

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 460

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina met in a regular session on Monday, July 11, 1977, at 3:00 o'clock p. m., in the Council Chamber, City Hall, with Mayor John M. Belk presiding, and Councilmembers Betty Chafin, Louis M. Davis, Harvey B. Gantt, Pat Locke, Neil C. Williams and Joe D. Withrow present.

ABSENT: Councilman James B. Whittington.

\* \* \* \* \*

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by Councilman Joe D. Withrow.

RECORD TO SHOW COUNCILMAN WHITTINGTON ABSENT DUE TO AN EMERGENCY.

Mayor Belk asked that the minutes record that Councilman Whittington is absent from today's meeting due to an emergency.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously, the minutes of the last meeting, on Monday June 27, 1977, were approved as submitted.

FIVE RETIRING POLICEMEN RECOGNIZED AND PRESENTED WITH PLAQUES.

Mayor Belk recognized the following city policemen who have recently retired and presented each of them with a plaque in recognition of his service: Willie G. Jetton, employed in 1945; Calvin Ramsey (1935); Jack Fesperman (1940); Raymond Gammon (1948); and William F. Kerr (1951).

WEEK OF JULY 15 - 23, 1977 PROCLAIMED AS "REDIRECT YOUR DIRECTORY" WEEK.

Mayor Belk recognized Assistant City Attorney Michael Boyd of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Jaycees, and read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS there are approximately 400,000 old telephone directories, weighing over 1,000,000 pounds, in Charlotte-Mecklenburg just waiting to be thrown into the trash heap as a result of the new directories being distributed by Southern Bell; and

WHEREAS, the distribution of new directories began June 29, 1977; however, the project entitled "Redirect Your Directory" hopes to short circuit the usual pattern and redirect those old directories into recycling efforts for the good of the environment and for the good of Charlotte-Mecklenburg; and

WHEREAS this venture is jointly sponsored by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Jaycees, the Charlotte Clean City Committee, and Southern Bell; and

WHEREAS all proceeds for this project will go to the work of the Mecklenburg Jaycees and the many community projects they are regularly undertaking;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, John M. Belk, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15 - 23, 1977 as "Redirect Your Directory" Week and encourage all residents and businesses to participate in this very worthwhile community effort.

Mayor Belk also recognized Ms. Marilyn Williams, Director of the Charlotte Clean City Committee, and thanked her for the fine work they are doing. Mr. Boyd stated the City will be donating all of its telephone directories and

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 461

expressed thanks to the Council and the entire city for helping with the project. There was no representative from Southern Bell present but their cooperation was noted.

PRESENCE OF ANNOUNCED CANDIDATES FOR CITY COUNCIL NOTED IN AUDIENCE.

Councilman Davis stated there are three announced non-incumbent candidates in the audience - Mr. Ted Arrington, Mr. Peter Gerns and Mr. George Godwin; also Mr. Ken Hopper who has not announced. Councilman Davis stated it is commendable that these people have taken the time to come and familiarize themselves with the duties; that it is indicative of the fact that they are good quality candidates.

Mayor Belk congratulated these men for their willingness to serve the City. He also referred to the announcement made by Councilman Williams at the informal session that he would not be a candidate for re-election and stated that Mr. Williams has served two terms and very ably so, and thanked him for this service.

HEARING ON THE 1977 CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG THOROUGHFARE PLAN.

Mr. William McIntyre, Planning Director, stated in 1960 the Council adopted the first plan for the development of a major thoroughfare system for the city. That 1960 plan was designed to anticipate the needs until 1980, not only in the city but in the areas adjacent to the city. In 1960 the population of the area was about 275,000 people. The plan was based on the expectation of a population in 1980 of about 475,000 people. Last year the population of the city and county was 400,000, indicating tremendous growth and the desirability of facilities to be able to move larger numbers of people about the city and county effectively and efficiently.

He stated we now need to reach out to the next twenty years and update the plan that was adopted by Council in 1960 and extend it to the year 1995; that we again have in the program the development of a major thoroughfare system amplified above and beyond the 1960 plan to the 1995 horizon line. They expect a population of perhaps 675,000 people as contrasted to the 475,000 people living in the city and country at the present time.

Mr. McIntyre used a map to point out the existing major thoroughfare system, as well as the proposals for additions to the 1960 plan to carry it to the 1995 needs for circulation. He named some of the existing major systems already being used - Eastway Drive, Woodlawn, Fairview; Peachtree and Willow on the westerly side; in the northerly section, Sunset Road, Old Concord Road. The lines indicated on the map for future development indicate taking existing roads which do not meet each other and filling in that gap to provide for effective circulation. He called attention to the fact that the map shows there are very few new extensions in the city at the present time as proposed. Most of the new extensions are on the westerly side and on the edge of the city - westerly and northwesterly. He cited the proposed extension of Lakeview Road from Beatties Ford Road in a westerly and southerly direction as an example of this.

Another line indicated the existing system of freeways - I-77, I-85, and Brookshire Freeway - and another line showed the proposed additions to this present expressway system. He stated the major new freeway is the Iredell which is proposed to encircle the urban area; another would be the relocation of NC-49 from the present North Tryon/I-85 existing facility to the westerly/easterly side of the county. In addition, the city and the state are already committed to the development of additions to that system in the near future - these are projects not on the ground yet but which have been funded. The Airport Parkway is an example of such a project; NC-16 is another; Highway 51, another.

Mr. McIntyre indicated on another map what would be the result if they do not expand the system to meet anticipated needs to 1995. It showed the projected 1995 traffic volume on the existing and the committed system; and also the estimated volumes that would result if the proposed plan is implemented. He reviewed some of the effects that would be produced if they do

July 11, 1977

Minute Book 65 - Page 462

not pursue the proposed system but stay with the present system plus those already under commitment.

He took Interstate 85 as an example and used the projected volumes that would be on that facility in 1995 according to the traffic distribution picture that the State has developed, which would be 127,000 vehicles per day at the maximum point of traffic impact. In the Independence Boulevard area there would be 119,000 vehicles per day on the existing system.

As a comparison between building no additional facilities beyond what we have now versus pursuing the development of the plan as proposed, he stated with the development of the outer belt, the I-85 traffic would be reduced to about 68,000. He cited other examples in which the two figures were compared.

Mr. McIntyre stated that in previous discussions of the major thoroughfare system plans and development, the Council has expressed some concern about the projected cost of implementing the proposed plan. The estimates made by the State, which obviously are not based on the details you get into with construction plans, indicate the cost of the development of the system as proposed would be \$475.0 million. He stated they have looked back into the records of the expenditures between the State and the City in the past several years, from 1970 to 1975, to see how the cost of the development of this plan would relate to the expenditures that have actually been made over a period of time. During that period the City and the State spent \$108.0 million. Some of this money, as they well know, was tied up in court suits, but it was in the bank and available to be spent during that period of time. If that rate of spending is projected out to the year 2000 you get \$453.0 million which is not too far out of line with the projected cost of about \$475.0 million.

He stated the investment in a major road system is also a contribution to the transit system in many cases. He displayed an overlay map to illustrate the relationship between the thoroughfare system plan as proposed and the transit development plan as proposed in the Planning Commission's Comprehensive Plan for 1995. He stated they need to remind themselves that the Transit System's major backbone is an express system - freeways where they already are available; that where there are no freeways in existence, busways would be used to supplement the use of the existing route.

