go forward. So now that we've got this draft of the UDO and the Policy Mapping and Place Type mapping that will inform it, I do hope we can signal to the community and to all of the stakeholders who want to engage in this process, engage in providing feedback and refining this Unified Development Ordinance that this is the focus now and the others can be set aside to some degree for the time being while we all work on this simultaneously.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, you also remember that we have two working groups that are meeting right now, the NEST and Equitable Development Commission. Well, they haven't started meeting, but they will. That time that you choose to take action on those two documents may align with their preliminary findings at some point so that the implementation strategy could incorporate some of those, which we don't know yet.

Councilmember Eiselt said just two questions. The Transportation Impact Study, how do you decide when it gets done, and can residents request that? I wouldn't think you'd do it for every single rezoning, but just some guidance on that.

Alyson Craig, Deputy Director Planning, Zoning & Development Department said right now, there's a threshold in place that's really managed by C-DOT. That is triggered in the rezoning process. Now also there's a requirement for TIS (traffic impact study) and TOD. And they're looking to expand that, the threshold how that would be applied, I think is still under discussion. C-DOT has a working group that they're with stakeholders that they're talking through some of those, and those decisions haven't been made yet. So, more information to come. I think at the retreat you'll get more info on that.

Ms. Eiselt said I'm glad to hear about it though. Thank you. Then my second question is trees. You know, we brought this up before that the replacement policy doesn't really

account for the loss of canopy, it's loss of the trunk. Is there any thought to expanding our Tree Protection Policies by saying that you've got to have Certified Arborists or, you know, just a little bit more control about who takes down trees and when?

Ms. Craig said yes, the ordinance does expand on that a good bit. So, there's now, Laura mentioned a heritage tree requirement, and so trees of a certain size will need to go through a permit process to be taken down. So, that's a pretty big step. We're also talking about street trees in residential areas, so infill areas, and that's not an area that we've really ever have delved into in terms of regulations. So, there's some expansion there as well. But I also wanted to mention too, that Laura said the tree save has been updated and modified, it's now a green area. So, there'll be different ways in which you can accomplish that. There'll be sort of a table with multipliers. If you preserve the existing canopy, then that multiplier for your tree-save, which is now called green area is enhanced. So, there are things also in the ordinance that help incentivize people for doing that.

Ms. Eiselt said okay. Thank you. I think that scenario we need to look at more carefully, so I'm glad to hear that that's part of this process. Thank you.

Councilmember Newton said I had a bit of clarification regarding the Neighborhood Character Overlay. I think you might have presented that Chris or maybe you, Laura. So, it's my understanding that the Neighborhood Character Overlay only pertains to design for lot specifications and criteria, is that correct? I guess more specifically not to density, not to unit density. Is that correct?

Ms. Craig said that's correct, but I'll let Chris expand on that.

Chris Jennette, UDO said oh yes, essentially, it allows you to modify dimensional standards, not uses that are permitted.

Mr. Newton said I just wanted to point that out and draw the clarification because I think that there are folks within the community certainly over the course of the process of us discussing the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. There are folks in the community that believed that that would or otherwise assume frankly, that that would apply to unit density and create the ability to block higher density, more specifically duplexes and triplexes in their neighborhoods. I just wanted to point out that that's not the case with the Neighborhood Character Overlay. There was discussion, maybe some assumption that we would have a possible flood of applications for Neighborhood Overlay consideration. I don't know if that still might happen, but I would assume that it might be upon the mistaken belief that this would be some mechanism to prevent duplex triplex development or higher density, more units within a neighborhood. I just wanted to point that out, maybe more clarifying for the general public too in community meetings. That's all I have.

Councilmember Driggs said Ms. Harmon you mentioned the density bonus in there, and we talked about this in the Committee meeting. We have had a density bonus for a long time and essentially it doesn't seem that anybody ever uses it. So, I'm wondering if the idea for the density bonus now is being discussed with developers in order to have an informed view about what is worth putting in place in the hopes of actually getting somebody to respond to it.

Laura Harmon, Project Manager said sure, thank you, Councilman Driggs. We will be following up with affordable housing developers with the new provisions. We think that this relaxes some of the requirements that may have been keeping people from using the previous density bonus, but we are going to also do some follow-up with the folks who are most likely to use this to see if they agree with us or not. Or if there are other adjustments that they recommend.

Mr. Driggs said right. I think it could be a valuable tool to try to kind of broaden the scope for affordable development. Frankly, if we can interest ordinary market price developers in it, and they are thoughtful about models, maybe working in conjunction with one of the affordable housing developers for improving their own project by availing themselves of

this feature. So, I just hope we'll be very market-driven about that. You talked about trees and I'm wondering if the economic impact study is going to establish what the cost is on housing prices of any requirements we may impose related to trees. I bring this up because I believe the tough question about trees is that we haven't done enough so far, but we're not going to be able, without limit, to just sort of impose a lot of new requirements on trees without working against our other purpose. So, are we going to have good data about how anything we propose to do with trees will affect the cost of housing?

Ms. Craig said I would imagine that that will be part of the discussion with the stakeholder group when we get to the economic impact analysis. I will add too that one of the things that we'll discuss is that there will be some just flexibility in how you meet the tree requirements. So, I think that that may help on the cost side of things, but if that's brought forward as an item from the stakeholder group, we'll certainly include that. I also wanted to mention too, on the density bonus for affordability that there used to be some geographic limitations that have now been removed. I presented this just in highlights of the UDO to a group of developers earlier today, and that was received quite well with some interest. So, look forward to having further discussions about how that can be a tool to help bring more affordable housing to the community.

