AGENDA

Meeting Type:	WORKSHOP
Date:	10/06/1997

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

Mayor Patrick McCrory *Mayor Pro Tem Al Rousso*

Charles Baker
Patrick Cannon
Malachi Greene
Mike Jackson
Nasif Rashad Majeed
Don Reid
Ella Butler Scarborough
Tim Sellers
Sara Spencer
Lynn Wheeler

Council Agenda

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

Monday, October 6, 1997

	Dinner Room 267
5:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Economic Development. Convention Center Joint Marketing Agreement
5:30 - 6:15	All Focus Areas: 2015 Plan
6:15 - 6:30	Economic Development: New State Regulations for Wastewater Treatment
6:30 - 7:15	Economic Development Planning Commission Report: Wireless Communications Towers
7 30	Citizens' Hearing Council Chambers

<u>Executive Session</u>
Adopt a motion to hold a closed session pursuant to G S § 143-318.11(a)(6) to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, conditions of appointment, or conditions of initial employment of an individual public officer or employee or prospective public officer or employee

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Joint Marketing of the Charlotte Convention Center

Brian Monroe
Keith Haywood

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: Economic Development

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

1. The Charlotte Convention and Visitors Bureau (CCVB) and the Auditorium/Coliseum/Convention Center Authority (the Authority) share marketing responsibility for the Convention Center City Council approved the joint marketing concept on June 28, 1993
2. During the FY98 budget review process, Council asked to receive information prior to consideration of the FY99 budget concerning how the marketing funds are used and how successful the joint marketing approach has been
3. 15% of gross revenues received from the Occupancy Tax and the Prepared Food and Beverage Tax are dedicated to promotion of the Convention Center
4. In addition, CCVB and the Authority share 30% of revenues in excess of original estimates for the Occupancy Tax
5. Of these marketing funds, 70% goes to CCVB and 30% goes to the Authority
6. The amount available for marketing from the two taxes was $2 8 million in FY98 By Fiscal Year 2000, marketing funds are projected to increase to $3 4 million

OPTIONS: None presented at this time

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

1. Council is requested to provide direction to staff as to whether Council wishes to consider other options for marketing the Convention Center or changes in the current agreement
2. If Council directs staff to develop other options, staff needs direction on the change in outcomes Council expects from new marketing approaches

ATTACHMENTS: None

John Inhof Comm.
Chair Planning
10/13 HOLD PUBLIC HEARING
TO PHIL BY MONDAY

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Review of *2015 Plan Planning For Our Future*

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: *The 2015 Plan* addresses issues in each of the five focus areas Community Safety, City Within A City, Restructuring Government, Transportation, and Economic Development

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

- The Planning Commission approved the *2015 Plan* in December, 1996
- The Planning Liaison Committee reviewed the *2015 Plan* in a series of meetings beginning in January 1997 In May, 1997 the Committee endorsed the plan and voted to forward it to City Council and County Commission for review and approval, with the addition of information on fiscal implications
- A public forum was held on September 10, 1997 to receive additional public input on the draft plan Approximately 7,500 notifications were sent out to invite citizens to the public forum Additional notification was provided on radio, television and in the *Charlotte Observer*
- The plan identifies and discusses issues in the following areas Transportation, Land Use and Design, Economic Development, Education, Parks and Open Space, Neighborhoods, and Regionalism
- The plan is a big picture look at the future of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg community It is intended to provide a framework and direction which will guide decision making Specific actions steps will be developed, within this framework, to address the identified community issues as part of the implementation of the plan
- City Council will hold a public hearing on the plan at its October 13, 1997 business meeting

OPTIONS: N/A

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED: Council is asked to review and discuss the plan goals and objectives in preparation for the upcoming public hearing Council will be asked to vote on the plan at a future meeting

ATTACHMENTS: *Summary of Citizen Comments from 2015 Plan Public Forum (page 1)*
Public Comments on Draft 2015 Plan from Website and Comment Sheets (page 5)
Summary of Comments from Planning Liaison Committee Review (page 8)
Addendum to Implementation Section of 2015 Plan (page 10)

Summary of Citizen Comments From *2015 Plan* Public Forum September 10, 1997

Approximately 30 citizens attended the public forum Notification was provided on radio, television news, and in several articles in the Charlotte Observer In addition, 6,500 notifications were faxed to Charlotte-Mecklenburg businesses and approximately 1000 flyers were sent to neighborhood organizations and individual citizens

LAND USE & URBAN DESIGN

- South Park area is not pedestrian friendly
- Do we have any pedestrian-oriented areas in Charlotte
  - ◊ North Davidson Street
  - ◊ Downtown
  - ◊ Dilworth
- Central Avenue and Albemarle Road should be improved to be more pedestrian friendly
- West side has some pedestrian friendly areas
- Is this absence because developers are not interested in making areas pedestrian-friendly?
- Need to integrate green space in development, including using cemeteries as part of the green space network
- Need to have better control of infill development within existing inner city neighborhoods
- Need to protect existing trees and have stronger enforcement of the tree ordinance
- Need stronger language in UMUD ordinance regarding height restrictions
- Need stronger efforts to preserve historical landscapes, existing farm land, communities and commercial areas
- Need to look at transit corridors for potential opportunities for greenway development
- Need to develop more linear parks by utilizing road right-of-way and medians
- Need to mandate design standards
- Need provisions in our ordinances to limit uses on infill development in existing neighborhoods
- Need stronger and clearer language on the creation of higher densities in transit corridors
- What is transit and higher densities? Developers misinterpret what is meant by these terms
- Make transit corridors true corridors of movement by avoiding left turns and strip commercial development

NEIGHBORHOODS

I Comments on Goal #1 Neighborhood Reinvestment

- Develop avenues for neighborhoods to interact with absentee landlords
- Existing neighborhoods should be more involved in development and have impact on decisions
- Need a neighborhood representation on the Planning Commission
- Elected officials should follow recommendations in adopted plan's
- City/County should be proactive in providing services to existing neighborhoods
- The Community Improvement Department should be more proactive

II Comments on Goal #2 Housing Preservation, Affordability and Choices

- Subsidized housing should provide various designs to meet a wider range of housing needs (i e , number of bedrooms)
- Need to encourage developments which provide housing for a mix of income levels
- Need to provide affordable housing for all incomes (make existing resources known)

III Comments on Goal #3 Neighborhood Organizing/Empowerment

- Need to provide more training opportunities for community leaders
- Need more training for transition from renter to homeowner