A very important consideration in relating the development of the thoroughfare plan to transit is the relationship of the bus feeder system that is proposed in the Comprehensive Plan to local buses running through neighborhoods. For the most part, the feeder bus routes follow circumferential routes in all of the proposed locations of existing major thoroughfares. They feel that the development of the circumferential system is very vital to pursue the objective of having a much more persuasive transit system - persuasive in inducing people to ride it.

Councilman Gantt asked if he heard Mr. McIntyre say it is possible to consider these as the major transit routes or feeders to the central city that it might even be conceivable that certain lanes on the I-77, I-85, Independence Boulevard facilities might be converted into express busways?

Mr. McIntyre replied that has been done in some places, but before he could give a real affirmative answer this would have to be explored with the State, and probably the Federal, government in terms of the acceptability of that idea. He feels it needs to be explored as it seems to have great possibilities.

Councilman Gantt stated his reason for asking that is that he feels it is a very good idea that the Thoroughfare Plan he is presenting with the transit alternatives has a relationship to that and he wonders whether even in our future budgeting for roads if we now start to build in, in terms of cost, etc., those things that relate to transit. For example, the necessary kinds of right-of-way requirements for express buses - for special lanes to carry people or for intersect parking (locations strategically along those lines); capital improvement funds for parking that relates to those roadways. That might be an expenditures that might be more related to transit than parking garages or other types of parking.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 463

Councilman Davis asked if the matter of discontinued streets which are proposed to be connected in this Plan has been reconsidered recently in light of Council's action to delete most of the streets from the discontinuous street program? Mr. McIntyre replied these discontinuous streets are in a different kind of category altogether. The discontinuous street program was basically a program to connect minor streets in subdivisions and local developments.

Councilman Davis asked, in the view of the public, how many of them would have the same impact on neighborhoods? Mr. McIntyre replied they are entirely different roads in their physical sense and for different purposes.

Councilman Davis referred to Mr. McIntyre's statement that this plan, if implemented, would make a substantial contribution to our transit system. He stated in the 1995 Comprehensive Plan the estimate for transit ridership is 6 percent which is about what it has been in recent years; and asked if this estimate would be upgraded?

Mr. McIntyre replied the estimate would certainly be re-examined as time goes on and changes will take place, but that estimate seemed to be the best one at the time the Plan was put together.

Councilwoman Chafin stated it is difficult for her to tell from the map furnished with the agenda, other than with respect to the major thoroughfares, exactly what they are talking about in the way of specific projects - in terms of widening, linkages - are envisioned by this Plan. Mr. McIntyre replied there is a larger map available and also they are working up a list of the projects.

Ms. Ann Pleasants, 3500 Country Club Drive, spoke in opposition to Shamrock Drive being included in the Thoroughfare Plan. She reviewed the efforts which her neighborhood organization, RESCU, have made during the past two years asking for relief from cut-through traffic, as well as the efforts the Traffic Engineering Department has made to regulate this traffic. She feels that this intentional directing of traffic onto already over-burdened Shamrock Drive has probably raised the traffic count to justify four lanes for Shamrock; that the reason they have this problem is the poor design of Eastway Drive. That what is needed is a transportation policy change, which now seems to be if enough commuters outside Charlotte want to travel any given residential street in the city it is our responsibility to accommodate this traffic going downtown with four lanes. This seems backwards to her; should not the neighborhoods be protected rather than accommodating the commuter traffic?

She stated the study made of Eastway Drive is reason enough to take Shamrock off of the Plan; that their study has been ignored by the City and by the State Board of Transportation; that she feels it has been their intention all along to four-lane Shamrock and they have now used RESCU's request for traffic diversion as justification. She stated it should be evident to Council by now that the citizens of Charlotte are not going to sit at home and read the news of their decisions any longer. They are trying to work with Council to try to make our city a better place to live. That neighborhood groups all over the City are asking for a policy change. If Eastway Drive was built to save their community from commuter destruction, as they were told, why has it not done so?

Mr. Ken Hopper, 3510 Country Club Drive, stated he is co-chairman of RESCU and a deeply concerned citizen. Over the past few years he has witnessed a steady decline in property values in the Country Club Estates community. This has been a direct result of the cut-through and spillover traffic. He also requested that Shamrock Drive be removed from the Thoroughfare Plan. He spoke of the study RESCU made and what has happened on Eastway Drive which was originally called a beltroad.

At the conclusion of his remarks, Mr. Hopper announced his intentions to run as an at-large candidate, on the Republican ticket, for a seat on City Council.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 464

Three members of the Myers Park Homeowners Association spoke in opposition to the designation of Sharon Road and Radcliffe Avenue as part of the Plan:

Mr. Michael Childs, 2301 Pembroke Avenue, gave a community-wide approach as to their opposition to these streets being included. He stated one question they have to face is whether the designation of these streets as a thoroughfare means anything or whether it is simply a line on a map. That they feel it portends the eventual widening of those two streets into a four-lane, high speed, high volume corridor and, therefore, the decision Council makes has a tremendous significance for Myers Park.

He gave four reasons for this conclusion. (1) The word "plan" itself indicates a blueprint - this is the idea of the people who drew up the Plan as to where major traffic ought to go. That Mr. Hoose has said that Radcliffe is already a thoroughfare because it is a major carrier of traffic between the Queens Road/Selwyn Avenue area and the Kings Drive/Queens Road West areas. Mr. Childs stated there is a world of difference between the definition of a thoroughfare as given in the statutes governing the adoption of the thoroughfare - a street which carries the major portion of traffic between two areas - and a major carrier. Mr. Hoose has also said that through traffic on Radcliffe exceeds the local traffic generated by homes in the near vicinity and therefore it is a thoroughfare. Mr. Childs stated any figures dealing with traffic in Myers Park will indicate, if you use this criterion, that almost every street is a thoroughfare. That Myers Park, because of its location between downtown Charlotte and all of the housing development going on in South Charlotte, is of necessity at the vortex of all this traffic.

(2) Mr. Corbett, Traffic Engineering Director, has told them that he sees this designation as the first step toward the widening of Sharon/Radcliffe. In connection with the Sherwood problem, the comment was made that they would not have this problem if Sharon/Radcliffe were four-lane. That is a dubious proposition and it speaks directly to the point of whether this street is, in the eyes of the Traffic Engineering Department, right for four lanes. (3) He referred to the City's Capital Improvements program of four years ago which projected the desire to have money in three years to widen these two streets. The drawings showed the addition of a four-lane corridor with parking on both sides, amounting to a six-lane corridor, with an 80-foot right-of-way. It was projected to accommodate 14,000 cars on Sharon Road and 7,200 on Radcliffe; that the traffic in that area is nowhere near that now.

(4) He read from a newspaper interview with Mr. Ike Heard of the Planning Commission staff in which he stated that "although high traffic volume may not exist on Sharon/Radcliffe, the streets are important in terms of connectivity;" that "the purpose of the thoroughfare is to provide a route which in the future will be capable of handling the increasing flow of traffic. Only if traffic on the existing routes reaches a significant volume, would any improvements on the thoroughfare be considered." Mr. Childs stated that Mr. Corbett believes that volume has been reached. That Mr. Heard indicated that if planners do any widening of streets in the area after the adoption of the Plan, the designated thoroughfare would be the first street to be considered.