Mr. Driggs said great because I think that's potentially a powerful tool and we just have to get real about what incentives are actually going to cause some of these responses we're hoping for it. My last comment is I'm really happy to hear you talk about traffic studies. And I can tell you that this is one area that people in my district are looking for any evidence that will approach development on Providence road, for example, differently, which looks to a lot of people to be sort of out of control. Like we keep approving things one at a time, there's, a huge queue of potential additional development there. So, I hope as we modify our traffic study requirements, that that modification will include being a little more sensitive to a big picture situation or to developments that are already underway but haven't yet contributed to the data. So, that as we consider new ones, we've got a more context and we're looking further into the future. That's just a comment though. I appreciate that we're working on the traffic study. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said to follow up on Mr. Driggs' comments about the cost of some of these enhancements in terms of preserving our tree canopy. While we are looking at the cost, let's also look at the cost of not doing it. Especially as Tree Charlotte had done a report on what is the cost and what is actual economic savings because of the [inaudible] canopy we have in terms of overheating and so on. So, if you can also look at that, I think that would be important. So, we are looking at both sides. I think preserving and protecting our tree canopy is so important as we are growing at such a fast pace. We are losing a lot of our natural resources. I have a question around our tree preservation fund. Are there any changes to that?

Ms. Craig said I would probably prefer to refer to Tim on details of that and we are bringing this item to the Council Retreat. I think there are more ways in which it can be funded, but it's really intended for tree preservation. But we'll get into that subject in greater detail at the Council Retreat.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. Looking forward to that. Also, there were some concerns that were raised by our speakers, Martin and Eric around the parking, especially in our uptown area. Could staff respond to those concerns that have been raised as well?

Ms. Craig said sure. So, I think there are some questions about aligning the Center City Plan with the UDO and, you know, those are certainly conversations that we can have. I believe Eric mentioned that as well as Martin. So, we believe that in the uptown area, that's one of our denser areas, that having some limitations as to how much parking is there will really help promote a more pedestrian environment. So, I think that's really the best approach. And as far as public versus private types of parking arrangements, I think that's just a broader city discussion. Not something really that the UDO would speak to, but if you have a specific question about that, let us know.

Councilmember Watlington said I just had a couple of quick questions or comments rather. The first one was in regard to the residential infield development work. I saw something on there that I know we've talked about a couple of times in other areas as it relates to housing neighborhood services and even speeds humps. I see 51% of property owners versus 51% of the residents. I just want to call out there, I hope we can do something a little bit different there because the areas that are most vulnerable to displacement are also high non-owner occupant property owners. So, it's extremely difficult to get historic designations or even like I said, a speed hump because the requirements currently say property owners versus the residents. So, I just wanted to call out here in this space, I hope that we can do something different here. The other question I had was, as it relates to parking minimums. We've established that we are a car-oriented City. So, as we think about people traveling from one area in their cars to these places where we're talking about not having parking minimums, how are we thinking about that, where are the people leaving their cars if they needed it to get to the general area?

Ms. Craig said so, I'm going to see if Chris can answer those questions on the parking, and then I can follow up.

Mr. Jennette said yes, I'm sorry. Can you just repeat, I just had a little bit of trouble hearing you at the end there?

Ms. Watlington said my question is in regard to the tiered parking requirements and how there are certain areas that will not have parking minimums at all. How does that jive with us knowing that we are a car-oriented City? Where are we expecting these people to leave their cars that they left their houses in? Is the idea that there are some community parking spaces?

Mr. Jennette said there's a fundamental difference between eliminating a parking minimum and saying that someone can't provide parking. Understanding that not having required parking doesn't mean not allowing parking. So, essentially what we're saying is that the city, you know, in these areas where parking minimums are being removed is that the city is no longer in the business of telling you exactly how much parking to provide. So, we're not saying you can't provide parking. If there's a parking maximum in place, you can provide as much parking as you want up to that maximum. The idea is, you know, that if you're in area that has ample parking on street or community parking, you might provide less as a result of that. And in the areas where parking minimums don't apply, it's essentially letting these businesses determine what they think is the right amount of parking for them.

Ms. Watlington said that's what I'm concerned about. Because oftentimes businesses are going to say, well, the right amount of parking for me is zero. So, I don't have to pay for putting down a parking lot. So that's just a call out there. I'm not comfortable with not having anything, because if everybody chooses to not provide any parking, we're going to have a whole lot more street parking and it's going to be going into our neighborhoods. I think you've already spoken to that once before. What does that look like as a whole?

Ms. Craig said If I could just jump in and say in sort of that tier three, that there are parking minimums may be applied though in certain uses that are adjacent to N-1 neighborhoods, just to recognize that there may be a conflict there. So, that's where those parking minimums may actually then occur.

Mr. Jennette said thanks, Alyson. I had mentioned, I think when I was talking about no parking minimums in tier three. There are parking minimums for certain uses when within 200 feet of a neighborhood - Place Type. And that's basically where you'd see minimums apply within tier three.

Ms. Watlington said the last thing is I just want to make sure I'm clear about the additional volumes. I know that we talked about separating them on purpose earlier this year. So, I just want to make sure I understand how that's intended to roll out?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the two volumes of the implementation strategy and the manners and metrics, how they align with the Unified Development Ordinance?

Ms. Watlington said Yes, I just want to understand. I know that the conversation earlier this year was let's separate adoption to make sure that everybody's comfortable. So, as I hear, we want to put them aside from, well, suggested that maybe we focus on this. I just want to make sure I understand if we were to do that, what would that look like?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said It actually doesn't have any implication at all on the Unified Development Ordinance in terms of alignment. I think if you look at those two documents, the manuals and metrics really have where you have your Place Types, which is what the current 2040 Policy-Map work is based off of. Then in your implementation strategy, that's where you have your Anti-Displacement Commission. That's where you have the community benefits, toolkit, discussion, and the equity redevelopment of commission as well as things related to community area planning efforts, as well as CIP (Capital Investment Plan) discussions. So, they really don't have any direct bearing on the outcome of the UDO.