IV Comments on Goal #4 Neighborhood Design

- Expand community policing throughout the county (increase number of community police officers)
- Need to train officers better to relate with diverse population

PARKS, REC. & OPEN SPACE

- Need to get input from residents when designing/locating new parks
- Encourage joint use with schools in and around neighborhoods, also joint use with other public land uses such as cemeteries
- Put more effort into getting better locations for parks within neighborhoods
  - ◊ Work with developers up front to get appropriate land donated for parks as opposed to accepting left over land in inferior locations (i e , floodplains)
  - ◊ Make parks the center piece of neighborhoods
- Parks are essential to quality of life!
- Be proactive in acquiring/developing greenways rather than waiting for gifts or dedications of land from developers
- Explore creative options for funding parks including trusts, bequests and other donations

- Greenways can serve a variety of purposes including
  - ◊ serving as linkages between neighborhoods, schools, churches, parks , shopping, etc
  - ◊ decreasing water run-off
  - ◊ providing routes for alternative transportation (i e , walking and bicycling)
  - ◊ enhancing value of adjoining land
- Need to be more creative in terms of public/private partnerships in both acquiring park land and in developing park facilities This is especially important as the competition for public funds (i e , bonds) continues to increase
- Set priorities for types of parks and park resources needed
- Regionalism is important Realize that parks don't have to stop at county boundaries Focus on regional parks and extend greenway system into other counties
- Provide environmental educational opportunities/state park system
- Increase upgrading of existing parks Crime prevention should be a major focus
- Consider ordinance requirement for subdivision developers to provide park land/open space
- Encourage provisions for wildlife preserves (if it's not too late)
- Greenways should be designed for preserving nature/wildlife
- We need to act quickly to preserve land because we are running out of continuous area

TRANSPORTATION and REGIONALISM

- Need to ensure that we have connections between transportation modes
- Need more resources devoted to sidewalks and pedestrian facilities
- Rezoning to provide high density land use along transportation corridors is not always the right answer
- Need monorail system for citizens outside Mecklenburg County so they do not compete with citizens of Mecklenburg County for use of our roads
- What is congestion? Is it a relative measure?
- One way to manage congestion is to better utilize our existing roadway system and encourage employers to offer flex time to cut down on peak hour traffic
- Bus turn outs and right turn lanes can help to manage congestion
- Need to balance the need for widening roads with the need to design intersections that people can walk across
- Sidewalks should be set back from the curb at least four feet and the sidewalk should be at least five feet wide If these standards cannot be met then we should not construct the sidewalk
- It should be the City's responsibility to repair the sidewalks, even in residential areas
- Need to do more marketing and public education regarding the transit system
- Mass transit is greatly needed
- Light rail should be in our future

- Need to bury power lines and use mast arms for traffic signals to improve the appearance of the community
- Need to encourage expanded taxi system, especially at the airport
- Need to include more H O V lanes in our transportation plans

EDUCATION COMMENTS

- Need to coordinate education and economic development initiatives
- Need to have county-wide standards for school facilities
- Need to continue to develop partnerships between the school system and other City and County Departments and Agencies, especially Planning
- The community needs to have a higher commitment level (i e , financial commitment) to education
- Need to have more partnerships between schools, government and businesses
- Public school system needs to be more aware of the potential impact of land use decisions on existing and future school facilities (surrounding land uses, including transportation uses, greatly impact schools and vice-versa)
- Schools response to rezoning petition has only been comments concerning the capacity of the schools in that attendance area They must consider the impact of the proposed land use on the school and respond to these issues
- County (i e , public school system) needs to be more involved in providing pre-school programs

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- Need to have a greater emphasis on vocational-technical training and schools
- Entry-level wages are too low
- Smaller neighborhood businesses need more support from financial institutions
- Ensure education coordinates with labor force needs
- Small businesses need more opportunities if they are to be competitive
- Need to develop a major employment center on the east side, to make this happen, we need to make sure physical infrastructure is in place
- Need to more thoroughly consider the impact of rezonings on property in immediate area, especially considering public facilities (i e , schools)
- Public school system needs to respond to rezoning petitions with consideration for the impact of the proposed land use
- Need to be wary of recruiting relocating businesses, what's to say they won't also abandon Charlotte
- Our emphasis should be on supporting good stable businesses and new startups rather than recruiting relocating businesses

Public Comments on Draft 2015 Plan
From Planning Commission Website and Comment Sheets

NEIGHBORHOODS

Goal IV: Neighborhood Design

It is my opinion that cul-de-sacs are not awful, rather, that they are and can be adjuncts to fostering a sense of community Until effective development models are in place (such as the model planned for the Prosperity Church Road/Outerbelt intersection) and their success can be demonstrated, don't "throw out the baby with the bath"

My house happens to sit in a cul-de-sac I have seen that cul-de-sac and others in the neighborhood serve as a gathering place for many things "pick-up" games of soccer, softball, basketball; tricycle races, Halloween parties, "dish to pass" picnic events, chatting places for adults as well as children I also have the good fortune of living next to a greenway By far the majority of the access points to that greater communal site are connecting paths build through cul-de-sacs, paths used by folks on foot or on bicycles The greenway provides a broader communal atmosphere which includes co-mingling from many neighborhoods, access to a public school and to a swim club open to many of the abutting neighborhoods, the exercise and recreation of cycling, running, walking, being in nature and learning from/about it With expansion of the greenway system there will be access to shopping One of the most positive elements in the preceding is the total absence of motor vehicles! Don't get rid of cul-de-sacs, rather use models to show how they can be community connectors which exclude motor vehicles This can happen even if there is not an adjacent greenway

I did try to make the above points at the public meeting on neighborhood design goals

EDUCATION

Goal II, Public School Facilities/Resources, Objective 3.