Mr. Childs stated all of this taken together says quite clearly that what the Planners have in mind for the Sharon/Radcliffe small part of the Thoroughfare Plan is something that will channel traffic for the benefit of a lot of other streets, the likely results of which will be there will be a tremendous increase on that street. That common sense tells them that the designation of this as a thoroughfare has a very real meaning - the future widening of Sharon and Radcliffe. Common sense also tells them that if this were not so, there would not be much resistance to taking it out of the Plan. Common sense also prompts them to ask "If there are no plans for widening this street in the foreseeable future, then why is it in there at all?"

He stated the designation in itself is bad for Myers Park because it leaves hanging over the people who live in that area the idea that it will be a major thoroughfare in the future. He stated when City Council a few years

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 465

ago took these streets out of the projected plans of the Traffic Engineering Department it was followed by a tremendous fix-up and improvement of the homes in that area. That once this "cloud" is lifted, the likelihood of homes being improved will increase dramatically.

He stated another thing from the perspective of the entire Myers Park area, they have heard time and again from other areas as to what a disaster a road-widening can be. Not only can it be a disaster to a street but it can be very harmful to the neighborhood itself, in that people seek out four-lane, high-speed roads. It would turn out to be not simply a re-direction of traffic from Sherwood Avenue and other streets like that, but it would mean an increased amount of traffic coming through the heart of Myers Park. They already have an enormous amount of traffic already and the question is do they want to continue the development of roads that will put an even larger burden on this part of the inner-city which is between downtown and the development in the South and Southeast.

They think the time is now to come to grips with this problem. Is it really in the best interests of Charlotte as a whole, and Myers Park in particular, to have this road built? They do not think so; there are a lot of other alternatives for the traffic. He stated there is no loud public outcry for this corridor to be built, so far as he knows.

Mr. Bob Lilien, 2121 Radcliffe Avenue, filed with the Clerk a petition signed by "more than 220 people," asking that Radcliffe and Sharon be removed from the Thoroughfare Plan. He stated there is a large group present today supporting this position; that one of the most important reasons they oppose this designation is that it is not needed and is not justified by the current traffic count, the current traffic flow; the proposed traffic flow nor the projected traffic count. They disagree with Traffic Engineering that there is a big demand for the use of these streets as a connector to reach East Boulevard. That the figure of 6,000 cars a day is used as a criterion to begin to justify looking at a possible four-lane; that Radcliffe presently carries only 1,100 and Sherwood carries only 2,700. He cited other streets in the area with heavier traffic counts, none of which appeared on the Thoroughfare Plan; and gave figures to support the fact that the traffic count on Sharon and Radcliffe today is about four times below what the estimates made in 1972 indicated the count would be in 1980.

He stated that contrary to staff's attempt to justify this designation on the basis of connectivity of major sources of traffic, in truth Sharon-Radcliffe does not connect the major traffic sources in the area. He stated Selwyn Avenue and Providence Road are the two major sources, and also cited other traffic factors involved, including safety as it relates to the residents who live on Sharon and Radcliffe. That Wendover and Woodlawn now serve as an inner loop and this should do away with the necessity for Sharon and Radcliffe to serve as an inner loop as was planned in 1960 and in 1972.

Mr. Lilien stated a professional traffic engineer, Bill White, has studied all of the data given to them by the City and finds no justification for thoroughfare designation of these streets. That 3,000 non-Providence, non-Selwyn cars per day move down East Boulevard through the area in question and all of them move on well-distributed street systems through Myers Park, allowing each street to carry a small amount of traffic instead of several streets having to carry it all. That destroying and unsettling a viable, inner city neighborhood is a high price to pay to move 3,000 cars a little faster, especially when the thoroughfare does not address the real problem of moving traffic from Providence to East Boulevard.

He also noted that Queens College faces on Radcliffe - of the college trustees who have been contacted none have been in favor of the thoroughfare designation. That Myers Park Baptist Church sits directly in the way of the thoroughfare and of the officials there who have been contacted they likewise oppose the designation. That Myers Park Elementary School now sits within 53 feet of the street and the school strenuously objects to the designation. The Board of Education is already on record as opposing any increase in traffic on Radcliffe and any widening of that street.

July 11, 1977

Minute Book 65 - Page 466

Mr. Lilien stated in 1972-73 Traffic Engineering wanted Sharon/Radcliffe on the Capital Improvements budget. City Council voted unanimously to remove it and the residents were told at that time "this is a dead issue." He stated the people have bought and restored houses on this street in reliance on that fact and the preservation efforts will certainly slow down if not completely stop if City Council makes the future of Sharon-Radcliffe uncertain by again hanging the thoroughfare cloud over their streets.

Mrs. Betty Collins, 7121 Lancer Drive, stated she is speaking on behalf of the parents of Myers Park traditional school, and they want to reaffirm the position they took in 1973 of opposing the thoroughfare designation. She stated that next fall the school is expected to open with 600 students enrolled. Approximately one-third of these children will be walking to school; the other two-thirds will be riding buses since it is an alternative school and the enrollment comes from all over the City of Charlotte as well as from the immediate community. There are particular problems in the busing situation and these buses have to be loaded on Radcliffe Avenue. It is not safe to have these children walking over a four-lane thoroughfare and it is not safe to have them loaded on buses in that kind of situation.

Mrs. Collins stated she is a new citizen of Charlotte, having been here only seven years. She has been very pleased and very impressed with the Myers Park community and how well it has been preserved, considering communities of this sort in other cities. She has lived in big cities and has seen these types of communities deteriorate for various reasons; that one of the reasons is traffic - thoroughfares coming through these communities and people moving out. She stated she is pleased to be a part of the Myers Park community, that her children go to school there and she admires the community. She asked Council, in making their decision, not to destroy the peace and tranquility which exists there.

Councilman Gantt stated there have been questions raised about the specifics of the Plan rather than the entire Thoroughfare Plan concept. He feels this would be a very good opportunity while all of these citizens are present to at least hear the staff's rationale for why these particular arteries are included in the Plan.

Mr. McIntyre stated the principal reason for Sharon/Radcliffe being in the Plan is a system reason rather than a traffic volume reason, as a connector between Sharon Road and Queens Road West. He stated that Shamrock Drive is a street that has extensive continuity in a radial direction from the central part of the City and therefore it serves a substantial amount of population not only in the area but coming into the area from the east.

Ms. Rhonda Innes, 2711 Dunlavin Way, requested that Shamrock Drive be removed from the Plan because, although it has been on there for twenty years, it serves to move traffic from two points which there are already a four-lane thoroughfare serving; that there is as much of a curve to the south on Shamrock as there is to the north on Eastway, Sugar Creek and The Plaza. She stated eighteen months ago they requested the Traffic Engineer to do a study of the possibility of upgrading the intersections of Sugar Creek at The Plaza and at Eastway. Now she sees that Shamrock is due to be widened in the next three years, but has heard nothing about those intersections being improved, nor have they heard any results of those studies. She stated if Council adopts a policy to take neighborhoods, Shamrock should be the first road to be removed from the Thoroughfare Plan. She stated Council will continue to defy neighborhoods until it takes a stand on priorities of traffic. That the directive Council gave the Planning Commission and the Traffic Engineering Department two months ago concerning alternatives to cut-through has merely delayed the need for Council to accept the moment of decision on the policy. The results of the study will not affect Council's decision, but only assist in implementing that decision. She also stated she fails to understand why a representative from the City was not at the beltway hearing, stressing the importance of that road which our thoroughfare plan is so closely based on.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 467

Mr. Frank Summers, 5621 Wintercrest Lane, stated he works very closely with the people in the Parksdale Area and the Barclay Downs Area. He stated he would like to talk about Colony Road; about the rapid transit plan, and about a green belt.