Ms. Watlington said so, what I'm hearing is essentially we've moved forward with what was in there, anyway?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said what matters to Council and to the staff is the adoption of this Policy Map because that's what's going to allow the Unified Development Ordinance to be completed in the summer of next year.

Ms. Watlington said I get that part, but also what concerns me is that it sounds like the key components of the implementation or strategy and the other volume we're doing anyway, which feels like a departure from what we said we wanted to do in the first place. Just a call out.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I hear you. Yes, maybe the keyword there is implementation, and we may be defining it differently. Implementation with the Unified Development Ordinances as related to the regulations and the ordinances. Not everything, in fact, in those two documents have much to do with those regulations and ordinances. But I hear you.

Councilmember Phipps said with respect to Neighborhood Character Overlay, is that a fairly new concept that we have?

Ms. Craig said that's a new concept for Charlotte.

Mr. Phipps said okay, because I can recall and piggyback off of what Councilmember Newton was suggesting that, I mean, you could use this as a proxy to limit or prohibit certain construction in neighborhoods. Like he mentioned duplexes or triplexes. I can recall an effort several years ago where it was a movement afoot to try to limit tiny homes from being a part of a certain neighborhood. So, is there a category that we have for tiny homes? Is that in the cottage? Would that be in the cottage overlay?

Ms. Craig said it is. Chris, if Chris or Laura could speak to that.

Mr. Jennette said yes, we don't specifically prohibit any type of dwelling unit based on the square footage in any district, if you wanted to build a small home and you could meet the standards, we're okay with that. What we've done is we've created a cottage court overlay, which basically allows for the creation of smaller units on smaller lots. I won't go into all the detail because it may take a while talking about it, but it essentially allows you to develop smaller units on smaller lots with a series of sort of site design-based criteria. So, they need to be organized around an open space. They can have common parking, they can have sort of common areas like kitchens, recreation spaces for the residents. It's really designed to try and get at that form of development. There's also an incentive in there. If you're providing actual smaller units, you're not building larger houses in sort of a cottage court orientation, but you're actually providing a smaller footprint, smaller

square footage units. You can actually get a little bit of a bonus in terms of your cottage court development there too.

Mr. Phipps said so, another question I have is could you have competing overlay districts in a neighborhood or you can only have one overlay district at a time? My concern is, for example, you showed the picture there in the residential infill overlay that appeared to be a duplex towering over a single-family home. I really can't imagine that that would promote or enhance a person's perception of a Neighborhood Character Overlay with that bigger structure over the top of the single-family unit there. So, can you have competing overlay districts, or would you just have to have one and done? You just can't have multiple overlay districts?

Ms. Craig said the Neighborhood Character, Historic District, Residential Infill Overlay, you would not apply multiples of those. You could conceivably have a Residential Infill Overlay and an Airport Noise Overlay, but with respect to the residential overlays, you would not be applying more than one. Chris, is that the way you see it?

Mr. Jennette said yes, that's definitely the way that I see it. I mean, they all serve sort of discreet purposes. Just to speak quickly too, I think the image that you were talking about was the Residential Infill Overlay. I think that that was really intended to show that those are a series of standards that would base something like height, off of the height of the adjacent unit. So, you might not see something sort of so out of context, because the maximum sidewall height's going to be based on the adjacent unit. So, a new house isn't going to be able to come in and tower over its neighbors the same way.

Councilmember Winston said I have a series of questions. I have not been able to read all 608 pages like Ms. Craig has, but I have perused every section. So, I'll ask all my questions and we can determine if you want to answer some of them now or all of them later, I guess. Looking in Section 12.4 under the Regional Activity Center Uptown Core Zoning District. Very interesting that Uptown Core Zoning District by right has a maximum build height that is unlimited. I know during the Comp 2040 Plan, we were discussing kind of the opposite of having unlimited, putting a maximum height, and then considering ways to go above and beyond that. So, I'd just like to know a little bit about the kind of philosophy, how we got to an unlimited height by right. Not necessarily saying I'm for against it but want to know the train of thought and how we got there.

I do see as well in the TOD you see, there is an unlimited maximum height that can be achieved using the bonus again, that's different than it being by right in the urban core. Just for colleagues and citizens out there, I knew that a Neighborhood Character Overlay district would be something of interest as we did talk about it a lot. I definitely suggest reading up on section 14.2. It pretty clearly defines what the Neighborhood Character Overlay district is, what it is, and you can infer what it is not. It really does guide pretty specifically on how to achieve and how we might, as a Council and the staff kind of sus through all of those applications that I'm sure we will see at some point in time.

I did want to touch on the height bonus table in 16.1 in the General Development Zoning Standards, specifically as it relates to transportation and enhanced micro-mobility facility bonuses that developers might achieve. I would question as to whether or not these transportation and micro-mobility bonuses are as creative as we can get, especially in relationship to our desires to create mobility hubs and transportation hubs that are going to be forthcoming in the future TMN (Transformational Mobility Network) but also as what is stated in the Comprehensive 2040 Plan. Is there something that relates to kind of this disruptive nature of transportation infrastructure that is emerging right now? I see no kind of mention of charging stations or improved connectivity as we look to smart transportation options and transportation as service options. Wondering if we can just get a bit more creative in those bonuses as what is on the paper right now. You know, such as options of dedicating future transit right-a-ways, along transit corridors, that's something that we already do and doesn't seem necessarily very innovative for the time period that we are kind of going into and in relation to the other plans that we either already have or are developing.