Expand the objective to include community/neighborhood organizations and broader cultural activities The broad concepts in the objective as well as the others in the goal are something my neighborhood has requested/desired - especially with the building of the Governor's Village The use of school facility communal areas as sites for community/neighborhood centers is happening in various places in the U S to the extent that design of new schools incorporate the concept into the design A reasonably well kept secret the basis for such broad utilization has been in place in Charlotte/Mecklenburg for 20 years or so A great challenge is to broaden the narrow "institutional" focus of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System - to instill the attitude of really being a part of the community

LAND USE AND DESIGN

The expansion or revision of current building codes that provide suburban sprawl solutions to our urban development Recent projects of suburban sprawl type development in our center city neighborhoods includes

- Starbucks in Myers Park
- Boston Market in Myers Park
- Strip shopping center in Elizabeth across from Arzberger's Engravers
- Elizabeth Avenue from Presbyterian Hospital to Independence Boulevard
- Project currently under construction across from Atherton Mill

All of the development noted above occurred in the recent past Therefore, it seems to me that our codes, etc , are allowing these suburban sprawl solutions in the areas we value the most The areas are urban in context and should be developed as such Through the three dimensional built environment, it appears the codes only allow or encourage this type of option and not others If these examples and the central business district are examples of industry policing, it appears we have fallen short of what we want in the future and should redevelop the guidelines we set

To: The Planning Commission, Attn Garet Walsh
From: Nancy Pierce Shaver, Co-Chair, Merry Oaks Neighborhood Association
Re: 2015 Plan

I commend you for including greenways in the 2015 Plan. Developing pedestrian/bicycle paths and preserving green space along our flood plains has many benefits beyond the merely aesthetic.

Studies in other cities consistently demonstrate that greenways stimulate economic growth and increase property values on adjacent land. Greenways preserve water quality and control flooding by providing pervious surface to contain and clean stormwater runoff. Greenways keep our population (especially children, the elderly and the disabled) safe and healthy by giving them a place to ride bicycles or roll wheelchairs and to walk without fear of automobile traffic

A network of greenways throughout the city can carry bicycle or walking commuters to, for example, Uptown, UNCC, University Research Park and Southpark, thus reducing congestion and the need for parking.

Finally, all great central cities have a large park or waterfront to give their citizens an aesthetic and emotional sense of place in the midst of the urban hustle and bustle Charlotte has nothing like this. A greenway system -- essentially a "linear park" -- which uses the flood plain to connect close-in and outlying neighborhoods and parks with the Central City could serve this function. When people from all socioeconomic, ethnic, and age groups walk or bicycle with their families or friends along a greenway which connects the various parts of our city, it would contribute greatly toward building a sense of community among our residents and increasing the quality of life for residents and visitors to our city

I urge you to direct all possible resources into accelerated acquisition of floodplains and development of Charlotte-Mecklenburg's Greenway Master Plan, so that we may see these multiple benefits as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Nancy Pierce Shaver

Summary of Planning Liaison Committee Comments From Review Sessions on 2015 Plan From Janurary 10, 1997 to May 2, 1997

GENERAL COMMENTS

- We need to move ahead on implementation strategies

- Specific implementation strategies and costs will be very important and we need to be clear in cost projections
- The Citizens' Capital Budget Advisory Board needs to be aware of the financial impacts of the 2015 Plan
- The 2015 Plan is a policy document and does not include specific improvements which can be "costed out"
- City and County departments have participated in developing the plan and are aware that they will be assigned implementation pieces which will effect their budgets by directing their resources to community-identified priorities
- Need to be realistic about what we can accomplish Citizens must be able to trust we will do what we say we will do We must not promise beyond our capabilities

- School planners need to be involved in the 2015 Plan review.

- We don't want to stop growth, we want to manage and direct it One way to do this is to encourage development where infrastructure is already in place Also, schools and parks can become growth management tools.

LAND USE AND DESIGN

- Transportation and land use must be better coordinated
- Schools can be a stumbling block for implementation of our land use and transportation vision We need to bring schools into the loop on planning
- Need further definition of term "balanced growth"
- Need to be sure our land use and zoning reflect the realities of the marketplace and recognize that they are key economic development tools

NEIGHBORHOODS

- Key to success of plan is improving conditions within our central city neighborhoods
- Safety is the most important neighborhood issue, but it is not just an issue of more police The police need partners (like the code enforcement team in Grier Heights) to make neighborhoods safer
- Schools can be a great catalyst for revitalization in fragile neighborhoods
- Need to be proactive with providing for affordable housing One way to ensure that we have affordable housing is to maintain the existing housing stock Another

strategy to make housing more affordable would be to convert all R-3 to R-4 base density

PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

- Need to emphasize joint use planning, especially for parks and schools
- Seems to be more a need for small neighborhood parks

TRANSPORTATION AND REGIONALISM

- The Transportation Plan does not reflect the 2015 Plan

EDUCATION

- The key piece to addressing the 2015 Plan goals and objectives is development of a long-range school facilities master plan

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- We need to focus on reducing crime as the key economic development strategy.
- We need to give attention to business retention
- Need to keep middle-income population

2015 PLAN: Planning for our Future
Addendum to the Implementation Section

I. Land Use & Design
Proposed Cost Estimates

Development and implementation of specific action steps to address the community's Land Use & Design goals and objectives are expected to be accomplished principally within existing departmental budgets Plan recommendations will, in particular, assist in directing existing resources of the Planning Commission, Neighborhood Development, CDOT and City Engineering

As an example, in FY 98, the Planning Commission is scheduled to undertake several projects based on the direction provided in the Land Use and Design section, including the following

- Corridors and Centers Project
- General Development Policies Reassessment
- Westside Strategy Plan
- Outer Loop Interchange Land Use Study
- Community Sustainability Project
- Walkable Communities Conference
- Neighborhood Action Planning and Implementation

Once developed and approved, some of these projects are expected to require additional public expenditures to implement In particular, the Westside Strategy Plan will likely recommend infrastructure improvements beyond those currently programmed In such instances, funding needs will be brought forward to elected officials for consideration

II. Neighborhoods
Proposed Cost Estimates

Development and implementation of specific action steps to address the community's goals and objectives for sustaining and enhancing neighborhoods, are expected to be accomplished principally within existing departmental budgets Plan recommendations will, in particular, assist in directing existing resources of the Planning Commission, Neighborhood Development (especially the Neighborhood Empowerment Division), Engineering and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department

Major initiatives currently underway, or already planned, which will serve to implement the *2015 Plan* goals and objectives for neighborhoods include

costs

- Neighborhood Based Problem Solving (Information system development and neighborhood meeting facilitation)
- Continued Implementation of Community Safety Plan, including problem-oriented policing initiatives
- Implementation of Neighborhood Action Plans
- 1996 Neighborhood Improvement Bond Projects
- Westside Strategy Plan
- Corridor Program initiatives
- One-Stop Shop Centers (jobs and training initiative)

With the exception of the Westside Strategy Plan, much of the funding for these initiatives has been identified As these efforts are expanded in coming years, departments may seek additional funding