Colony Road extends and already exists from Sewlyn Avenue to Sharon Road; and is interrupted by a very small section south of Fairview, and then it does not exist beyond that. This road that is being planned on the Thoroughfare plan would pass entirely through areas that are zoned residential, and it is surprising to him that it is necessary to have a thoroughfare plan going through entirely residential areas. A road of this type is very undesirable in areas zoned as residential because it invites, and it is almost impossible to prevent strip zoning of these roads in the commercial area. He asked that they request a detail plan on what is going to be the land use in that area. If it is slated to be commercial, make it commercial and show it as commercial and let the people talk about the issue itself; and not think of it as a residential road when it is a commercial road.

That he is particularly concerned about the effect of the Colony Road Thoroughfare upon the neighborhood in which he lives. The neighborhoods in which they live are bounded by Barclay Road-Fairview Belt Road; it is a very large belt road going through the area. It is also bounded by the Wendover Belt Road, another large belt road going through this area. It is bounded in another direction by Park Road; and it has the severely threatened Barclay Downs Road running through the middle of the area. To add another very highly traveled road on Colony Road seems unneeded through the area. He would like to see this road, the thoroughfare road, removed from the plan until better land use planning takes place.

Mr. Summers stated he would like to commend the planners on the Transit Plan. It is very much a step in the right direction. He would think this transit plan should be updated, and put on an urgent basis. Other people have talked about the ruin of their neighborhoods as we are trying to save the areas and inner parts of the city to let the outer parts of the city develop. The development of the outer parts of the city will occur. It is very important this development take place without destroying the rest of the city. He recommends and urges Council to update the transit plan. It is a very good plan and he thinks is very important.

Along the same line, and very much connected, he suggests very strongly that Council consider around the City of Charlotte, somewhere, a green belt. This is a very important thing for a good quality of living. If they will think about that, they will see that the transit plan as the road plan then has to be completely re-thought. He stated the green belt does not have to be city parks entirely; it could be golf courses, with city parks in the outer parts of town, and will leave some portion as farm land. If they do that and implement the transit plan, then the road plan will be modified and will need much less of these roads such as the Colony Road Thoroughfare.

At the request of Council, Mr. McIntyre pointed out the Colony Road project. He stated Colony Road now exists from Selwyn Avenue down to Sharon Road. The proposed extension crosses Fairview, crosses Sharon and down into Rea Road.

Mr. Charles Conner, 6525 Morrison Boulevard, stated he is a member of the Transportation Action Council of the Greater Charlotte Chamber of Commerce. His purpose of being here today, as well as the presence of several individuals he will introduce, is to urge the members of City Council to move toward the adoption of the 1977 Charlotte-Mecklenburg Thoroughfare Plan. Those who support the 1977 Plan feel the adoption of the Plan is in the best interest of the majority of the citizens of Charlotte-Mecklenburg in providing our community with conceptual guidelines of future traffic flow in and around Charlotte.

Mr. David Taylor, Corporate Vice President of Celanese Corporation and First Vice Chairman of the Greater Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, stated he does not believe the Chamber in any way attempted to assess the individual components of the plan.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 468

He thinks the Chamber will always look at any plans of this nature for the overall good of the City without in any way trying to say that one street should be favored, or not favored over another. He does believe the Chamber through the years has taken a position that has overall lead to a better city as a result.

On June 15, 1977, the Chamber adopted the following resolution regarding the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Thoroughfare Plan:

"Whereas, Thoroughfare development in Charlotte has been proceeding for 17 years within the framework of a plan conceived in 1960 with metes projected through 1980; and

Whereas, a new thoroughfare plan is needed to continue orderly growth and development, which depends significantly on a planned system of traffic arteries, and an approved thoroughfare plan is necessary as a component of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Comprehensive Plan 1995; and

Whereas, both state and federal regulations require mutually adopted thoroughfare plans for cities as a part of the funding program; and furthermore without such a plan funding is thereby jeopardized; and

Whereas, citizens of Charlotte-Mecklenburg benefit from locations of anticipated thoroughfares, and thoroughfare improvements can be identified whether for the purchase of home purchases, business locations or other considerations;

Now, Therefore, Be it Resolved that the Greater Charlotte Chamber of Commerce hereby endorses the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Thoroughfare Plan of 1977, and urges the Charlotte City Council to move towards its adoption!"

Mr. Conner stated although all the directors of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce were not present at the voting on that resolution; those who were voted unanimously to adopt the resolution. He then read the names of the existing directors.

Mr. Stan Brookshire, former Mayor of the City of Charlotte, stated he is present only in the public interest and he has no ax to grind; he is only here for what he considers the good of the city and the preservation of those things, and only those things that will add to its importance as it becomes a bigger city.

That he needs not tell them as local elected officials they have two major responsibilities. First is the delivery of municipal urban services to serve the citizens of Charlotte. They are fortunate in having a good professional staff headed by Mr. Burkhalter as City Manager to manage the details of the day to day operations. The second responsibility, and he is sure they are aware of that, is the proper and careful planning for the growth and development of this urban Charlotte-Mecklenburg community. That he says growing; and we all know it is growing; although there are a lot of other citizens satisfied with its present size, and would not like to see it larger, it is going to grow whether we want it to grow or not.

Sometime ago he understands they did adopt and approve the master plan, developed by the City-County Planning Department, that carries development to the year 1995. He is sure a part of that program does cover the thoroughfare needs that are anticipated by this community up to the year 1995.

The 1977 Thoroughfare Plan for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg has been approved by the Board of County Commissioners. Previously it was approved by the State Department of Transportation, who not only in approving it, indicated a willingness to help provide the beginning of the outer belt road for Charlotte-Mecklenburg. That beginning being the section between Pineville and Matthews, or between I-77 and U.S. 74.

The concept also has the endorsement of the Chamber of Commerce as per the resolution just read. He thinks it also has the backing and endorsement of the news media.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 469

There are some opposed to the location of the outer belt road - at least the portion between I-77 and U.S. 74, largely for personal reasons. But even those who objected in public hearings so far have objected only to the exact or proposed locations. The feeling is that most of us are willing to see progress made if it steps on somebody else's toes, and not our own.

Mr. Brookshire stated he is suggesting to Council the importance of re-affirming their commitment to long range planning to carry us to the year 1995, including the development of the very important outer belt loop to accommodate not only those who want to pass through Charlotte without having to trespass or use our present streets, but for those of our citizens who want to move from one quadrant of the city to another, without having to drive downtown on one artery and out on another. It just makes real good sense, and he is sure Council in its careful planning will give considerable thought not only to those who object to a given route, but to the overall need for the greater community of Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

Mr. Brookshire stated Mr. W. T. Harris, Mr. Allan Tate and Mr. D. Reid were all present earlier in the meeting, but had to leave due to the lateness of the hour.

Mr. Sandy Welton, 2501 E. Fifth Street, stated the Elizabeth Community Association hopes the Council will be very careful in looking at the Plan's impact on neighborhoods in town.