Article 17.1 states that accessory structures are permitted in all zoning districts. I think that's a great thing. I would ask the staff if we could consider or find a way to provide stock plans for ADUs (Affordable Dwelling Units) in the UDO. I believe as recently as the past week or two, I believe there was a city in North Carolina that has provided the public with the ability to shop those stock plans of ADUs. Again, these ADUs are units, granny flats or sometimes they're referred to, that all people can build but not necessarily everybody looks at themselves as a developer or has a development team that would need to do the types of due diligence to design these types of products. If we could provide an affordable kind of portfolio of options, I think that could go a long way in achieving the goals that we have for getting and seeing more of these ADUs develop in all parts of town.

Article 19, Taiwo knows he's ready for this one. I've heard that this three-tiered parking system at least one of them tier-three has no minimums, but I don't see that in the text. Tier three literally says the first sentence is a minimum number of off-street parking spaces are required for a limited number of uses and locations. I would like to see an option that provides a tier that provides literally no parking minimums. I was having a conversation today; I understand the idea and the intent of maximums, but I would even like us to kind of see what we can do for modeling. Why are minimums and maximums even necessary? I'm not totally sure why. If the market, especially again, as we are at the beginning of a very disruptive time in transportation infrastructure, while the market and this is the first year of the Comp 2040 Plan, might decide that it wants personal vehicle parking as part of developments, that's not necessarily the case 10, 15 years from now. So, I hope we don't handcuff ourselves with maximums. But I hope that we also don't handcuff ourselves with not presenting an option that does clearly take minimums off the table. So, I have a note on 19.3, section F, spaces exempt, from parking maximums. So, here is where I found in the UDO where we do put an incentive onto developers for electrical vehicle charging stations that's in 19-F, line two. So again, when I'm thinking of more imaginative bonuses for height, I'm wondering since we put this electrical vehicle charging station, this type of future transportation infrastructure in another bonus section, why is this not something that we can include in the height bonuses that we have.

Flipping forward to Section 19.6. Single-family dwelling units. It says basically this is the section that requires parking for single-family dwelling units. I know one of the slides said that Charlotte has grown in the 20th century to be dependent on the single-occupancy vehicle. I would add to that description personal vehicles with combustion engines. We know that the future of transportation is going to be electric. But it seems like here we are regulating the infrastructure around the parking for a combustion engine, right? Are we able to require EV (Electric Vehicle) charging capabilities in single-family zoning dwellings? If we do have the capability of regulating certain types of parking infrastructure for the current conditions, do we have the ability to regulate for the future of transportation? Again, if we're thinking about electrification of the grid and services, if people are not able to charge their vehicles at home, then they won't necessarily be able to purchase the future of personal vehicles. So, it doesn't matter what type of public infrastructure is out there. If folks are not again, we think of the digital divide today, think of the electrical divide of tomorrow where some people, because they live in certain zip codes, won't be able to participate fully in society access points, in this point personal electrical vehicle requirement. So hopefully, that's not a blind spot in this UDO, if we can regulate that. I think we should, especially since, again, since we are already regulating infrastructure around combustion engines.

Section 19.7; I like the inclusion visually of plants on the drawing as being cover on parking structures. It looks like we are pushing the inclusion of green infrastructure. But where I see this picture, I couldn't really find where exactly we are providing different regulatory options for the use of green infrastructure on roofs or siding, doing things differently. So again, if we can do that offline where you can kind of go through that section to see what is there is actually new. But I do appreciate seeing it in the illustrations. Article 25 Post-construction Stormwater Regulations. I do believe this is the section that could be affected by proposed legislation that is currently in the general assembly. I'd like to know more about what we are proposing here and the potential conflicts that may arise should the General Assembly and Governor make new laws there. I think I only have two more things. Oh, maybe one more thing. Just a note that I had for myself. So, 33.5 in

relation to CATS, bus stops, amenities, design, and design standards. My question is where in city policy do we as City Council actually deal with the actual CATS, bus stop, amenity design standards? Is that something that we can work on? Again, something that's has been an issue over my time on the Council of, you know, not having a cover, not having pads, bus stops being put in the middle of fields, or not places that are accessible. I'm wondering if, is that somewhere in the UDO that regulates this, or if not, where does the Council have the ability to kind of dive into those standards? With that, those are all my questions from this first draft of the UDO.

Mayor Lyles said let's just get those questions back in a written format so that everybody can hear them or read them and remember them probably is a better way of saying that.

Mr. Winston said well, with that said if you need me to repeat or send it, does the staff have all of those questions?

Mayor Lyles said it's on video and I've been writing them down.

Ms. Craig said yes, we have as well.

Mr. Winston said well if there's anything off the top that the staff does want to respond to please feel free. If there's something in there that, you know, would be for the good of the order, please feel free.

Ms. Craig said thank you. We can follow up and provide written comments on everything so that everyone can see it.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION

There was no closed session

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 11: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE THE ALLEYWAY OFF EAST KINGSTON AVENUE AND SOUTH BOULEVARD

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on the issue to close the alleyway off East Kingston Avenue and South Boulevard, and (B) Adopt a resolution and close the alleyway off East Kingston Avenue and South Boulevard.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 226-229.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE THE ALLEYWAY OFF MORNINGSIDE DRIVE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against a motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on the issue to close the alleyway off Morningside Drive, and (B) Adopt a resolution and close the alleyway off Morningside Drive.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Page(s) 230-232.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 13: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

There was no City Manager's Report.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 14: AMEND THE CHARLOTTE REGIONAL WORKFORCE CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT AND CONTRACT SERVICES FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) adopt a resolution approving the second amended and restated Charlotte Regional Workforce Consortium Agreement to designate Charlotte Works as the local fiscal agent, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a contract with Charlotte Works for performance management.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Pages 233-237.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE W.T. HARRIS BOULEVARD MULTI-USE PATH PROJECT FROM NORTH TRYON STREET TO JW CLAY BOULEVARD

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to accept Surface Transportation Block Grant funds in the amount of \$997,000 for the W.T. Harris Boulevard multi-use path project from North Tryon Street to JW Clay Boulevard, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 155-X appropriating \$997,000 in Surface Transportation Block Grant funds from the North Carolina Department of Transportation for engineering, right-of-way, and construction of the W.T. Harris Boulevard multi-use path project from North Tryon Street to JW Clay Boulevard to the General Capital Projects Fund.

Councilmember Egleston said I was asked today, and I couldn't answer, so, I don't know if Ms. Babson or somebody, how do we define what a multi-use path is and how it's different from a sidewalk or Greenway or something else of that nature? I couldn't tell then, so I was wondering if she could tell us?

Liz Babson, Transportation Director said yes, ma'am good evening, Mayor and Council. Mr. Egleston, a multi-use path is typically about 12-feet wide, and it allows for both pedestrians and cyclists to use that facility.

Mr. Egleston said so more like a Greenway, but maybe closer to the road?

Ms. Babson said yes, so the multi-use path is sort of the bicycle side pedestrian version of what you would see in a greenway that runs alongside the road.

Councilmember Phipps said would that be constructed with asphalt or cement?

Ms. Babson said we typically construct those with concrete because we've done a lot of cost analysis to determine that the long-term maintenance of the concrete is a better investment.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Pages 238-238W.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 64, at Page(s) 408.

ITEM NO. 16: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE W.T. HARRIS BOULEVARD MULTI-USE PATH PROJECT FROM THE PLAZA TO GRIER ROAD

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to accept Surface Transportation Block Grant funds in the amount of \$1,229,000 for the W.T. Harris Boulevard multi-use path project from The Plaza to Grier Road, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 156-X appropriating \$1,229,000 in Surface Transportation Block Grant funds from the North Carolina Department of Transportation for engineering, right-of-way, and construction of the W.T. Harris Boulevard multi-use path project from The Plaza to Grier Road to the General Capital Projects Fund.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Pages 239-239X.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 64, at Page(s) 409.

ITEM NO. 17: SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTIES ON ISENHOUR STREET

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution approving the sale of three vacant City-owned properties located at 3221 Isenhour Street, 1005 Patch Avenue, and Wainwright Avenue (Parcel Identification Numbers 077-192-12, 077-192-13, and 077-192-21) to JCB Urban Company for \$90,000; and (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete the sale of the properties.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Pages 240-241.

ITEM NO. 18: AMEND RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS FOR PROPERTY ON PARKWOOD AVENUE

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt and carried unanimously to (A) Approve an amendment to the restrictive covenants on property located at 1621 and 1623 Parkwood Avenue (Parcel Identification Numbers 083-137-12 and 083-137-13) to extend the timeframe for completion of development on said property and modify the scope of permissible development to include a single-family residence and duplex, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to execute all documents necessary to amend the restrictive covenants on property located at 1621 and 1623 Parkwood Avenue.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: AMEND THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY OF CABARRUS COUNTY

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs to adopt a resolution ratifying an amendment to the interlocal agreement with the Water and Sewer Authority of Cabarrus County to implement and jointly fund the Lower Rocky River Pump Station Expansion project.

Councilmember Egleston said I understand that there are people in this part of East Charlotte who have currently no guarantee of the sewer capacity that they are needing for things that are being developed in that area right now. So, I'm trying to understand if we ratify this inter-local agreement, what leverage we have with Cabarrus County to make sure that we're getting the capacity we need, and when we might be able to assure the folks who currently right now have no assurance of that capacity that it's coming.

Mayor Lyles said is its geography?

Mr. Egleston said yes. I think Ms. Charles could probably speak to it better than I can, but I heard from several people on this particular item that this is becoming a pretty well-known problem in that area of town for any new development that needs to tap into the sewer system.

Angela Charles, Director of Charlotte Water said sure, and I just want to show you the location. I want to begin with the big picture, as a regional utility, Charlotte Water has several agreements with jurisdictions who are adjacent to our county. If you look at this map, the blue arrows represent water that we sell to neighboring jurisdictions and the green arrows represent wastewater service coming into our utility. If you look to the East, there should be a green arrow. I can't see it here, but a green pointing to the Rocky River Plant which is in Cabarrus County. What we do is water flows downhill. As we have developed in this county, we do have a portion of our service area that is served by WSACC (Water and Sewer Authority of Cabarrus County), it is more economical for us to have water go by gravity than to pump it over the ridge to one of our facilities in part, only part, small parts of Eastern Mecklenburg county and parts of the small towns.

If you go to the next slide. So, this represents, Councilmember, Egleston, and members of Council, this is the map that we send in the update in September. But you'll see the part of the Mecklenburg County service area that are served by WSACC. It's 6% of the City of Charlotte and that's by landmass, 14% of Huntersville, and their ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction). The same thing with Cornelius and Davidson is mostly impacted. But if you look at the kind of gold lines there, that represents our trunk lines actually flowing to the Cabarrus County. So, what have we done? The first thing is we have validated capacity records with WSACC. We have an agreement for 6 million gallons a day for wastewater. We're their customer. We've been notified that we are close to that threshold, and we've been working with them on this threshold. Also, we have from NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality), when we're doing our calculations, we use a number of 60 gallons per day per household. Because we are discharged to Cabarrus County, we're having to use 120 gallons. What we're trying to do is use 60 to help with that capacity. We've done lots of evaluations in the sewer system.

Tonight, you have before you, the agreement with WSACC, we're also communicating with the town managers.

Noted on here is a pump station and we are proposing and what we are initiating is a pump station in the Northern part of our service area to also help this area. What we are doing is we're saying we need to support with the pump station that we are building. That's not on the agenda tonight, but it will be forthcoming. There are other ways to serve development in the interim, and that would be private lift stations. We're asking folks to contact us; communication is the key. Now the expansion to Cabarrus County is slated for 2024. In the meantime, what we're doing is we are evaluating capacity requests in that area. So that's it. I know that was kind of long.

Mr. Egleston said yeah, I think that helps understand the challenge. I can appreciate the need for patience. I guess there'd probably be more patience from the folks who have this uncertainty if there were some sense that you know, what we're doing tonight, or what we're going to be asked to do with the new pump station is going to happen in a timely manner that it's going to enable us to actually address the challenge that we have in front of us and we have some level of confidence that they will get the capacity they need, which they don't currently have any assurances of.

Ms. Charles said they will eventually get it. Yes. The action tonight is the first step in increasing the capacity. We've asked, and I forgot that in my explanation, we've asked for an additional 3 million gallons a day from WSACC, they're doing it a seven and a half million-gallon expansion to their Wastewater Treatment Plant, we've asked for three. The first action is to increase the capacity of this influent pump station. Your action tonight will help with that. Again, they are estimating it's going to be 2024 before their expansion is completed. The pump station that I mentioned that will be in Mecklenburg County, we are estimating we'll be done in a couple of years, that will provide much relief for folks who are impacted. But what we're doing is we're evaluating the capacity requests. We're working with developers in that small area on phasing such, you know, that we can use the capacity we have left in the best manner possible.

Mr. Egleston said but when you're talking about those two timelines, which are over multiple years, that's not implying that that's the timeline for folks who are asking for capacity now to receive it.

Ms. Charles said it just depends on the project. Now we do have, in the previous map, we have about 34 projects in process. Typically, the developers come to us 18 months ahead of time, sometimes two years, sometimes a year. It just depends on the project.

Mr. Egleston said okay, well, if this is something you can do, it sounds like you're in good contact with the people who have the need out in this part of east Charlotte. So, I'd ask that that continues and that we be kept up to speed on it too. I think one of the things I've heard from people who are very concerned about this is that historically Charlotte Water has been so good about ever running into these sort of challenges that I guess this has caught them off guard. I think this happens much more frequently in other communities than it has ever been occurring here. So that's a compliment to how the great work that Charlotte Water is doing. But I think it caught a lot of people off guard that we found ourselves in this position.

Ms. Charles said yes, I really appreciate that comment Councilmember Egleston. And again, what is unique here is that we are a customer of another utility. Their planning process is different than our planning process. That's one of the reasons we looked at our infrastructure and said, what can we do within our county to help provide relief and use our infrastructure and the Clarke Creek Pump Station, and I don't want to get into all the details, is an action coming in a future before this Council, because we want to go ahead and get that started.

Councilmember Phipps said yeah, given the timeline that you described for these facilities to be online, we're not talking about a moratorium on development, are we?

Ms. Charles said we hope not. The way we are, we're looking at it is a slowing and what we're asking developers to do, especially if it's a new request to pace their development along with our CIP project. So, it's similar to what we did in South End, and I don't know whether you remember, but there was this narrative out there, Charlotte Water is having an issue with capacity. We said, no, that's not the case. We've got some infrastructure improvements that we need to make to address it. There's a similar situation here in that, there are some improvements that will need to be made. We're going in, and some of it is paper capacity versus what's in the field. We are going in and verifying our capacity records to ensure that we've got all of the capacity accounted for accurately. What I mean by that, sometimes a developer approaches us, and let's say we allocate a thousand gallons a day. He builds his houses and he only uses 800 that we have another 200 on the books and we can give to someone else. We don't want to use the M-word yet, but it is a slowing in certain parts, and we want to prioritize the request until we get all of the infrastructure improvements made.

Councilmember Johnson said I was just going to ask, and this is probably already planned. If Council can get a detailed presentation from Charlotte Water, give us information about what area is impacted right now and what the future plans are for the other areas. I wanted to hear more about this.

Ms. Charles said sure.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Ms. Charles said we can certainly do that. Again, for City of Charlotte Proper, when you look at the total landmass is only 6%. It mainly impacts portions of the small towns in North Mecklenburg, Davidson, Huntersville, and Cornelius.

Councilmember Ajmera said I just had a call with Ms. Charles last week about a similar concern that was raised by a developer and at the same time, I've heard from a couple of developers where they have said great things about Charlotte Water and our investment in our infrastructure, and just the forward-thinking leadership that we have. So, while we are talking about the capacity increase, I just want us to keep that in mind that in our region Charlotte Water is certainly known for forward-thinking and increasing our capacity ahead of time to address future needs. So, Ms. Charles, thank you for your leadership. I certainly enjoyed our conversation last week and learned a little bit more every day from you. Thank you.

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

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Pages 242-243.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: MECKLENBURG SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT GRANT MATCHING AGREEMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution ratifying a grant matching agreement with the Mecklenburg Soil and Water Conservation District.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 52, at Pages 244.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: CORRECTION TO 401(K) CONTRIBUTIONS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve payment to Prudential Retirement to correct employer contributions for vacation payout to certain individual 401(k) account participants, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 157-X appropriating \$1,018,357 from the Risk Management Loss Fund's Fund Balance to the Risk Management Loss

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 64, at Page(s) 410.

ITEM NO. 22: AMEND THE 2021 CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Phipps, and carried unanimously to approve amendments to the 2021 City Council Regular and Budget Meeting Schedule.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Lyles explained the rules and procedures of the appointment process.

ITEM NO. 23: APPOINTMENTS TO THE ARTS AND CULTURE ADVISORY BOARD

The following nominees were considered for four appointments for three-year terms beginning October 1, 2021 and ending September 30, 2024.

- Carla Aaron Lopez, nominated by Councilmember Graham and Winston.
- Debbie Abels, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Phipps.
- Amy Aussieker, nominated by Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, and Phipps.
- Lauren Batten, nominated by Councilmembers Eiselt and Johnson.
- David Butler, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, Graham, and Winston.
- Aisha Dew, nominated by Councilmembers Egleston, Graham, and Newton.
- Davita Galloway, nominated by Councilmembers Egleston, Johnson, and Watlington.
- Marcie Kelso, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Winston.
- Timothy Miner, nominated by Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Eiselt, and Winston.
- Brook Muller, nominated by Councilmembers Egleston, Johnson, Phipps, and Watlington.
- Cyndee Patterson, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Graham, and Watlington.
- Kevin Patterson, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, and Watlington.
- Beth Quartapella, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Eiselt.

Results of the first ballot were recorded as follows:

- Carla Aaron-Lopez, 7 - votes Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, and Winston.
- Amy Aussieker, 4 votes – Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston and Phipps.
- David Butler, 2 votes – Councilmembers Eiselt and Winston.
- Aisha Dew, 6 votes - Councilmembers Ajmera, Egleston, Graham, Johnson, Newton, and Watlington.
- David Galloway, 5 votes – Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, Johnson, Newton and Watlington.
- Marcie Kelso, 2 votes – Councilmembers Ajmera and Winston.
- Timothy Miner, 6 - votes Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Eiselt, Phipps, and Winston.
- Brook Muller, 4 votes – Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, Johnson and Phipps.

- Kevin Patterson, 6 - votes Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, and Watlington.

Mayor Lyles said I also spoke with Michael Marsicano today. He wanted me to share that the Foundation Board of Directors will discuss the selection of the private sector appointment on November 15th at their Board Meeting. He did not say that they were going to vote on them that day, but he did say that they would be having their discussion about their selection on that day and he just wanted me to pass that along to the Councilmembers.

Carla Aaron-Lopez, Aisha Dew, Timothy Miner, and Kevin Patterson were appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 24: APPOINTMENTS CHARLOTTE EQUITABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

The following nominees were considered for six appointments for three-year terms beginning October 1, 2021 and ending September 30, 2024.

- Robert Aulebach, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, and Watlington.
- Blake Bickmore, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, and Phipps.
- Jordan Brooks-Adams, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.
- Angela Carlson, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Graham, and Phipps.
- Deborah Dryden, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Newton.
- Leslie Jones, nominated by Councilmembers Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.
- Alison Lee, nominated by Councilmember Johnson and Watlington.
- Mattie Marshall, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, and Newton.
- Meko McCarthy, nominated by Councilmembers Egleston and Newton.
- Dan Melvin, nominated by Councilmembers Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.
- Carolyn Millen, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, and Newton.
- Marjorie Molina, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Egleston, and Newton.
- Kevin Poirier, nominated by Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, Graham, and Johnson.
- Ismaail Qaiyim, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Eiselt, and Winston.
- Richard Saltrick, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.
- Rebekah Whilden, nominated by Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, and Johnson.

Results of the first ballot were recorded as follows:

- Robert Aulebach, 3 votes – Councilmembers Driggs, Johnson and Watlington.
- Blake Bickmore, 2 votes – Councilmembers Eiselt and Phipps.
- Jordan Brooks-Adams, 6 - votes, Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Johnson, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.
- Angela Carlson, 2 votes – Councilmembers Driggs and Phipps.
- Deborah Dryden, 3 votes – Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs and Newton.
- Leslie Jones, 5 votes – Councilmembers Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington and Winston.
- Allison Lee, 1 votes – Councilmember Johnson.
- Mattie Marshall, 7 - votes, Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson, Newton, and Watlington.
- Meko McCarthy, 4 votes – Councilmembers Egleston, Eiselt, Newton and Winston
- Dan Melvin, 2 votes – Councilmembers Phipps and Winston.

- Carolyn Millen, 5 votes- Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt and Newton.
- Marjorie Molina, 4 votes – Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston and Newton.
- Kevin Poirier, 3 votes – Councilmembers Ajmera, Egleston, and Graham.
- Ismaail Qaiyim 5 votes - Councilmembers Ajmera, Eiselt, Johnson, Newton and Winston.
- Richard Saltrick, 4 votes – Councilmembers Driggs, Phipps, Watlington and Winston.
- Rebekah Whilden, 3 votes – Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston and Eiselt.

After run-off ballot:

- Carolyn Millen, 7 - votes on by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Newton, Phipps, and Watlington.
- Marjorie Molina, 7 - votes on by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson, Newton, and Winston.
- Ismaail Qaiyim, 6 - votes on by Councilmembers Ajmera, Eiselt, Johnson, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

The below applicants received less than six (6) Council votes resulting in a third vote to break the tie.

- Leslie Jones, 5 - votes by Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, and Watlington.
- Richard Saltrick, 5 - votes Councilmembers Egleston, Johnson, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Phipps to appoint Richard Saltrick.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, and Newton.

Jordan Brooks-Adams, Mattie Marshall, Carolyn Millen, Marjorie Molina, Ismaail Qaiyim, and Richard Saltrick were appointed.

ITEM NO. 25: APPOINTMENTS TO THE CHARLOTTE NEIGHBORHOOD EQUITY AND STABILIZATION COMMISSION (CHARLOTTE’S NEST)

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term for a Housing Advocates beginning October 1, 2021 and ending September 30, 2024.

- Kimberly Timmons-Hampton, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Phipps.

Results of the ballot were recorded as follows:

- Kimberly Timmons-Hampton, 10 - votes on by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Kimberly Timmons-Hampton was appointed.

The following nominations were made for two appointments for three-year terms for Neighborhood Leaders or Community Organizers beginning October 1, 2021 and ending September 30, 2024.

- Roma Johnson, nominated by Councilmembers Egleston, Eiselt, and Winston.
- Vicki Jones, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Egleston, and Eiselt.
- Carolyn Millen, nominated by Councilmembers Newton and Watlington.
- Antoinette Mingo, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Newton, and Watlington.

Results of the first ballot were recorded as follows:

- Romo Johnson, 4 votes – Councilmembers Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson and Winston.
- Vicki Jones, 6 - votes on by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, and Phipps.
- Carolyn Millen, 4 votes – Councilmembers Driggs, Newton, Phipps and Watlington.
- Antoinette Mingo, 5 votes – Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Newton, Watlington and Winston

Vicki Jones was appointed, and a second ballot was taken between Romo Johnson, Carolyn Millen and Antoniette Mingo.

- Roma Johnson, 6 votes – Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Phipps and Winston.
- Antoinette Mingo, 4 votes – Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Newton and Watlington.

Roma Johnson was appointed.

- One appointment for a three-year term for a Land Use category representative beginning October 1, 2021, and ending September 30, 2024.

Vicki Jones was appointed.

A second ballot was taken between Romo Johnson, Carolyn Millen and Antoinette Mingo and recorded

- Roma Johnson, 6 - votes on by Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Phipps, and Winston.

Vicki Jones and Roma Johnson was appointed.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term for a Neighborhood Conditions category representative beginning October 1, 2021 and ending September 30, 2024.

- Tonya Jameson, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Egleston.
- Davena Mgbeokwere, nominated by Councilmembers Johnson, Watlington, and Winston.
- Carolyn Millen, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Eiselt, and Newton.

Results of the first ballot were recorded as follows:

- Tonya Jameson, 7 - votes on by Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, and Newton.
- Devena Mgbeokwere, 3 votes – Councilmembers Phipps, Watlington and Winston.
- Carolyn Millen, 1 vote – Councilmember Ajmera

Tonya Jameson was appointed.

Councilmember Johnson said I wanted clarification, I asked earlier if we had some discussion about the individuals who were approved or who worked for arts agencies, that they would waive or forego their right to funding for the next three years due to our ethics policy. I wanted clarification, which provision states because as I've stated, I have a concern that individuals who are board members are eligible and they're able to abstain from a vote, but that employees are not. So, I wanted to know what the difference was

because there's no board members, it's their responsibility for an agent or an organization is to raise funds. So, I wanted to know from an ethics perspective, how we are making the difference why an employee cannot abstain or how a board member is eligible. I wanted to know how we are again, differentiating the two.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to ask the City Attorney to address your question, Ms. Johnson.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said thank you for the question Councilmember Johnson, and for the rest of the Council. The section that I raised for the Administrator to consider is section 3-A. This is the section that speaks to avoiding impropriety in the exercise of their official duties, but specifically, and this relates to board members, their official actions should be above reproach and they should not use their official position for personal gain. The issue there was board members are actually making funding decisions that ultimately will lead to their salaries being paid that that could be considered using your official position for personal gain. That's what I raised to the Administration's attention. That's, I believe the basis for the decision

Ms. Johnson said but it's still not clear to me, but I see that Councilmembers are leaving. So maybe they're not interested.

Mayor Lyles said well, no, nobody's leaving. I mean, everybody's here. They might be walking around a little bit. It's been a long day

Ms. Johnson said I know it's been a long evening, but yeah, I just don't hear that difference. But yeah, I'll have to think about that. I'll follow up. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said is there something particular?

Ms. Johnson said well, I've shared my concern. I don't see the difference. If you're involved in the organization then you're involved in the organization, specifically since board members that's the role to raise funds for the organization. They have more influence over an organization than an employee does. So, I just didn't think that it was fair that an employee or someone who works for an organization needed to forego their opportunity for funding. I think this just perpetuates and expands that wealth gap or individuals who are at service level the ability to serve. It's a lot, so, but I've stated at my concern on record. Thank you.

Councilmember Winston said yeah. I talked to Ms. Johnson about this earlier. I see why the board member is not a conflict of interest. I am a bit confused as to why employees of organizations would be in actual conflicts of interest by the rules that we've been going by. Actually, you know, we are board members, and we make decisions on funding. I don't know why a commission under us would be held to a higher standard than we are. We are not precluded from voting, in fact, by law, we have to vote, even if those funding decisions relate to one of our employers. As long as we're not an owner of that entity that gets direct remuneration from that decision, can we exclude ourselves from the vote? You know, for instance, I am an employee of the Charlotte Hornets. I have been part of votes that relate to funding of Spectrum Center and the Charlotte Hornets. I might've voted against it for the RNC (Republican National Convention) in 2020, but nonetheless, I was part of the vote. I know that this commission or this committee is unique and that they will be making funding decisions. But I don't know why their ethical level is somehow higher than the standard that we are held to.

Mayor Lyles said we've had this conversation and I think if both of you would take a moment to talk with the City Attorney about it there might be some explanation. It may not be that you that you agree with it, but there might be an explanation for it.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 3 Hour, 36 Minutes
Minutes Completed: November 15, 2021