It is also likely that additional projects and initiatives will be developed which will need funding outside of existing department's budgets These will be brought forward to the elected officials for consideration

III. Parks, Recreation and Open Space Proposed Cost Estimates

The Parks Master Plan, currently under development, will establish specific action steps to address many of the community's goals and objectives for parks, recreation and open space identified in the *2015 Plan* The Parks Department did not request funding from the current (1997) County bond package, however, it is likely that they will seek such funding in future years to implement the recommendations from the Parks Master Plan, once it is completed and approved The *2015 Plan* also encourages the development of creative funding opportunities (i e , public/private initiatives, land swaps) to acquire and develop park resources and recommends that such opportunities be identified in the Parks Master Plan

Other projects/initiatives are underway, or currently proposed, which will address *2015 Plan* goals and objectives for parks, recreation and open space include

- Joint Use Facilities Planning
- Greenways Planning
- Bicycle Plan
- Rural Space Preservation

IV. Transportation Proposed Cost Estimates

The Charlotte City Council has approved a five-year transportation plan designed to respond to traffic congestion and pollution while providing more options for buses,

costs

carpools, and other alternatives to cars This five-year plan establishes action steps to address many of the community's goals and objectives for transportation identified in the *2015 Plan* The estimated cost of implementing the five-year plan is $503 1 million Funding for the plan is still being determined

Recent legislation has also enabled Charlotte-Mecklenburg to seek a ½ cent sales tax increase to fund transit initiatives Future transit plans will be influenced by this recent legislation and the success of local campaigns to endorse such an initiative.

In addition to the Five Year Transportation Plan, other projects/initiatives are also underway, or currently proposed, which will address *2015* goals and objectives for transportation, including

- Expansion of the Charlotte-Douglas International Airport (funding as per the Airport Master Plan)
- Centers and Corridors Project
- Integration of Transportation and Land Use Planning Initiatives
- Bicycle Plan
- Walkable Communities Conference

If additional projects and initiatives are developed which will need funding outside of existing department's budgets, these will be brought forward to the elected officials for consideration.

V. Regionalism
Proposed Cost Estimates

Development and implementation of specific action steps to address the community's Regionalism goals and objectives are expected to be accomplished principally within existing departmental budgets Plan recommendations will, in particular, assist in directing existing Planning Commission resources

As an example, in FY 98, the Planning Commission is scheduled to coordinate quarterly meetings with planners and elected officials from all the cities and towns within Mecklenburg County Planning staff will also be working with surrounding jurisdictions on the development of the Centers and Corridors Sourcebook, the completion of a plan for the US 29 Corridor and in implementing initiatives developed through the Carolinas Urban Choices work

VI. Education
Proposed Cost Estimates

The *2015 Plan* Education goals and objectives focus on planning and on developing partnerships The Plan does not identify specific facility or resource needs Rather, it

costs

emphasizes the need to identify, prioritize and creatively plan to meet future resource needs

A critical part of addressing the *2015 Plan* Education goals and objectives will be to develop a school facilities master plan. The process for developing this plan is already underway with the work of the Committee of 21. This committee was formed in August, 1997 to develop a process for developing a master plan and to recommend what should be included in a school facilities plan

Approximately $50,000 has been approved for consulting services to develop the master plan An additional $50,000 has been approved for additional staff resources for long-range school planning

2015 Plan recommendations will also assist in directing existing resources of the Planning Commission and Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools As additional projects and initiatives are developed, any funding needs outside of existing department's budgets will be brought forward to the elected officials for consideration

VII. Economic Development Proposed Cost Estimates

Development and implementation of specific action steps to address the community's Economic Development goals and objectives are expected to be accomplished principally within existing departmental budgets Plan recommendations will, in particular, assist in directing existing resources of the Planning Commission, Neighborhood Development, CDOT, CMUD and the City and County Managers' Offices

As an example, in FY 98, the Planning Commission is scheduled to undertake several projects which will address goals and objectives in the Economic Development section, including the following:

- City Business Retention Strategy
- Economic Development Directions Report
- Westside Strategy Plan
- Urban Economic Development Strategy Plan
- Wilkinson Boulevard Corridor Revitalization Plan
- North Tryon Street Corridor Revitalization Plan
- Center City 2000 Plan

Once developed and approved, some of these projects are expected to require additional public expenditures to implement In such instances, funding needs will be brought forward to elected officials for consideration

costs

Wastewater Plant Update

October 6, 1997

- **Background**
  - Last year, hurricane Fran and other events led to several large wastewater spills from hog farms in eastern NC
  - As a result, public and political interests were rallied to "do something" to protect the environment
  - Strict legislation was proposed aimed at the swine industry
  - The swine industry responded by running a series of TV, radio, and newspaper ads whose purpose was to show that municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) were much worse polluters of the environment than hog farms
  - The ad campaign was successful in swaying the General Assembly to take strong actions affecting both the animal industry and municipalities
  - The governor named a new secretary of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) who immediately announced a "tightening" of regulatory and enforcement actions

- **New Legislation and Administrative Redirection**
  - Nutrient limits
    - Strict nutrient limits are mandated for WWTPs discharging into nutrient sensitive waters
    - Lake Wylie or Mountain Island Lake could be designated nutrient sensitive in the future
    - The expansion of McDowell Creek WWTP to be completed this spring includes equipment to reduce nutrient discharges to Mountain Island Lake
  - Reporting of spills and overflows
    - Until now, only significant spills were required to be reported to the state
    - The state now requires that all spills greater than 25 gallons must be reported
    - The new requirements will greatly increase the number of reports made to the state
  - Permitting of facilities
    - Delays are occurring in the expansion of Mallard Creek WWTP as a result of more stringent reviews by state staff
    - Delays are occurring in the construction of a flow equalization basin at Sugar Creek WWTP due to state staff's stricter interpretation of regulations than before
  - Stronger enforcement actions
    - Council has been informed that construction delays and equipment startup delays have caused permit violations at our WWTPs
    - The heightened enforcement program could result in stronger enforcement action than normally expected

- **Utilities Response**
  - Staff resources have been re-directed to assure good treatment process control
  - Capital improvements to increase plant performance have been accelerated
  - Utilities staff is working with regional and state offices of DENR
  - Utilities is frequently communicating with the North Carolina League of Municipalities, other cities, and professional associations

- **Conclusion**
  - Wastewater treatment plants are being required to meet more stringent limits that will require additional resources
  - Treatment plants are not the enemy Treatment plants protect the environment
  - We support efforts to keep our streams and lakes clean especially since we are also responsible for drinking water