Councilman Gantt stated in listening to all the comments with the exception of some of the last few speakers who spoke to the idea of accepting the Thoroughfare Plan at least in concept, most of the people are specifically concerned with certain streets. This boils down to about three different arteries he has noted. There has been some question in his mind ultimately how we will dispose of the Thoroughfare Plan. He imagines it will be a separate item that might be considered at a later time. But it seems to him that what he did not hear today is an objection to a plan itself. He thinks that is important, and should be kept upper most in the minds of the Council - that is the concept of having a 20 year plan while we move people from Point A to Point B, has not been rejected even by citizens who object to the location of specific arteries.

Councilman Gantt stated he is quite willing to examine in some detail, with the staff, and with those citizens who object to that, any of the arteries - in particular the two arteries we heard today. But Council should keep upper most in mind that we do need a thoroughfare plan; and he would hope that none of them heard this to mean that maybe we should scrap the whole idea of 20 year planning of roads. That is a significant thing the staff has done with regard of tying in transit with thoroughfare planning.

As to the examination of those specific roads, he heard Pat Locke saying once a little earlier that it might be a good idea to have this heard in Committee so that those persons who object, or the major spokesmen for the various arteries on the plan, might have an opportunity to air out the record with the staff, and with those members of that Council Committee.

Councilwoman Chafin stated she thinks that is an excellent idea.

Councilman Williams stated he is inclined to agree with Mr. Gantt on that point. He understands too that staff is developing an itemized list of these roads with a short description on what each one would entail. That would be very helpful to him. Just looking at this map it is hard to figure out where all the roads are. He would not want to endorse the plan, and not have exactly what is in it.

Councilwoman Chafin stated she hopes the Committee will examine the plan in great detail because it occurs to her while the citizens who have come before Council today are aware of the plan for their specific neighborhood, and have been able to develop some very persuasive arguments against those plans, there are perhaps residents of other neighborhoods who are not aware of the plans. In some way we need to make them aware so they will have an opportunity to participate. Also, Ronda Innes made a very good point when she suggested the City should have been represented at the hearing on the outer belt loop. She stated she does not think there is a line, or a broken line that is more important to the future of transit planning in the study and dealing with the problem of neighborhood cut-through traffic when we get the outer belt road.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book '65 - Page 470

AMENDMENT TO THE CETA TITLE I CONTRACT WITH EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION OF NORTH CAROLINA TO INCREASE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN SUMMER WORK YOUTH EXPERIENCE PROGRAM FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.

Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried, an amendment was approved to the CETA Title I contract with the Employment Security Commission of North Carolina to increase the number of participants from 323 to 430 in the Summer Youth Work Experience Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth, at an increased contract amount of \$66,369.

CONTRACT WITH AREA MENTAL HEALTH BOARD FOR THERAPEUTIC LEISURE EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AREA YOUTH, APPROVED.

Councilwoman Locke moved approval of a contract with the Area Mental Health Board (Impact Enterprises), in the amount of \$88,500 to be used for a Therapeutic Leisure Education Program for approximately 200 Community Development Area Youth. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously.

CONTRACT WITH RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE FOR A LAND UTILIZATION AND MARKETABILITY STUDY FOR SPECIFIC AREAS LOCATED WITHIN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TARGET AREAS, APPROVED.

Councilman Gantt moved approval of a contract with Research Triangle Institute, in the amount of \$20,150, for a land utilization and marketability study for specific areas located within the North Charlotte, Grier Heights, Five Points, Southside Park, West Morehead, First Ward and Third Ward Community Development Target Areas. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow.

Councilwoman Locke requested Mr. Sawyer to explain this. She asked if this cannot be done in-house? Mr. Sawyer, Director of Community Development, replied this take special knowledge in the market of land. They are faced with the redevelopment plans that have been approved and prepared almost entirely by planners. In these plans certain land has been set aside to be used for commercial or industrial purposes. At the time they did this it more or less encompassed areas that had already been zoned for commercial which the planners thought was appropriate. They realize as they get closer to the point, after clearing some of the land, of accumulating and offering it for sale they need some expert advice and counsel on how much of it can be absorbed into the market for different purposes so they do not end up with ten acres of neighborhood shopping when only three acres are needed. That is the kind of work this contractor will do for them. They will focus in on North Charlotte first - the existing North Charlotte commercial area at the intersection of 35th and 36th Streets which they were requested to look at from this standpoint by the North Charlotte Association. That was included in the first year plan, and they are now at the point where they are honoring that request.

Councilwoman Locke asked if the Planning Commission cannot do this? Mr. Sawyer replied the Planning Commission worked closely with them in planning the area; but he is not sure the Planning Commission has the kind of real estate knowledge of the kind that does marketability studies that could do this for them. He stated they do not have the capability in their shop; they have people who buy land for them and who sell land for them. They do not get into the marketing.

Mayor Belk stated one of the shortcomings of local government is that we do not plan that far in advance. The Research Triangle groups is one of the best assets to help make decisions on important issues. That he would congratulate Mr. Sawyer on his recommendation.

Councilman Gantt stated as Mr. Sawyer remembers we had an experience with Tyson's Grocery Store sometime ago when we started to work on that project in that the amount of area designated for commercial property was much too large compared with the actual need. We need to tie that down a little more specifically. He thinks this is a very good idea. Mr. Sawyer replied this will do exactly that. That the problem did surface at that time. It exists in Grier Heights; it exists in Cherry. Areas have been zoned for commercial use for years and they have not been used. You have a constant change of demands with shopping centers being established;

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 471

we just do not know what is left for the neighborhood, and we need something very substantial and some with a great deal of creditability that we can offer to perspective developers to let them know what the market might be, and how much development can be supported by the purchasing power represented in the project area.

Councilwoman Locke asked how soon the report will be finished? Mr. Sawyer replied he believes the major portion will be in 90 days.

Councilman Davis asked who the other two firms were to submit bids? Mr. Sawyer replied Hammer-Siler-George, Inc., and Real Estate Research Corporation.

The vote was taken on the motion, and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC WORKS BILL OF 1977 ACTIONS.

(a) Motion was made by Councilman Gantt, and seconded by Councilman Withrow to adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to file an application for federal funds under the Public Works Bill of 1977, and to establish the following priority of projects:

1.) First Ward Housing Project	\$ 750,000
2.) Sidewalk Construction	500,000
3.) Water and Sewer Line Extensions	800,000
4.) Fourth Ward Redevelopment	500,000
5.) Community Development Target Area Parks	330,000
	\$2,880,000

Councilman Davis stated he is going to vote for this. He received a report from the Water and Sewer Department relating not only to this item, but to the other items that were on the unfunded portion of the capital improvement program. Even though he is voting for this now he would like to reserve the right to comment on this further after having more time to digest that study.

The vote was taken on the motion, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 12, at Page 436.

(b) Councilwoman Locke moved approval of a contract with Hawkins Associates, Architects, for architectural services for design of 25 units of multi-family housing for low and moderate income families to be located in First Ward at a fee of 7.7% of the total construction cost, plus a total fee of \$3,000 for preparation of a master plan. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow.

Councilman Davis asked what previous business has the firm of Hawkins Associates had with the City of Charlotte in the last two or three years? Mr. Hopson, Public Works Director, replied none. They do have a contract with the Housing Authority which is with the federal government; they have nothing with the City of Charlotte nor with the County.

The vote was taken on the motion, and carried as follows:

- YEAS: Councilmembers Locke, Withrow, and Gantt.
- NAYS: Councilmembers Chafin, Davis and Williams.

The Mayor broke the tie voting in favor of the motion.

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A CLEAN WATER BOND FUND GRANT FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEMS IN THE 1977 ANNEXATION AREAS.

Motion was made by Councilman Gantt, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and carried unanimously, adopting a resolution accepting a N. C. Clean Water Bond Fund Grant, in the amount of \$64,181, for wastewater collection systems in the 1977 annexation areas.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 12, at Page 437.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 472

ORDINANCE REGULATING DOOR-TO-DOOR SELLING AND SOLICITATION, DENIED.

Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, stated the City Council some months ago was asked to consider regulating residential door to door sales and soliciations, and his office was requested to draft an ordinance.

The ordinance before Council is submitted in accordance with that request. The ordiannce would in general regulate door to door residential sales, solicitation and canvassing with some exceptions. Those exceptions would be if a potential sales person was invited to the residence by the resident, or if the particular sales person was engaged in the solicitation, vending or canvassing for charitable, patriotic, educational, health, religious, political or philanthropic purposes. These people are exempt from this ordinance because they are basically covered under the City's Charitable Solicitation ordinance which has been in existence for some 15 or 20 years which requires registration of those types of sales and solicitation with the Charity Soliciation Commission. Other than those exemptions, it would be unlawful under the proposed ordinance to engage in door-to-door sales and soliciations in residential areas (it is limited to residential types of sales and solicitation activities) without having first registered with the Police Department, and having been issued a certificate of registration.

The terms "sales, solicitors, vendor and canvasser" and definition is contained in Section 6-8 of the proposed ordinance. Section 6-81 provides the information that would be contained on an application a person would have to fill out and file with the registration officer in the police department in order to obtain a permit. If the ordinance is approved, each applicant would be required to pay a fee of \$3.00 to the registration officer to defray the cost of processing the application. In addition each applicant would have to supply two photographs which is a requirement of the application at his or her expense.

The ordinance then provides once the police department receives an application, it has 24 hours in which to investigate the information on the application, and assuming further the person has not been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, or a crime involving fraudulent acts or conduct, a permit must be issued.

The permit or certificate of registration is valid for a period of six months; the person receiving a permit must carry the permit with them at all times while they are engaged in sales or solicitation; they must present that permit or certificate to each resident they contact before beginning their sales activities; they must also exhibit the certificate to any law enforcement officer upon request.

Section 6-84 provides two grounds on which the registration officer may reject or deny the request for an application or permit. Those grounds are (1) the failure of the applicant to complete the application; (2) a material misstatement or misrepresentation in the information submitted on the applicant; and (3) conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, or of a crime involving fraudulent acts or conduct.

In the event an application is denied, an appeal can be taken from that denial to the Police Chief or his designee within 72 hours of the date of the denial. A hearing must be held if an appeal is taken within five days. A hearing is held before the Police Chief or his designee, and he may either uphold the decision of the registrati officer not to issue the permit, or reverse the decision and order the permit to be issued.

Section 6-85 provides that no person subject to the provisions of this ordinance may solicit, vend or canvass on a door-to-door basis except during the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M., Mondays through Saturdays.

Finally, the ordinance provides that it is unlawful for any person holding one of these permits to advertise, represent or hold out in any manner that the certificate is an endorsement of the holder by the city, by the city council, or by any employee of the city.

He stated he has left the effective date blank, and if Council desires to adopt the ordinance he suggests they set the date sometime in the future so that the police department will have sufficient time to prepare application forms and certificate

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 473

forms, and to allow sales people who might be covered by the ordinance sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the ordinance provisions and process that would be required.

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, stated since the writing of this ordinance, he would like to suggest to Council that the appeal be changed to the Charity Solicitation Commission, rather than the Police Chief. That he has a comments from Mr. Ed Pickard, Chairman of the Commission, saying the Commission would be willing to accept that responsibility. That he would like to get the Chief out of the appeal position.

The Mayor and Councilmembers indicated that was a good suggestion.

Speaking for the ordinance was Mr. Ted Law of the Better Business Bureau who suggested several changes in the proposed ordinance. One was to change the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 8: P.M. to 8:00 A.M. to 9:00 or 9:30 P.M. Second is to delete the requirement for the thumb print of the applicant. He stated he talked to some of the people in the hallway who are opposed to this ordinance, and they all have valid reasons, and they believe in what they are going to say.

He stated they receive an average of 15 to 17 written complaints a week to the Better Business Bureau on problems of direct sales at the homes. He stated they are not talking about the legitimate people here in this audience; they are talking about the con artist coming in and trying to rip off the people. People do not do enough of "shutting the door". They do not say "no" enough.

Councilman Gantt asked how they would make this new licensing procedure known to the average consumer? Mr. Law replied it would be through the medias, through people going through the areas; it could be done very easily through the media; and we could have at least a six months campaign on this.

Among those present and speaking in opposition to the proposed ordinance were Mr. Paul DiPaolo, Direct Selling Assn., Washington, D. C.; Richard Biondo, Avon Products, New York, N. Y.; Phillip Lehman, Legal Aid Society of Mecklenburg County; Ron Dimmer, Salad Master Cookwear; C. W. Elliott, Stewart-McGuire Shoe Company; Betty R. Clawson, Fuller & Dudley Cosmetics; and William P. Cranford, Wearever Aluminum.

Councilman Gantt moved that Council not adopt this ordinance. The motion was seconded by Councilman Davis.

Councilman Davis stated he applauds the motive behind this proposal, and Mr. Underhill drafting what he thought Council wanted to consider. He has done a good job. But to consider several points. One that we are dealing with several organizations where we have 100 percent turnover per year; we have a tremendous court backlog; we have an ordinance that the degree or difficulty of enforcement would be tremendous; and we have a very small amount of money involved in any single transaction that would be disputed. With these things in the background, he is not inclined to favor this ordinance because of four main reasons.

One, it would be a harrassment of the honest direct sellers; it would probably be ignored by the dishonest, and possibility used by them to their advantage. It would be impractical to enforce; and we still live in an environment today where we cannot enforce speeding in school zones; and where recently we had a football coach to resign because schools have become a haven for "pot pushers" in his opinion.

It would be protection for the individual citizens of Charlotte to the extent of interfering with his life style. He much prefers an educational program to let people know the law already affords them as to who they permit in their homes, and to how they must conduct themselves. He thinks it would be an indignity to direct sellers that we do not visit upon other similarly situated employees.

The vote was taken on the motion to deny the ordinance, and carried unanimously.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 474

RESOLUTION DELEGATING AUTHORITY TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS DEPARTMENT TO LEASE OR RENT SPACE WITHIN NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS DEPARTMENT FACILITIES.

Councilwoman Locke moved adoption of the subject resolution, which motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 12, at Page 438.

CONTRACTS AWARDED.

(a) Councilwoman Locke moved award of contract to the low bidder, Oro Manufacturing Company, in the amount of \$10,750, on a unit price basis, for seven display cases and one dolly for Mint Museum of History. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

Oro Manufacturing Company	\$ 10,750.00
The Erwin Jones Company	13,555.00

(b) Upon motion of Councilman Withrow, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and unanimously carried, Contract was awarded on the low bid of P. C. Godfrey, in the amount of \$19,800, on a unit price/lump sum basis for plumbing work for the Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plan.