Wastewater Plant Update

October 6, 1997

- **Background**
  - Last year, hurricane Fran and other events led to several large wastewater spills from hog farms in eastern NC
  - As a result, public and political interests were rallied to "do something" to protect the environment
  - Strict legislation was proposed aimed at the swine industry
  - The swine industry responded by running a series of TV, radio, and newspaper ads whose purpose was to show that municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) were much worse polluters of the environment than hog farms
  - The ad campaign was successful in swaying the General Assembly to take strong actions affecting both the animal industry and municipalities
  - The governor named a new secretary of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) who immediately announced a "tightening" of regulatory and enforcement actions

- **New Legislation and Administrative Redirection**
  - Nutrient limits
    - Strict nutrient limits are mandated for WWTPs discharging into nutrient sensitive waters
    - Lake Wylie or Mountain Island Lake could be designated nutrient sensitive in the future
    - The expansion of McDowell Creek WWTP to be completed this spring includes equipment to reduce nutrient discharges to Mountain Island Lake
  - Reporting of spills and overflows
    - Until now, only significant spills were required to be reported to the state
    - The state now requires that all spills greater than 25 gallons must be reported
    - The new requirements will greatly increase the number of reports made to the state
  - Permitting of facilities
    - Delays are occurring in the expansion of Mallard Creek WWTP as a result of more stringent reviews by state staff
    - Delays are occurring in the construction of a flow equalization basin at Sugar Creek WWTP due to state staff's stricter interpretation of regulations than before
  - Stronger enforcement actions
    - Council has been informed that construction delays and equipment startup delays have caused permit violations at our WWTPs
    - The heightened enforcement program could result in stronger enforcement action than normally expected

- **Utilities Response**
  - Staff resources have been re-directed to assure good treatment process control
  - Capital improvements to increase plant performance have been accelerated
  - Utilities staff is working with regional and state offices of DENR
  - Utilities is frequently communicating with the North Carolina League of Municipalities, other cities, and professional associations

- **Conclusion**
  - Wastewater treatment plants are being required to meet more stringent limits that will require additional resources
  - Treatment plants are not the enemy Treatment plants protect the environment
  - We support efforts to keep our streams and lakes clean especially since we are also responsible for drinking water

COUNCIL WORKSHOP
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

JUST AS INFO TO COUNCIL -
OVERHEADS + HANDOUT.

TOPIC: New Wastewater Treatment Regulations

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: Economic Development

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

The N C General Assembly recently adopted new regulations regarding wastewater discharge limits State regulators are approaching permitting and enforcement in a different manner The climate has partially changed regarding the public's view of wastewater treatment plants due to a great deal of publicity by the interest group called Farmers For Fairness

CMUD would like to take the opportunity to inform Council of

- new state regulations regarding wastewater treatment,
- the impact of the hog farm violations and subsequent publicity on municipal treatment plants,
- current status of wastewater treatment

POTENTIAL FOR STRONGER ENFORCEMENT THAN EVER BEFORE MAY BE CONCERN
WAYNE McDEVITT STATE

OPTIONS: N/A

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED: This item is for Council information only, no action is needed

ATTACHMENTS: None

STAFF WILL RECOMMEND 8/18/97 VERSION WITH ~~REVISION~~ MODIFICATION OF NOTIFICATION PROCESS.

JOHN PLYLER

INDUSTRY DOES NOT AGREE WITH ANYTHING DONE IN LAST 2 WEEKS

Revised	7/1/97	(Planning Committee Recommendation)
Revised	7/9/97	(Planning Committee Recommendation)
Revised	8/8/97	(Planning Committee Recommendation)
Revised	8/18/97 VOTED IN	(As Per Planning Staff/City Attorney)
Revised	9/23/97	(Planning Committee Revised Recommendation)
Revised	9/30/97	(Planning Committee Revised Recommendation)

PETITION NO. 97-12

ORDINANCE NO _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING APPENDIX A OF THE CITY CODE ZONING ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Section 1 Appendix A, "Zoning" of the Code of the City of Charlotte is hereby amended as follows

1 Amend CHAPTER 12 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY, PART 1. SUPPLEMENTAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, Section 12 108 "Height Limitations" as follows

(8) Wireless communications transmission facilities including, but not limited to towers, masts, antennae and related antenna support structures are permitted above (or below) the height limit in any district Wireless communications transmission facilities may be constructed up to any height in a nonresidential zoning district and adjacent to nonresidential zoning and need only comply with the underlying zoning district's separation standards concerning setback, side and rear yards Wireless communications transmission facilities located on a site in or adjoining a residential zoning district shall not exceed the height of the established tree line or other obstacles on the site by more than 20 feet and must comply with the separation standard outlined below In the event there is no established tree cover on such site, any wireless communication transmission facility shall not exceed 120 feet in height and must comply with the separation standard outlined below All wireless communication transmission facilities located in or adjoining residential zoning in excess of the height limit noted previously must receive an advisory recommendation from the Zoning Committee of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission and utilize stealth technology as outlined in subsection 8(i) All wireless communications transmission facilities of up to 150 feet in height, whether permitted as a principal use on a site or as an ancillary or secondary use on a site, must be designed and equipped with the technological and structural capability to accommodate at least two wireless communications carriers All such towers over 150 feet in height must be designed and equipped with the technological

and structural capability to accommodate at least three wireless communication carriers Lots and buildings thereon must conform to the minimum area, height and yard requirements for the district in which they are located unless otherwise indicated by subsection 8(a1) or 8(a2) below If the facility is above 40 feet in height and is located on a lot in or adjacent to a residential district, the associated setback, side and rear yards adjacent to the residentially zoned property must be increased by one foot for each one foot of facility height in excess of 40 feet, up to a maximum of 120 feet The facility plant and/or any related support building shall be allowed in accordance with the provision of Section 12 504 Replacement of existing wireless communication transmission facilities to increase the height of such facilities shall be allowed in accordance with the separate provisions of subdivision 8(d) below

8(a 1) Wireless communications transmission facilities may be constructed up to any height in a nonresidential zoning district which is adjacent to nonresidential zoning as an ancillary or secondary use on a site where another use (other than single family or duplex use) is already established as the principal use of the property, such as a school, church, multi-family residential complex, shopping center, office building, commercial, golf courses, parks or other similar use In this case, the wireless communications facility shall not be required, regardless of the underlying zoning, to separately comply with the normal district standards dealing with lot area, height and frontage on a public street and subdivision regulations so long as the principal use complies with such requirements for the underlying district nor shall the facility be required to comply with requirements of the Tree Ordinance

8(a 2) For lots in or adjacent to a residential district, wireless communications facilities may be constructed as an ancillary or secondary use on a site where another use (other than single family or duplex use) is already established as the principal use of the property to a height no more than 20 feet above the established tree line or other obstacles on the site of the principal use or to a height of 120 feet in the event there is no established tree cover on the site of the principal use provided that the minimum setback, side and rear yards adjacent to the residentially zoned property are increased by one foot for each one foot of facility height in excess of 40 feet, up to a maximum required separation of 200 feet If a proposed wireless communications facility is located on residentially zoned property, separation from adjoining nonresidential zoned property shall be controlled by the adjoining nonresidential zoned property's minimum separation standards concerning setback, side and rear yards, as appropriate However, if the proposed wireless communications transmission facility is located in a nonresidential district and adjoins only nonresidential districts, the facility may be constructed to any

height subject to underlying minimum district requirements for separation from adjoining properties

8(a 3) A properly permitted wireless communications transmission facility, established as an ancillary or secondary use, may remain in its present location if the principal use of the site is abandoned, demolished or removed However, if the wireless communication transmission tower is ever replaced, it must then comply with all applicable yards, setbacks, and separation standards as a principal use in the district The changing of, additions to, or removal of antenna on the tower as well as the co-location of additional carriers on the tower shall be permitted and shall not require the tower to be brought into compliance with current separation requirements

8(b) Wireless communications facilities are permitted above the height limit on lots in research, institutional, office, business, and industrial districts which do not adjoin lots in a residential district Lots must conform to the minimum area and yard requirements for the district in which they are located unless otherwise indicated by subsection 8(a1) or 8(a2) above Such facilities are not subject to the notification provision outlined in subsection 8(g)

8(c) Wireless communications transmission facilities are permitted atop any building or structure (other than single family or other residential structure of less than two stories in height) in any district so long as such facilities do not exceed 20 feet in height measured from the top of the highest point of the existing structure Such facilities are not subject to the height limit outlined in Section (8) or the notification provision outlined in subsection 8(g)

8(d) Replacement of Existing Wireless Communication Towers With Additional Height

Wireless communications transmission facilities existing at the time of the adoption of this ordinance amendment may be replaced in any zoning district with replacement facilities containing taller towers or antennae and shall not be required to conform to the separation standards concerning setback, side and rear yard requirements applicable to a tower or antenna of such increased height as provided in subsection 8(a2) provided that

8(d1) The replacement tower must conform to the separation standards concerning setback, side and rear yard requirements applicable to the original tower at the time it was originally constructed

8(d2) The replacement tower must utilize monopole construction unless located in an industrial district Any tower up to 150 feet in height must be designed and equipped with the technological and structural capability to accommodate at least two wireless communications carriers Any tower over 150 feet in height must be designed and equipped with the technological and structural capability to accommodate at least three wireless communication carriers

8(d3) The Wireless Communications facility owner must provide the Zoning Administrator with an affidavit signed by at least one other wireless communications carrier stating that it needs a wireless communications facility within 1000 feet of the subject site and agreeing to co-locate on the replacement tower

8(d4) The replacement tower must conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements in force at the time of the replacement tower permit application, and

8(d5) The height of any such replacement tower which is located in or adjoining residential zoning may not exceed the height of the original tower by more than 50 feet (The addition of up to 50 feet in height under this provision may occur only once) Any such replacement tower located in or adjoining residential zoning is subject to the height limit outlined in Section (8) and 8(a) above

8(d6) Notification of adjacent property owners and neighborhood leaders is required for lots in or adjoining residential zoning districts as outlined in subsection 8(g)

8(e) Replacement of Existing Wireless Communication Towers at the Same Height

Any existing wireless communications transmission facility, including but not limited to towers, masts, antennae and related antenna support structures, may be removed and replaced with a new facility within 100 feet of the same location without being required to conform to the current zoning standards applicable to the underlying zoning district at the time of such replacement so long as such replacement is no closer to the setback, side or rear yards than the existing facility and provided that

8(e1) The height of the replacement facility does not exceed that of the original facility Any such replacement tower is not subject to the height limit outlined in subsection 8 and 8(a)

8(e2) The replacement facility must utilize monopole construction unless located in an industrial district Any tower up to 150 feet in height must be designed and equipped with the technological and structural capability to accommodate at least two wireless communication carriers Any tower over 150 feet in height must be designed and equipped with the technological and structural capability to accommodate at least three wireless communication carriers

8(e3) The replacement facility shall comply with the landscaping and buffering requirements applicable at the time of replacement

8(e4) If the new facility is to be used for the co location of two or more wireless communications carriers at the time of its construction, the wireless communications facility owner must provide the Zoning Administrator with an affidavit signed by at least one other wireless communications carrier stating that it needs a wireless communications facility within 1000 feet of the subject site and agreeing to co-locate on the new tower for the remainder of the term of the existing lease, if the property on which the tower is located is leased

8(e5) The applicant has up to 90 calendar days to remove the original tower after the new facility is installed

8(f) The wireless communications facility equipment building or buildings used in connection with facilities permitted under Section 8(a) (d) or (e) shall be limited to 500 sq ft per communications company using said facility and be limited to 15 feet in height, provided however, that the building height limitation may be waived by the Zoning Administrator up to a maximum height of 25 feet in order to accommodate architectural design, screening or similar special needs

8(g) Public Notification Process for Certain Wireless Communications Transmission Facilities

8(g1) Purpose of Notification

Wireless communication transmission facilities may have impacts on nearby residential properties While the use can be permitted subject to certain standards, the neighboring residential property owners should have the opportunity to learn about these uses to hear an explanation of the proposed facility, present relative information that may affect the design of the facility, and to furnish information on the permit application

8(g2) Notification Process

The following notification process is required prior to the approval of any permit to locate certain wireless communication transmission facilities or to replace an existing tower with additional height on a site located in or adjacent to a residential zoning district Notification as outlined below is not required for those proposed tower sites which are located in a nonresidential zoning district adjacent to nonresidential zoning Notification is also not required for wireless communication facilities as provided under Section 12 108 8 (b), (c), (e) and (j) The notification process is designed to facilitate the exchange of information between the permit applicant and the affected nearby property owners

8(g2a) The Zoning Administrator shall mail a notice to all property owners, as shown on the County tax listing, within 100 feet of the proposed facility site including those across a street In addition, the Zoning Administrator shall mail a notice to neighborhood leaders, as determined by the list at the Planning Commission staff office, within one mile of the proposed facility site

8(g2b) Any permit applicant shall be responsible for supplying the Zoning Administrator with postage paid envelopes addressed to adjacent property owners and neighborhood leaders as noted above Any error in an owner's

or neighborhood leaders list or any other procedural error or omission shall not invalidate the issuance of an otherwise properly issued permit

8(g2c) The Zoning Administrator shall not render a decision on the application until 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date of the mailing of the notification letters The 30 day notification period may be used by any interested party to discuss the proposed wireless communication transmission facility with the permit applicant The permit applicant shall in good faith consider any comments from such adjoining property owners concerning landscaping and screening and other design issues of the facility

8(g2d) In addition, the Zoning Administrator shall secure an advisory recommendation from the Zoning Committee of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission in accordance with subsection 8(i) below prior to the approval of any permit for a wireless communications transmission facility which exceeds the height limit outlined in Section 8 and 8(a) above

8(h) Wireless Communication Transmission Facilities Data Base

Any permit applicant shall submit the following information to the Zoning Administrator as part of the application process for any new or replacement tower or for any modifications to an existing tower For this purpose, the changing, adding to or taking from antenna on any existing tower shall not be considered a modification to an existing tower

8(h1) Street addresses for all existing wireless communication towers owned, leased, or operated by the permit applicant in Mecklenburg County

8(h2) Height of all existing wireless communication towers owned, leased, or operated by the permit applicant in Mecklenburg County

8(h3) The ground elevation above sea level for all existing wireless communication towers owned, leased, or operated by the permit applicant in Mecklenburg County, and

8(h4) The longitude and latitude for all existing wireless communication towers owned, leased, or operated by the permit applicant in Mecklenburg County

8(i) Advisory Recommendation from Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission and Application of Stealth Technology For Certain Wireless Communications Transmission Facilities In Excess of Height Limit in or Adjoining Residential Districts

The Zoning Administrator shall secure an advisory recommendation from the Zoning Committee of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission prior to the approval of any permit for a wireless communications transmission facilities located as the principal or ancillary use on a site in or abutting residential zoning districts in excess of the height limit outlined in Section 8 and 8(a2) The Zoning Administrator may consider the recommendation of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission in the review of the permit application Such facilities will be required to utilize the most appropriate stealth technology application available for the site under consideration Such stealth technology application is defined as the attachment or incorporation of a wireless communication antenna into or on a structure or object such that the antenna does not significantly draw attention to itself or the public is not significantly aware of its existence Examples include, but are not limited to, attachment of antenna to a building, placement of antenna within or on a church steeple, bell or clock tower, chimney, victory bells, simulated trees, playing field lights or other light fixtures, signage or other similar devices This provision does not apply to facilities located in and adjoining nonresidential zoning districts or facilities permitted under subsections 8 (b), (c), (e) and (j)

8(j) Wireless communication transmission facilities may be installed on other non-wireless transmission towers located within existing utility rights-of-way of at least 60 feet in width with existing utility towers (such as public utility towers, television towers and radio towers) or anywhere within the associated utility right-of-way as long as such facilities do not exceed 35 feet in height above the utility transmission tower height Such facilities are not subject to the height limit outlined in subsection 8, the notification provision outlined in subsection 8(g) and they are not required to conform to the normal separation or yard requirements

8(k) All new or replacement wireless communication transmission facilities as well as modifications to existing facilities shall comply with all applicable regulations of the Federal Communications Commission

8(l) Any wireless communications transmission facility that is unused for a continuous period of twelve months shall be removed by the tower owner or the property owner

8(m) Wireless Communications Facilities, Towers and Antenna, as used in the preceding sections and sub-sections shall not include television and radio broadcast towers, personal or company owned and used communications towers and facilities or common carrier micro wave towers It is the intent of this ordinance that Wireless Communications Facilities, Towers and Antenna include those operations which are commonly referred to as Cellular and PCS services

8(n) Pole and Antenna Design

All new wireless communications transmission facilities shall utilize monopole (rather than lattice) type design unless located in industrial zoning New wireless communications transmission facilities located in or adjoining residential zoning shall not utilize platform antennas

2 Amend CHAPTER 12 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY, PART 5. SPECIAL REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN USES, Section 12 504 "Public Utility Structures" as follows

Section 12 504 Public utility structures

(7) Wireless communications transmission facilities including, but not limited to, transmission structures, equipment shelters and related facilities may be established in accordance with the provisions of subsection 12 108(8) and the provisions of this Section Wireless Communications transmission facilities may also be established as accessory or secondary uses in accordance with the provisions of subsection 12 108(8)

Section 2 That this ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption

Approved as to form

_____
City Attorney

I, _____, _____City Clerk of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and exact copy of an Ordinance adopted by the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, in regular session convened on the _____ day of _____, 19____, the reference having been made in Minute Book _____ and recorded in full in Ordinance Book _____, Page(s)_____

WITNESS my hand and the corporate seal of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, this the _____ day of _____, 19__

_____

CHET HELT YES
JOHN PLYLER - NO
MAHLON ADAMS YES
JOHN TABOR YES
DEAN GATES YES

Wireless Communication Transmission
Facilities Text Amendment

Section 12 108

(8) As a principal use (by themselves)

- May be to any height in a nonresidential zoning district
- In or adjoining residential zoning district, not to exceed height of established tree line or other obstacles on site by more than 20'
- If no tree cover on site, may not exceed 120' in height
- If higher than previously noted, Zoning Administrator before issuing a permit must receive an advisory recommendation from the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, and utilize stealth technology
- If over 40' in height, the setback, side and rear yards adjacent to a residential district must be increased by 1 foot for each foot in excess of 40', up to a maximum of 120'

As a principal use, or an ancillary or secondary use up to 150 feet in height must be designed to accommodate at least 2 communication carriers All towers over 150 feet must be able to handle at least 3 carriers

8(a 1) Towers may be constructed to any height in nonresidential zoning adjacent to other nonresidential zoning as a secondary use, such as an office building, parks, etc If so, the wireless facility is not required to meet any of the zoning district standards for lot area, height, etc

8(a 2) As a secondary use in or adjacent to a residential zoning district, the tower may be no higher than 20' above tree line or other obstacles on site, or to 120' if no tree line However, the minimum setback, side and rear yards adjacent to residentially zoned property are increased by 1 foot for each foot in tower height over 40 feet with a maximum required horizontal separation of 200 feet

If in residential zoning, separation from nonresidential zoning will be the same as the maximum yard requirements for the nonresidential zoning

However, if tower is in nonresidential zoning adjoining only nonresidential zoning, the tower may be to any height, subject to the district's normal yard requirements

8(a 3) If secondary use, tower may remain in present location if principal use is removed If tower is replaced, then it must comply with the standards of a principal use for that district

The changing or removal of antenna on the tower will be permitted without requiring the tower to comply with current regulations

8(b) Towers are permitted above the height limit in nonresidential districts adjoining other such districts Lots will conform to the minimum area and yard requirements of the district, unless the towers are secondary uses These towers are <u>not</u> subject to the notification provision

8(c) Towers are permitted atop any structure (other than single family or residential structure of less than 2 stories) in any district, not to exceed 20' from highest point of structure - <u>not</u> subject to notification provision

8(d) <u>Replacement of Existing Towers</u>
Existing towers at the time of adoption of this amendment may be replaced with taller towers without conforming to these new standards

8(d 1) Replacement tower must meet original yard requirement at the time originally constructed

8(d 2) Replacement tower must be monopole, unless in an industrial district

Up to 150 feet, must be able to accommodate 2 carriers - over 150 feet, 3 carriers

8(d 3) The tower owner must provide Zoning Administrator with an affidavit signed by at least 1 other owner stating that they need another tower within 1,000 feet and agreeing to co-locate on replacement tower

8(d 4) Replacement tower must conform to the landscaping and buffering requirement in force at replacement time

8(d 5) Replacement towers in or adjoining residential zoning can not be more than 50' above height of original tower

The addition of 50' can only be done once

8(d 6) Notification process is required for replacement towers in or adjoining residential zoning

8(e) Replacing Towers at Same Height

Any wireless facility may be removed and replaced with a new facility within 100 feet of some location, but no closer to required yards of the existing facility, and

8(e 1) Replacement is no higher than original

8(e 2) Must be monopole, unless in industrial district

If up to 150, must be able to accommodate 2 carriers, and over 150', must be able to have 3 carriers

8(e 3) Must comply with normal landscaping and buffering requirements

8(e 4) Same co-location affidavit as additional height

8(e 5) Must remove original tower within 90 days after new tower is installed

8(f) Facility equipment building(s) in connection with towers limited 500 square feet per company using -

Limited to 15' in height unless Zoning Administrator allows up to a maximum of 25' because of architectural design, screening, etc

8(g) Notification Process

8(g 1) Purpose - to allow neighboring residential property owners to learn of tower, present information that may effect its design, and furnish information on the application

8(g 2) Notice required for sites in or adjoining residential zoning

8(g 2a) Notice required to property owners within 100 feet and to neighborhood leaders

8(g 2b) Applicant supplies postage paid envelopes for notice

8(g 2c) 30 day comment period for interested parties prior to Zoning Administrator's decision

8(g 2d) Advisory recommendation comes from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission for towers above height limit in residential

8(h) Data base of existing tower facilities to be established

8(i) Advisory recommendation from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission and stealth technology required for new towers in excess of height limit on or adjoining residential sites

8(j) Towers can be located anywhere in existing utility rights-of-way at least 60 feet in width with existing utility towers up to 35 feet in height above existing towers

8(k) Towers must comply with FCC

8(l) Towers must be removed if unused for a year

8(m) These provisions do not apply to television or radio towers

8(n) No monopoles except in industrial zoning No platform antennae in or adjoining residential zoning

COUNCIL WORKSHOP
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Wireless Communications (Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment (Petition No 97-12)

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: Economic Development

3RD PART
JOHN WILL EXPLAIN
COMMITTEE'S PHILOSOPHY
FOR FINAL CHANGES.

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

- This petition proposes a series of changes to the current zoning regulations regarding cellular towers The issue was originally discussed by the Economic Development and Planning Committee of City Council in 1996 An agreement was reached that the cellular tower industry would act as the petitioner for the text amendment

- Public hearings were held in February and April, 1997 Subsequently, the Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission discussed the matter for several months Planning Commission members reached consensus on many areas of debate but were unable to achieve agreement on the issue of the feasibility and desirability of maximum tower heights in and adjoining residential areas As a result, the proposed text amendment was forwarded to City Council with a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission Just prior to the scheduled decision meeting on September 15, Chairman Heard of the Planning Commission requested the matter be sent back to the Planning Commission for further work City Council agreed to this request at the September 15 zoning session

- The Planning Committee of the Planning Commission discussed the petition on September 23 and the following key points were agreed to unanimously These have now been incorporated into a revised text amendment

- The Planning Committee is scheduled to review and approve of the changes on September 30 A written recommendation will be forwarded to City Council in the Friday, October 3 Council-Manager Memo

- Council asked that this item be placed on the October Workshop Agenda for discussion

Key Points of Proposed Text Amendment Recommended By Planning Committee

Freestanding Towers in or Adjoining Residential Zoning

Height limit is no more than 20 feet above the established tree line and other obstacles on the site or no more than 120 feet on sites without trees

Advisory Recommendation from Planning Commission and Stealth Technology Required for Towers in or Adjoining Residential Zoning Which Exceed Height Limit The Zoning Administrator is to obtain an advisory recommendation from the Planning Commission for towers in or adjoining residential zoning which exceed the height limit and such towers are to employ some form of stealth technology

Freestanding cellular towers located in or adjacent to residential zoning will trigger a notification process to adjacent property owners and neighborhood leaders The nearby owners do not have the ability to prevent the tower but can discuss the facility with the carrier The carrier is to consider comments concerning such items as landscaping "in good faith"

No platform antennae allowed

For all new or replacement freestanding towers

Co-location required for all towers -
Up to 150 feet in height two or more carriers
Above 150 feet in height three or more carriers

All new towers must use monopole design unless located in industrial zoning

OPTIONS:

- Approve the recommended text amendment
- Reject this proposal This would leave the current zoning regulations unchanged The current regulations do not require co-location of towers and do not impose a height limit on towers in residential areas

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

City Council previously referred this petition back to the Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Commission in order to receive another recommendation This petition will appear on the October 22 decision agenda

ATTACHMENTS: None Additional information and the September 30 Planning Committee recommendation will be sent in the Friday Council-Manager Memo