The following bids were received:

P. C. Godfrey	\$ 19,800.00
Tompkins-Johnston	20,000.00

(c) Motion was made by Councilman Withrow, seconded by Councilman Davis, and unanimously carried, awarding contract to the low bidder, Oxford Building Services, Inc., in the yearly amount of \$12,554.40 for janitorial service for Greenville Neighborhood Center.

The following bids were received:

Oxford Building Services, Inc.	\$ 12,554.40
Columbus Services International	15,012.00
Southern Building Maintenance Co.	17,964.00

(d) Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilman Gantt, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder, Oxford Building Services, Inc., in the yearly amount of \$7,770.36, for janitorial service for Amay James Neighborhood Center.

The following bids were received:

Oxford Building Services, Inc.	\$ 7,770.36
Columbus Services International	8,316.00
Southern Building Maintenance Co.	10,548.00

(e) Councilman Gantt moved award of contract to the low bidder, Sanders Brothers, Inc., in the amount of \$197,500, on a unit price basis for sanitary sewer construction for additional street and collector sewers. The motion was seconded by Councilman Davis, and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

Sanders Brothers, Inc.	\$197,500.00
Gilbert Engineering Company	204,450.00
Hickory Sand Company	207,750.52
Rea Brothers, Inc.	211,446.50
RDR, Incorporated	237,661.35
Ben B. Propst, Contractor	245,380.00
Dellinger, Incorporated	248,865.80

July 11, 1977

Minute Book 65 - Page 475

CONSENT AGENDA APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Gantt, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and unanimously carried, approving Agenda Items No. 12 through No. 22, as follows:

1. Transfer of a residual parcel of land from the relocation of Kings Drive from the City to Central Piedmont Community College.
2. Three separate loan agreements between the City of Charlotte and Motion, Incorporated, in the total amount of \$13,800, for the purchase of three single family houses and lots located in the Third Ward Community Development Target Area.
3. Resolution declaring an intent to close a portion of Main Street, located in the Cherry Community Development Target Area, and calling a public hearing on the question on Monday, August 8, at 3:00 o'clock p. m. on petition of the Community Development Department.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 12, at Page 439.

4. Settlement of Claims:

- (a) Settlement in case of City of Charlotte vs. Mary H. Lewis, et al, in the amount of \$2,500, for Caldwell-Brevard Connector, Parcel 26.
- (b) Settlement in case of City of Charlotte vs. Charles A. Moss, et al, in the amount of \$2,850, for Annexation Area I(2) sanitary sewer trunks project, Parcel 297.

5. Resolution authorizing the refund of certain taxes in the total amount of \$1,249.98, which were collected through clerical error and illegal levy against ten tax accounts.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 12, at Page 441.

6. Contracts for water main construction:

- (a) With John Crosland Company for the construction of 960 feet of 8-inch and 6-inch water mains and two fire hydrants to serve Olde Towne Village Center, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$10,700.
- (b) With Providence Properties, Inc. for the construction of 4,050 feet of 12-inch, 8-inch, 6-inch and 2-inch water mains and three fire hydrants to serve Falconbridge Subdivision, Section II, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$46,500.
- (c) With Providence Properties, Inc., for the construction of 3,280 feet of 6-inch water mains and three fire hydrants to serve Falconbridge II, Phase II, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$27,300.

7. Contracts for sanitary sewer construction:

- (a) With Dr. Posey E. Downs, Jr., for the construction of 15 linear feet of 8-inch sanitary sewer line to serve 3826 Sedgewood Circle, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$2,670.
- (b) With Providence Properties, Inc. for the construction of 3,095 linear feet of 8-inch sanitary sewer line to serve Falconbridge II, Section I, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$46,425.
- (c) With Providence Properties, Inc., for the construction of 2,700 linear feet of 8-inch sanitary sewer line to serve Falconbridge II, Section II, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$40,500.

(d) With Bevins Development Company for the construction of 2,320 linear feet of 8-inch sanitary sewer line to serve Slatewood, Section IV, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$34,800.

(e) With Trust Company of New Jersey for construction of 1,399 linear feet of 8-inch sanitary sewer line to serve Sharon Lakes at South Boulevard, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$21,000.

8. Encroachment Agreements:

(a) Blanket encroachment agreement with North Carolina Department of Transportation for water and sewer installations in secondary roads in Mecklenburg County.

(b) Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for a two-inch water main in Rea Road and Carmel Estate Road (SR 3965).

(c) Agreement with North Carolina Department of Transportation for the construction of a sanitary sewer line to serve 6615 North Tryon Street.

9. Property Transactions:

(a) Acquisition of 7.5' x 186.81' x 15' x 132.98' plus construction easement, at 1800 block of Larkhaven Road, from Westbourne, Inc., at \$450, for sanitary sewer to serve Westbourne Subdivision.

(b) Acquisition of 7.5' x 186.81' x 15' x 200.18' of easement, plus construction easement, at 1800 block Larkhaven Road, from Westbourne, Inc., at \$590, for sanitary sewer to serve Westbourne Subdivision.

(c) Acquisition of 15' x 65.88' of easement, plus construction easement at 1824 Larkhaven Road, from John W. Foster and wife, Melba E., at \$70 for sanitary sewer to serve Westbourne Subdivision.

(d) Acquisition of 15' x 699.95' of easement, plus construction easement, behind 1800 block of Larkhaven Road, from Westbourne, Inc., at \$1400, for sanitary sewer to serve Westbourne Subdivision.

(e) Acquisition of 15' x 22.48' of easement at 6700 William Harry Court, from Robert B. Wilson, Jr. and wife, Pamela C., at \$1.00 for sanitary sewer to serve Stonehaven Section 20, Phase D.

(f) Acquisition of 15' x 45.29' of easement, at 6230 Thermal Road, from Wachovia Bank and Trust Company N. A., Successor Trustees u/d for Alexander Children's Center, at \$1.00 for sanitary sewer to serve Stonehaven Section 20, Phase D.

(g) Acquisition of 30' x 54.04' of easement, plus temporary construction easement, from Edward Calvin Mattick and wife, Mellinee J., at 13407 Circle Avenue, at \$54 for Mallard Creek Outfall.

(h) Acquisition of 30' x 506.14' of easement at 11400 Highway 29, from Construction Brick and Tile Company, at \$506 for Mallard Creek Outfall.

(i) Acquisition of 15.10' x 33.80' x 29.10' on 9.78 acres vacant tract at south end of Center Street, Cornelius, N. C., from Reece Electric Company, at \$35 for McDowell Creek Outfall, Phase III.

(j) Acquisition of 30' x 551.74' of easement, plus temporary construction easement, from William B. Miller and wife, Sara C., at 13125 Iris Drive, Huntersville, N. C., at \$900, for Torrence Creek Outfall, Phase II.

(k) Acquisition of 15' x 316.79' of easement from Alabama Long Shuman Heirs: Jennie S. Shuman, Donald R. Shuman, at \$1.00, at 5026 York Road, for sanitary sewer to serve 5100 South Tryon Street.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 477

(1) Acquisition of four parcels of property for Third Ward Target Area:

- 1.) 6,615 sq. ft., at 1001 Greenleaf Avenue, from Charles W. Tull, at \$15,900.
- 2.) 6,626 sq. ft., at 1021 Greenleaf Avenue, from Jeanette Cohen, at \$8,000.
- 3.) 6,612 sq. ft., at 1101 Greenleaf Avenue, from Eva M. Dysart, at \$7,000.
- 4.) 5,580 sq. ft., at 1121 Greenleaf Avenue, from Frances Abrams, at \$10,500.

(m) Acquisition of 8,000 sq. ft., at 3131 Tross Street, from James Wallace, at \$6,000, for Grier Heights Community Development Target Area.

10. Ordinances affecting housing declared unfit for human habitation:

- (a) Ordinance No. 604-X ordering the unoccupied dwelling at 724 East 15th Street to be demolished and removed.
- (b) Ordinance No. 605-X ordering the unoccupied dwelling at 308 Ingle Street to be demolished and removed.
- (c) Ordinance No. 606-X ordering the occupied dwelling at 914 Yellowstone Drive to be vacated and closed.
- (d) Ordinance No. 607-X ordering the occupied dwelling at 910 Yellowstone Drive to be vacated and closed.
- (e) Ordinance No. 608-X ordering the unoccupied dwelling at 339 Harrison Street to be closed.
- (f) Ordinance No. 609-X ordering the unoccupied dwelling at 2012-14 Gibbs Street to be closed.
- (g) Ordinance No. 610-X ordering the unoccupied dwelling at 515 Mill Road to be closed.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 24, beginning at Page 277.

11. Ordinances ordering removal of weeds, grass, trash, rubbish, and junk from the following locations:

- (a) Ordinance No. 611-X for vacant lot adjacent to 1723 Newcastle Street.
- (b) Ordinance No. 612-X for 1001 Beatties Ford Road.
- (c) Ordinance No. 613-X for rear of 423 Bradford Drive on North Avenue.
- (d) Ordinance No. 614-X for Newland Road and Cummings Avenue apartments.
- (e) Ordinance No. 615-X for vacant lot adjacent to 3909 Freedom Drive.
- (f) Ordinance No. 616-X for 111 North Gardner Street.
- (g) Ordinance No. 617-X for vacant lot adjacent to 1505 Seigle Avenue.
- (h) Ordinance No. 618-X for vacant lot adjacent to 1812 Double Oaks Road.
- (i) Ordinance No. 619-X for adjacent to 316 Coxe Avenue.
- (j) Ordinance No. 620-X for vacant lot adjacent to 415 Cemetery Avenue.
- (k) Ordinance No. 621-X for vacant lot corner East Barden Road and Broken Saddle Lane.
- (l) Ordinance No. 622-X for vacant lot rear of 2227 Marbetta Lane.
- (m) Ordinance No. 623-X for rear of 2207 Falmouth Road.
- (n) Ordinance No. 624-X for vacant lot corner of East 37th Street and Spencer Street.
- (o) Ordinance No. 625-X for vacant lot adjacent to 1721 Matheson Avenue.
- (p) Ordinance No. 626-X for 5219 Hoover Drive.
- (q) Ordinance No. 627-X for 1401 Thriftwood Drive.
- (r) Ordinance No. 628-X for vacant lot adjacent to 4416 Tillman Road.
- (s) Ordinance No. 629-X for vacant lot adjacent to 1900 Russell Avenue.
- (t) Ordinance No. 630-X for vacant lot adjacent to 2006 Russell Avenue.
- (u) Ordinance No. 631-X for vacant lot across from 2813 Clyde Drive.
- (v) Ordinance No. 632-X for vacant lot adjacent to 2813 Clyde Drive.
- (w) Ordinance No. 633-X for rear of 2517 Rozzells Ferry Road.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 24, beginning at Page 284.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 478

CLOSING OF CRESTBROOK DRIVE TO BE PLACED ON AGENDA TO SET PUBLIC HEARING ON THE QUESTION.

Councilwoman Locke stated she hopes all the Councilmembers have received a copy of the memorandum from her on the closing of Crestbrook Drive. That she would like for Council to proceed with this.

Mayor Belk asked what action is required of Council? Councilwoman Locke replied it will have to be placed on the agenda to set a public hearing to permanently close the street and to have the property revert to the adjoining landowners.

MOTION TO CONSIDER NON-AGENDA ITEM APPROVED.

Councilwoman Chafin requested Council to consider a non-agenda item which is considered to be a matter of emergency. It is a resolution dealing with some moderate modifications of the Southside Redevelopment Plan.

She moved that Council consider the item at this time. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and carried unanimously.

COUNCILMAN GANTT EXCUSED FROM PARTICIPATION DUE TO CONFLICT.

Councilman Gantt advised that he has a conflict as his firm handled the architectural work for that project. The City Attorney stated he has advised Mr. Gantt that he does have a conflict and therefore should request permission to be excused from participation.

Motion was made by Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and unanimously carried to excuse Councilman Gantt from participation in the item.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE APPROVING MODIFICATION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN, SOUTHSIDE PARK REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

Motion was made by Councilwoman Chafin, and seconded by Councilwoman Locke to approve the resolution approving modification of the Redevelopment Plan, Southside Park Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Sawyer, Director of Community Development, stated Mr. Tyson's grocery store is well known to all. It was located in the Southside Project Area, and had to move because of the Remount Road widening. That his Department, along with the Department of Public Works cooperated in temporarily relocating Mr. Tyson so he could move back out of the way to allow the road to be built; and then construct a new building on land he already owned in the project area.

Mr. Sawyer stated the project requirement for setback is 20 feet from the public right of way; the zoning requirement for signs is a setback of 15 ft. That Mr. Tyson built his building right on the 20 foot setback line, not realizing he could not put his sign in. That he has prepared a sign which meets all the requirements in every respect, except for location. It is four feet wide and ten feet high; it will sit perpendicular to Remount Road so that it can be seen from both directions. In looking at the graphics on this sign versus graphics on a sign he would have to put flush with his building, if he took the alternative and complied with the regulations, they think the sign he has prepared is preferable, and will not do violence to any of the other conditions of the plan. Mr. Sawyer stated they are cooperating in preparing this resolution and bringing it to Council.

Mr. Sawyer stated this will accommodate Mr. Tyson, but it will also accommodate other merchants who build in this area which has been designated for commercial use. They are not holding a big area for development as a shopping center.

Councilman Davis stated he prefers to have items like this come up in the normal process, rather than dealing with them on an emergency basis, but he is going along with this today.

July 11, 1977  
Minute Book 65 - Page 479

The vote was taken on the motion, and carried unanimously as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Chafin, Locke, Davis, Williams and Withrow.  
NAYS: None

Councilman Gantt did not vote as he had been excused from participating by Council due to a conflict.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 12, at Page 443.

NOMINATIONS TO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION AND ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT.

Councilwoman Chafin placed the following names in nomination for three year terms each to the Historic District Commission:

- (1) Mr. Crutcher Ross to succeed himself for a three year term.
- (2) Dr. Ben Romine to succeed himself for a three year term.

Councilwoman Chafin placed in nomination the following names to fill the unexpired terms on the Zoning Board of Adjustment as alternate members:

- (1) Mr. Doug Burns, an architect
- (2) Mr. Armond W. Lane, a west side resident.

COUNCILMAN GANTT ADVISES PERSONAL PROPERTY IN THE FOURTH WARD AREA HAS BEEN SOLD.

Councilman Gantt stated as of 4:00 p.m. this afternoon the property he has owned in Fourth Ward has been sold.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned.

  
Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk