

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 269

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, met in regular session on Monday, May 10, 1976, at 3:00 o'clock p. m., in the Council Chamber, City Hall, with Mayor John M. Belk presiding, and Councilmembers Betty Chafin, Louis Davis, Harvey Gantt, Pat Locke, James B. Whittington, Neil C. Williams and Joe Withrow present.

ABSENT: None.

\* \* \* \* \*

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by Reverend F. William Lantz of Saint Christopher's Episcopal Church.

MINUTES APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and unanimously carried, approving the minutes of the Council Meeting on Monday, April 26, 1976, as submitted.

WEEK OF MAY 8 THRU MAY 15 PROCLAIMED AS ARMED FORCES WEEK IN CHARLOTTE.

Mayor Belk recognized Captain Barry Miller, Councilman Joe Withrow, and Grant Whitney, and read a proclamation in which the week of May 8 through May 15 was proclaimed as Armed Forces Week in Charlotte. The proclamation was presented to Captain Barry Miller.

Councilman Withrow announced that on May 15 there will be a military ball at the Civic Center at 7:30 p.m., and all the people in the audience who believe in this Country and the armed forces of this Country are invited to buy tickets to this affair. They would like to have 2,500 people come.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE EMPLOYEE PLAQUE PRESENTED TO JAMES E. DOAN.

Mayor Belk recognized Mr. James E. Doan and presented him with the City of Charlotte Employee Plaque for his services to the City from March 16, 1961 until his retirement on April 28, 1976. He expressed the appreciation of the Mayor and Council for his services.

PETITION NO. 76-3 BY LOU PERRY BATTS FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING OF PROPERTY ON THE NORTH SIDE OF CENTRAL AVENUE, ABOUT 360 FEET WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF CENTRAL AVENUE AND SHARON AMITY ROAD, DENIED.

Councilman Gantt moved that the subject petition for a change in zoning from O-6 to B-1 be denied as recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and carried unanimously.

PETITION NO. 76-5 BY JIMMIE POURLOS FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING OF PROPERTY ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF CENTRAL AVENUE AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF CENTRAL AVENUE AND WINTERFIELD PLACE, DENIED.

Councilwoman Locke moved that the subject petition for a change in zoning from O-6 and B-1 be denied as recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Chafin.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 270

Councilman Whittington stated Mr. Miller wrote a letter to the members of City Council referring to Paragraphs (e), (f) and (g) and stated in his opinion he did not think the Planning Commission had acted wisely and made a decision before they got a recommendation back from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Councilman Whittington stated he does not know if this is true or not, but he thinks that should be cleared up before Council acts on this petition one way or the other. He asked if Council would consider postponing decision until the Planning Commission can answer these questions.

Mr. Landis of the Planning Commission staff stated the Commission considered this in detail and did give consideration to the pending question before the Board of Adjustment. They felt the outcome of that deliberation would not affect the Commission's recommendation. Even if the Board of Adjustment had recommended in favor of the variance, which he believes they subsequently did not, they would still recommend denial of this petition.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE NO. 78-Z AMENDING CHAPTER 23, SECTION 23-8 OF THE CITY CODE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP TO CHANGE THE ZONING OF PROPERTY ON THE NORTH SIDE OF NORTH DAVIDSON STREET, SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF NORTH DAVIDSON STREET AND EAST THIRTY-SIXTH STREET FROM B-1 TO I-1(CD), ON PETITION OF W. R. BLALOCK.

Councilman Gantt moved adoption of the subject ordinance changing the zoning of the property from B-1 to I-1(CD) in lieu of the requested I-1, as recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Chafin and carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 23, at Page 89.

FLOODWAY SPECIAL USE PERMIT AUTHORIZED TO H. D. PURSER FOR ERECTION OF BUILDING WITHIN THE BRIAR CREEK FLOODWAY DISTRICT AT 1500 SAINT GEORGE STREET.

Motion was made by Councilman Withrow, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried approving application of H. D. Purser for a Floodway Special Use Permit for the erection of a wood frame storage building within the Briar Creek Floodway District on property located at 1500 Saint George Street to be used in conjunction with the already established Purser Fuel Oil Service, Inc., as recommended by the Planning Commission.

POLICY CONCERNING REQUIREMENTS TO BE MET BY ABSENTEE OWNERS IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT HOUSING REHABILITATION LOANS REFERRED TO THE CITY COUNCIL'S PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Mr. Sawyer, Director of Community Development, stated he has been advised by members of his staff, one of whom is an appraiser, and others who have worked closely with the appraisal business for a number of years, that the FHA some time ago established rent multiplier factors for different sections of the cities throughout the country, certainly throughout the State and Charlotte, in order to assist their appraisers in arriving at fair market values for properties which they appraise. That the appraiser can plus them or minus them as conditions change and as circumstances warrant in each district. The average single-family house is not rented, but in order to go through the proper appraisal process the value is related to its ability to produce income. Therefore, rental is assigned through these rent multiplier factors.

He stated their suggestion is in order to make this work, that each property be appraised at least once by an appraiser mutually agreed upon by the owner

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 271

of the property and the City. This appraisal would give them the one thing most important and also the multiplier. It would give them the "as is" value of the property. Then they would assign a fair market rent after the proposed improvements are made. This gives a before and after rent. The rent suggested would be either accepted or not accepted by the owner. It would either be a value that would be fair to the tenant and not excessive and fair to the owner in terms of proper return on his investment, or they would go to a second appraisal.

In either case, the objective in all cases is to arrive at the fair market rent that would maintain the Council's objective which is to keep these properties within the ability of the low income people who rent them and the money would not be used to exclude them by increasing the rent. Also, the owner would be fairly treated.

Councilman Gantt stated a question comes to his mind. As an example, a house presently valued at \$10,000, and the landlord wants to use the maximum amount of loan available for this property, and he borrows \$20,000 at three percent interest. Now, theoretically he will have a piece of property valued at \$10,000 plus \$20,000, or a \$30,000 house. Then he applies the multiplier to determine what the rent should be. Is it not possible that under that procedure one could substantially have the rent at such a level that the tenants either in the house at the time, or those we would want to direct our interest to, would be unable to afford that house? Mr. Sawyer replied he thinks that is an extreme example, and he does not want to argue thesis. That he thinks under that circumstance, if a fair return to the investor on his loan were allowed, he is sure it would be beyond the means of a low income family to rent.

Councilman Gantt asked the safeguard that is built into that. While we want to improve the units and would be happy to see someone who wanted to make a \$20,000 investment, it would be a nice neighborhood. But we would also have relocation like mad because we would not be able to house the people who used to be there. Mr. Sawyer replied he thinks the procedure would weed out that kind of a loan. The \$20,000 maximum is for more than one unit. You have some four family units - and it is possible for a one-family - but the intent was to make it high enough so that not only the average structure but all structures could be improved with these loans. Now, they assume the amount of money it costs to bring a property up to the minimum code standard is not amortizable with rent because the owner is suppose to maintain the property at that level anyway in order to rent it at all. It is the improvements beyond that they would be looking for.

Mr. Sawyer stated there are two objectives. The primary objective of making housing available to low and moderate income families. Secondary is the objective of getting the property that is deteriorating improved and brought up to a higher than minimum standard.

Councilman Withrow stated he has been in this type of business for thirty years. He asked if there has been any communication between Mr. Sawyer and people like John Dwelle, Lex Marsh and these people who are renting the type of houses he is speaking of. Mr. Sawyer replied not a great deal other than through the public hearings. Councilman Withrow stated there is no way a landlord is going to do it on the terms Mr. Sawyer and his people are talking about. If they want to get these houses rehabilitated to where they will have rental units for low income, then do not tie on it a multiplier or that sort of thing. The market itself will take care of the rental. Private enterprise will take care of what they are talking about. The banks who are going to lend the money will determine how much money they want to lend on this piece of property. There is no way he could go down and borrow \$20,000 on a \$4,000 house. They would lend \$2,000.

May 10, 1976

Minute Book 63 - Page 272

Councilman Withrow stated if it is our objective to bring these houses up to standard then go to the people who are in the business and ask them if they would borrow money at three percent and bring these houses up to code at a minimum rent. Talk to these people. People are not going to borrow money if you put stipulations on them, this sort of thing. He would not do it, and none of the other landlords are going to do it. He asked if there is not some other way than rent control? People are afraid of rent control.

Councilman Gantt stated the question is what guarantees you have even if you did go that way, that the market would determine the value of the rent? What guarantees do we have that we are going to get reasonable kinds of rent? Councilman Withrow replied you would have a reasonable chance of getting people to borrow the money and fix up the units they are talking about. If you go the other route, they are not going to do it. He stated we should talk to somebody in the business, and not go out haphazardly. Have some people who are in this rental business to come and tell us. Councilman Gantt stated he is not sure he wants the people in the business to exactly dictate to Council how the policy should be.

Councilman Williams stated a three percent loan in itself is a departure from private enterprise. There is something artificial about a three percent loan nowadays. The government is injecting this artificiality into the subject, and the government ought to be able to theoretically put some controls on it. But you want to be fair to the property owner and you want to encourage him to improve his property if you can. He asked what would be the matter with the kind of policy where the landlord would be allowed to increase his rent sufficiently to recoup his three percent interest. He thinks everyone would agree he should get his three percent back if he uses that three percent to improve the property. That gets the out-of-pocket expense back to the property owner. Then we all know how inflation has been in the last few years, and it does not seem fair to the property owner to restrict him to a return on this investment that does not keep up with inflation. Why not, in addition to the three percent, tie the rental increase to the consumer price index and let him increase it to that extent. Apply these two things to the appraisal prior to rehabilitation? Councilman Gantt replied it does that to some extent. A 24 percent increase is possible after the first year - six percent per year. Councilman Williams stated you also have the after-rehab appraisal of what is the fair market rent, do you not? Mr. Sawyer replied we will obtain that in the process.

Councilman Gantt asked if that is not also a possibility where Mr. Withrow is concerned? If you own five houses and you apply to the Community Development Department for these loans at three percent and they do the appraisal on that property and come up with your maximum rent, are you not going to make a judgement right there as to whether or not you want the loan or not? The proof will be in the pudding as to whether or not the policy makes any sense ultimately, because the landlords will reject them or will go along with them.

Councilman Withrow stated if our objective is to bring these houses up to minimum code, to make these houses livable, then you have to make it so the landlord himself is willing to borrow the money to do this. He is not going out and borrow \$10,000 on a \$4,000 house. The only way they are going to find out whether these people would be interested is to go to the big users - there are about six of them in Charlotte that own about 90% of what they are talking about, or manage them. They should have an input as to what they think. He stated he thinks the objective of the City is to try to get them up to minimum code.

Councilwoman Locke stated the incentive is in the three percent. Councilman Withrow replied then do not tie them down. Councilwoman Locke replied she thinks they have to tie them.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 273

Councilman Whittington stated he does not know what to do. He had (b) and (c) options combined from what Mr. Sawyer had recommended. But Mr. Withrow is in this business and he thinks Council should listen to him before making a decision. He would request that Council let this lay on the table until we get a conference with these people, invite them to Council and see if what he is talking about will fly, or if what he is talking about is better before they make a decision on it.

Councilman Withrow stated to go to the source of people they know and ask if they would bring houses up to minimum code, or if their clients they are managing them for will do it. Go from that angle rather than shooting in the dark.

Councilman Gantt stated while he appreciates Mr. Withrow's experience in that area, and would have hoped the Community Development staff would have talked to people who are in that business prior to showing them the first policy; he does not think there is any getting around the fact that a three percent loan represents a real subsidy. It is almost like no interest. For that, we have a responsibility, in his opinion, to get some guarantee that that money will be used in the public interest, in this case to provide better housing for our low income people.

Councilman Gantt moved that the Mayor refer this to the Planning and Public Works Committee of Council for them to hear this issue, talk with the Community Development staff and the realtors in this business. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SALE OF LAND IN BROOKLYN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. N. C. R-43 TO WASHBURN GRAPHICS, INC., ADOPTED.

Councilman Whittington moved adoption of the resolution authorizing the sale of land in Brooklyn Redevelopment Project No. N. C. R-43 to Washburn Graphics, Inc., at a total bid price of \$288,613.40. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and after discussion, carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, beginning at Page 420.

AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT WITH PROFESSIONAL A & E ASSOCIATES, LTD. TO EXTEND TIME OF CONVEYANCE OF PARCEL 6A UNTIL OCTOBER 31, 1976, APPROVED.

Councilwoman Chafin moved approval of an amendment to the contract for sale of land dated November 16, 1973, as amended November 17, 1975, between the City of Charlotte and Professional A & E Associates, Ltd., to extend the time for conveyance of Parcel 6A until October 31, 1976. The motion was seconded by Councilman Gantt for discussion.

Councilman Gantt asked if it appears any more feasible now for this project than it did five months ago; or whether Council should rescind the contract if it is not possible? Mr. Whitehead of Professional A & E Associates stated they requested the extension for six months to coincide with the deadline of October 31st for Parcel 6B - that is the front parcel at the corner of McDowell and Baxter Streets. If it is not economically feasible to go with the development of this property, then they are not going to do it. It is not feasible with the high interest rates we have today. Interest rates today are about 9-3/4 percent, and they bid this property in November 1973 when interest rates were 8-1/2 percent. If they can land a major tenant and find a tenant for the restaurant they think they can do it. But not if they cannot get a major anchor tenant for the office building. They are competing with downtown office buildings offering incentives such as six months free rent. It is hard to prove economic feasibility with that sort of thing.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 274

Councilman Gantt stated that sounds tentative to him. He thinks he can go ahead and vote for this; but this is the last time he is likely to vote for an extension.

Councilwoman Locke asked if he is paying the interest on the property? Mr. Whitehead replied they have a \$26,000 good payment policy down on it. For two years this has accrued interest of about \$2,500.00. He stated if they are concerned about the six months extension on Parcel 6A, they will reimburse the City for the interest on that. That he has a letter to that effect. The letter was filed with the City Clerk.

Councilwoman Locke stated she voted against this before, and she intends to vote against this again. She does not think it is fair to the City.

Following was a discussion, after which the vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows:

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

ACQUISITION OF AVANT FUEL & ICE PROPERTY ON NORTH DAVIDSON STREET AND PROPERTY OF J. HENRY MCGILL ON NORTH DAVIDSON STREET IN FIRST WARD URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Williams and seconded by Councilwoman Chafin approving the acquisition of two parcels of real property in the First Ward Urban Renewal Project, as follows:

- (a) Acquisition of 85,664 square feet of property at 940 North Davidson Street, from Avant Fuel & Ice Company, at \$165,300.00.
- (b) Acquisition of 22,533 square feet of property at 934 North Davidson Street, from J. Henry McGill, at \$59,700.00.

Councilman Gantt stated he does not know the land use plan in this area, but he would hope somehow the garden would be retained. Mr. Sawyer, Director of Community Development, replied they intend to do everything they can to do it, and they have assured Mr. McGill that they would. The City Manager stated he has a letter from Mr. McGill, who is in the audience, asking them to do everything they can to preserve the rose garden.

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

REQUEST OF MEMBERS OF GREEK ORTHODOX COMMUNITY THAT CITY DONATE USE OF SECTION OF LAND IN EVERGREEN CEMETERY TO CONSTRUCT A GREEK MEMORIAL APPROVED.

Councilwoman Locke moved approval of the request of members of the Greek Orthodox Community that the City donate the use of a 33' x 43' section of land in Evergreen Cemetery, immediately adjacent to the area currently set aside for burial of Greek families, to construct a Greek Memorial. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

REPORT ON STATUS OF TRAFFIC CONDITIONS IN THE SHAMROCK GARDENS, MIDWOOD AND COUNTRY CLUB NEIGHBORHOODS.

Mr. Corbett, Director of Traffic Engineering, stated several weeks ago a group of citizens from the Country Club-Shamrock area came before Council and voiced concerns about the traffic problems in their neighborhood.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 275

He stated his Department had been looking into that problem for some months and there is a traffic problem along Country Club and Shamrock Drive. They feel, however, this is not the problem in itself; but is a symptom of the overall problem within the area. He stated they have studied the traffic conditions in the area of Shamrock, Country Club, The Plaza, Central Avenue, Eastway Drive and Matheson Avenue. He stated the difficulty with the traffic on Country Club and Shamrock is an indication of the trouble within the area.

He stated there are approximately 4,000 vehicles a day using Country Club which was designed as a residential street. The difficulty on Shamrock is that it is a two-lane street and there are some 10,000 cars a day using that street. This gives a total flow of approximately 14,000 vehicles a day, during a 24-hour period, through this area between The Plaza on the north and Central Avenue on the south. These two major thoroughfares, The Plaza and Central Avenue, are separated by a distance of approximately two miles, and Eastway Drive, a major thoroughfare incorporated with a belt road, splits this area.

Mr. Corbett stated within the area he is talking about there are some 5,571 dwelling units, each of which generate approximately eight trips per day. There are some 1,226 businesses which attract traffic. All of them together generate a daily demand of some 65,000 trips into and out of this area. This does not include those vehicles that would pass through the area from some point on the north going south which do not have a destination or origin within this area. It does not include the area beyond out to the city limits which generates a considerable amount of traffic.

He stated there are some physical barriers which cause the traffic to cut through the corridor created by Shamrock and Country Club Drives. The railroad on the north, and there is only one major point at which traffic can cross that railroad between Eastway and Delta Road and that is on Tipperary Drive which feeds from an area across the railroad into Shamrock and along Shamrock and into town. On the other side is Briar Creek. The only road which crosses Briar Creek of any consequences other than Central Avenue or Eastway Drive is Country Club Drive. The difficulty in the neighborhood has grown. Traffic can no longer use The Plaza, Eastway and Central Avenue and get to its destination without encountering major congestion, so it has spilled off into this corridor. The 4,000 cars which pass along Country Club and the 10,000 which pass along Shamrock is demonstrated in the fact it all comes to one point down at the end at Matheson Avenue and attempts to get across The Plaza over to Matheson or on to The Plaza coming on into the City. Shamrock has basically reached its capacity of 10,000 cars a day and the traffic as it comes in on Shamrock spills over on Matheson, some of it already on Country Club, to give a volume of 12,000 a day on Matheson just east of The Plaza. Each of the little streets - Simpson, Florida, Georgia, Attabury and Virginia - carries its share.

Several years ago when Matheson Avenue was built from Tryon Street over to The Plaza an attempt was made to cause traffic to continue to use Shamrock Drive. At that time, they widened Virginia Avenue between Matheson and Shamrock hoping that this would encourage traffic coming in on Shamrock to utilize Virginia to get over to The Plaza. The difficulty which has arisen there is due to the fact that since Shamrock has become so loaded and traffic has spilled over to Matheson, as it gets down to Virginia traffic cannot get out of Virginia into Matheson. This has caused more traffic to spill over on Country Club. The people in the neighborhood have asked that restraints be placed in operation. They have told them that the thoroughfare plan as approved in 1960 calls for the widening of Shamrock to four lanes all the way in, across Eastway to East Ford Road to Lynnhaven, along Brook Road into The Plaza. This is the route that much of this traffic follows now. They have recommended earlier that this particular part of the thoroughfare plan be carried out unless something else is done.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 276

The residents have requested that they take action to try to keep traffic off of Shamrock and Country Club Drives on Eastway, to carry it along Eastway Drive up to Sugar Creek Road, then on Sugar Creek Road to The Plaza and on The Plaza into the City. The major difficulty which arises is at the intersection of Sugar Creek Road and Eastway Drive. There are presently some 5,000 vehicles a day turning left, headed north on Eastway Drive onto Sugar Creek Road. The peak hour load is in the afternoon between 4 and 6 as an excessive 700 vehicles in one hour. If they were to deter traffic from utilizing Country Club and Shamrock, and it were to follow this route, major changes would have to be made at the Eastway/Sugar Creek intersection, either by providing another left turn lane off of Eastway and a second lane headed north on Sugar Creek Road, in order that we might turn two lanes left.

At The Plaza similar conditions would have to be provided. The left turn driving off of Sugar Creek onto The Plaza is not nearly as great, but the total traffic volume at the intersection is such that the traffic which they would have to give to a left turn movement would have to be taken away from the other approaches and that lost capacity would have to be recouped. The residents have asked that they consider such things as no left turn signs, stop signs, many devices which might deter traffic from using Country Club. At this point, the Traffic Engineering Department is unable to recommend the installation of those devices unless something is done to provide for additional capacity in the form of another major arterial route or widening the existing arterial routes. That 14,000 vehicles a day coming through this corridor is a four-lane demand. If they eliminate that, that means building a new four-lane street someplace, or widening the existing two arterials - Central Avenue and The Plaza - by up to four lanes, two lanes each or four lanes on either one. This is the difficulty they have.

He stated they have had some conversation with some other cities who have gone in and made an attempt to provide traffic restraints. In Seattle, Washington, they did an experiment within a 12-square block area which had a four-lane thoroughfare on either side. They were able to use devices such as stop signs, no turn signs, and achieve some success. In Massachusetts they had quite a different problem. They had a much larger area on a street that was comparable in length to Country Club Drive. They attempted to install no turn signs, stop signs and removable barricades in order to discourage traffic. They quickly found that since there were no major arterials in close proximity to this area, that the motorists did not obey those signs; they did not obey the barricades; they moved the barricades or went around them. They also found that when you attempt to place restraints in operation, it is a good idea to have a good feeling of the total neighborhood. One of the difficulties here is what is the total neighborhood? Is it the immediate area along Country Club Drive, is it the area bounded in orange, or is it a much larger area? Traffic Engineering has not been able to give them specific recommendations for the solution of this problem on a long range basis. They have provided what they call an interim recommendation.

At the intersection of Matheson and Virginia they could install channelization and a stop sign on Matheson so that traffic coming along Shamrock Drive could transfer over to Virginia, get to Matheson, turn right with a right-of-way, with Matheson Avenue having to either yield the right-of-way to Virginia or as an alternate suggestion, be able to turn only into Virginia. As far as installing other devices along any of the intersections, for example Bentley Place, Townsend, Sandhurst, Hilliard, which might deter traffic from using those streets, they are of the opinion they should not do those until major improvements are made along the main thoroughfares.

Several days ago he went into the community and rode with one of the residents, Mrs. Innes, and they went through some of these intersections. At the time that they rode through them, there was no apparent problem. But

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 277

when you take the volume demand which exists in these intersections, such as Shamrock Drive, Sugar Creek and Eastway, Eastway at The Plaza, and do the capacity calculations which traffic engineers use, you quickly discover you cannot accommodate this load - he is talking about the major part of the 14,000 vehicles a day. If they did deter it, they might deter half or two-thirds of it but they would have to add it to the loads elsewhere and it comes out real fast that we cannot accommodate it without major improvements.

The problem is quite extensive. It is not confined to this neighborhood. There are some twenty neighborhoods in the City where we have streets exactly like Country Club, exactly like Shamrock. They have proposed that the thoroughfare plan be carried out at some time and that Shamrock be widened to four lanes. They think that is a good recommendation. It came through in the original thoroughfare plan which foresaw this problem developing in this neighborhood because of the lack of a thoroughfare system. They do think that there should probably be some changes made in the suggested alignment. As he mentioned, the present alignment is along Shamrock, East Ford, over into Brook Road and The Plaza. Better consideration might be given to following somewhat the yellow route he indicated on the map, along Shamrock, then hooking into Matheson very near The Plaza rather than coming down along East Ford. That way they hope they would encourage traffic to stay away from Country Club, to stay off streets such as East Ford, Simpson, Florida, Georgia and Attabury and confine itself to the four lane facility - Shamrock Drive.

Councilman Gantt asked if he is saying that stop signs and possibly an additional lane along Eastway Drive for an additional left turn lane, and the same at The Plaza would create negative results? Mr. Corbett replied he is saying if they apply restraints to Country Club without doing the things that he has mentioned, they are going to be in trouble. If they provide the additional left turn lane immediately at Sugar Creek Road on Eastway it would take care of the problem today. In the additional growth in traffic, they are going to be in great difficulty. Some of these streets are now carrying 17,000 to 25,000 vehicles a day; in the future they are designated to carry greater volumes. So it would be putting the difficulty off until tomorrow. They might solve it just for a day or a week or even a year, but the problem will come back. There has to be consideration for additional major thoroughfares in that area. These two will not eliminate the problem.

Councilman Gantt asked if four-laning Shamrock Drive will eliminate the problem? Mr. Corbett replied four-laning would contribute greatly to reducing the problem as far as now and as far as the future is concerned. If these steps are taken they would be in agreement with most anything they wanted to do to deter traffic from Country Club Drive. Even if you do not, and you should consider putting in devices which would restrain traffic along Country Club there is only one type of device that is going to be successful and that is a physical barrier. You are going to have to cut the road in half by a barricade or make it dead end in some way so that traffic physically could not go through there.

Councilman Whittington asked if Eastway Drive, Sugar Creek Road and The Plaza are the only thoroughfares you have? Mr. Corbett replied that was all they had on that side. Councilman Whittington stated the problem is that traffic coming from northeast Charlotte trying to get from the northwest to the east, they are coming through this area of Country Club Drive. In this deliberation, and he knows this is an unpopular question, but he thinks Council needs to know, did the extension of Matheson Avenue to Independence Boulevard come up in any of his deliberations? Mr. Corbett replied that as far as the traffic engineers are concerned, yes. They feel that the elimination of Matheson Avenue could have done much to contribute to this problem. If Matheson Avenue had remained a part of the thoroughfare plan, the traffic which now cuts off of Central Avenue, through Kilbourne, down Dunlavin Way

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 278

and on into Country Club could remain along Central Avenue and use Matheson to get over into the northeastern part of the City. Instead it has no reasonable alternative route at the present time.

Mr. Burkhalter asked if doing part of that Shamrock widening from The Plaza down as far as Country Club Drive, would relieve the situation at all? Mr. Corbett replied if they changed the present location where Shamrock comes into The Plaza, if the location where Shamrock now enters The Plaza - it is approximately one block length north of where Matheson comes in - without Matheson being a continuous street, going down to Central, we would have a better solution in order to bring Shamrock over - this, of course, would take some homes in the neighborhood - and tie it in to Matheson in such a way that traffic could then go straight across; or we could extend it across The Plaza where it now comes in. Shamrock would be extended across The Plaza and tied into Matheson Avenue. That is another alternative solution which could reduce traffic along Country Club. Of course, it is not going to reduce it on Shamrock.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that if he made it easy to cross The Plaza you would get a lot of people to stay on Shamrock even though they were crowded - they wouldn't be getting off on the side streets? Mr. Corbett replied yes, they believe so. Even if you only widen that part of it. The difficulty is you have a two-lane street all the way through there. You have traffic that comes across Shamrock one way; you have traffic which comes up on Hilliard, comes in and joins together at one point; there are some 8,700 on Shamrock at another point; some 2,300 on Hilliard that joins together in the neighborhood of the school and increases to 10,000 vehicles a day. As it comes along to East Ford Road it fuels off at each of the side streets, and anything they could do to improve this section for a better connection with Matheson Avenue, he thinks would deter some of that traffic from using this section of Matheson and also keep it off of Country Club.

Councilman Davis stated he had two questions. Is he saying that if we conform to the previously approved thoroughfare plan and if we experience continued growth that Shamrock is going to become a four-lane arterial? Mr. Corbett replied, Shamrock in the presently adopted thoroughfare plan is to be a four-lane facility, yes. Councilman Davis stated Mr. Corbett mentioned one idea of putting two left turn lanes on Eastway to turn left on Sugar Creek, is the problem there that you only have one lane on Sugar Creek? Mr. Corbett replied in a northerly direction, only one lane. They have two lanes which come south of The Plaza and only one lane right at the intersection with Eastway Drive which goes away from Eastway Drive. They would have to build an additional lane there in order to accommodate two lefthand turn lanes. Mr. Davis asked how long before it becomes two lanes northbound? Mr. Corbett replied with 200 feet, or 400 feet.

Councilman Davis asked as you go on Sugar Creek to turn left on The Plaza, what is involved in making that two lanes turning left? Mr. Corbett replied widening back several hundred feet. It would also probably require some widening along The Plaza for this reason. If they generate several thousand vehicles a day turning left there, the time which would be given to that in a special traffic signal indication would have to be subtracted from The Plaza or from Sugar Creek Road. They already have a major left turn movement off The Plaza headed in the other direction which is up in the neighborhood of 2,000 a day. They have to provide a special left turn signal for that at the present time. Doing what they are talking about, we would then have a special left hand turn signal in both directions, plus a green signal for Sugar Creek plus one for The Plaza. This means that you would get, in any one opportunity, to go one out of four chances; and when you are talking about several thousand vehicles a day and you translate that into several hundred, anywhere from 500 to a thousand an hour during the peak hour, you can get serious problems.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 279

Councilman Davis asked if that alternative is not viable? Mr. Corbett replied they do not believe it is viable - not as a long term solution. As a short term solution, it could help. But by the time you get that accomplished in reality through appropriations, planning, design and having it built, he thinks they would quickly see that this is not going to be the long range solution to the problem.

Councilman Gantt stated that as a short term solution, though, it would be considerably cheaper to implement that plan. Mr. Corbett replied that the chances are it would.

Councilwoman Chafin asked how quickly it can be implemented?

Mr. Corbett stated it would depend first on appropriation of money. He would say that it would be at least two years because the project has to be designed, the right-of-way has to be bought, and they are not talking about inexpensive right-of-way; they are talking about very, very expensive right-of-way.

Councilman Gantt asked if he would give them some projection on Shamrock Drive as a four-lane facility?

Mr. Corbett replied that presently Shamrock as a four-lane facility is not in the City's five-year plan. He does not anticipate it being in the five-year plan for a number of years unless there becomes an immediate desire to try to solve this problem.

Councilman Gantt stated then they do not have a solution to this problem.

Mr. Corbett replied from a Traffic Engineering standpoint there is a solution. It is the one he knows is unfavorable with the residents. Their proposal is to widen Shamrock Drive. The demand is there today. We have a 14,000 vehicle a day demand right now which is enough to justify the four-lane facility.

Councilman Gantt stated that even if we went with the CIP program, we are talking about three or four years before that can be done, so we do not have a solution to the problem today.

A number of people from the area responded to the report given to Council.

Mrs. Rhonda Innes, 2711 Dunlavin Way, in her statement stated the traffic they are complaining about mostly is confined to four hours a day - two in the morning and two in the afternoon. When you get out to The Plaza it is four lanes, and with a little adjustment on the lights and especially the light which allows all the Shamrock traffic to come out of Shamrock to Matheson, the traffic on The Plaza at that very short section of about a quarter of a mile could be expedited into town and taken off their streets. This is only two hours. All of the numbers Mr. Corbett has given are spread out over a 24-hour period.

Mrs. Delores Robinson, 2818 Dunlavin Way, in her statement stated that she does not understand how we have gotten so turned around and let neighborhoods all over the City come down and beg Council to do something. That roads do not make cities, people do; homes do and homeowners; they are the backbone. She does not understand why we continue to tear down neighborhoods for the sake of roads that people are not even using.

Mr. Bill Abernathy, 3100 Dunlavin Way, stated RESCU has been in operation for six months and they have been trying to get something done about the situation for six months; during this time they have met with a lot of sympathy, but no one can do anything apparently to help them. That they do not buy that there is no solution to the problems. That the full impact of Eastway

May 10, 1976

Minute Book 63 - Page 280

Drive has not been totally studied. Eastway Drive as a section of the belt loop was suppose to alleviate many of the traffic problems in the area, and be a street of a capacity that could function for many years. But that apparently is not true. It is apparently overloaded now at certain times and conditions.

Mr. Abernathy filed with each member of Council a copy of the comprehensive study of Eastway Drive which was made by RESCU.

Mrs. Lucy Ulmer, 3919 Country Club Drive, stated she has always considered herself a totally apolitical person; a member of the so-called silent majority until her home and the stability of her neighborhood was threatened. The growing awareness that resulted from this six months fight has left her appalled, angry and politically active. That she is just an example of what is happening all over Charlotte as more and more people realize that City Government may be more concerned with self interests and interest of their friends than they are in the people who elect them. That she will try to be informed now, and will try to inform as many people as she can about what she has learned these past six months.

Councilman Withrow asked if there is an interim measure which they could take at Sugar Creek; is there anyway to go ahead and implement some of this and just see what will happen? Is there something we can do now, that Mr. Corbett said the other was two years away?

Mr. Corbett replied that they could make a change at the corner of Matheson and Virginia and do that immediately which hopefully will encourage fewer people to use Country Club and keep them on Shamrock. However, this could result in some additional traffic using Brook Road and Florida Avenue as a means of getting out to The Plaza. It is their intention to go ahead if it is Council's desire, and put in the stop sign control at Matheson in an attempt to give Virginia the right-of-way so that people will stay on Shamrock and Virginia and then Matheson over to The Plaza. Should that prove not to be too successful we can go further with the construction of the channelization that he showed them later. They prefer to do the stop sign first and see how that works out.

Councilman Withrow stated perhaps they should go ahead and see if there is an answer; see if they cannot alleviate some of the problems. We might not be able to but at least we can try. Get estimates on some of the alternatives.

Councilwoman Chafin stated she would like to see some estimates on the increased left turn lanes.

Councilman Whittington stated he wants to ask a question of these different folks here from the Country Club neighborhood. Right after the election in November, he was invited to come to Shamrock School. Mr. Fitzpatrick was there and he does not know how many of them were there in attendance. At that time they were asking the City to do something to relieve the traffic in Country Club Hills. He believes that was their direct request and the spokesman there made these requests of the City. Mr. Davis was there, Ms. Chafin was there, Mr. Withrow was there and he was there. Since that time, he thinks that that is what Mr. Corbett has been trying to do. Now, he gets the impression here today that they do not want the City to make these improvements that he has come to Council and recommended. And, one of the other things that Council did is stop the extension of Matheson Avenue because as a neighborhood project they did not want that. He thinks it is fair to try to get some reaction from them what it is they do want, because contrary to what most of them have said in their statements, this neighborhood has nothing to do with Fourth Ward. Everybody keeps talking about Fourth Ward. What he, as one member of Council, is trying to do is to help the neighborhood, but he thinks they all need to get on the same wave length and the same course so that they can help them as best they can with the problem of the automobile. They are not going to keep cars off of Dunlavin or Sandhurst or Country Club Drive. They can help. He thinks all of them have to realize this.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 281

Mrs. Innes stated since that time, they all began really delving into this trying to find out what the problem was; why they were getting all this traffic and it really has happened over a very short period of time. They have discovered it is because of all the development and the cars generated by Eastway Drive, because of the backup this kind of thing causes. Now, by widening Shamrock, that merely brings it closer into their neighborhood. This in turn will become zoned for business and they will have the same thing over again, only much closer to the houses. This Shamrock area is now residential for a good part of the street. There are some schools there. By widening and making that a thoroughfare so close to these other streets, you are not going to take the traffic off the streets. You are going to create more. This is the pattern.

Mrs. LaVelle, 3100 Ann Street, stated their property is Ann Street, Country Club, and Jeff Street. If they will do her a personal favor and get the Police Department to come and sit there one week in her driveway and give these people tickets. She does not care whether she lives there or who lives there, there is no reason for people to go 50, 55 and 60 miles an hour past an elementary school, there is no point to that. There have been several people in the neighborhood who have called and asked the Police Department to come there and stop this. She guarantees if they give about 200 of these people tickets they are going to quit coming through there like that. It is not only all the traffic; they also object to the speed they use to go through there. There is no sense in it, absolutely no sense.

Mayor Belk asked if there is not a speed limit at the school? Mrs. LaVelle replied there is. They have Shamrock on one side of the school and Country Club on the other side. You cannot believe how they fly down that street. If they do not sit there where she lives they will not believe it. There is a speed limit on Country Club also, 35 miles per hour, but nobody goes 35.

Mr. Abernathy stated that he wanted to make a comment too in response to Mr. Whittington's statement. Nothing that Mr. Corbett has presented to them is really going to solve this problem. Widening Shamrock Drive, even if it is five years or ten years or whatever away, is not going to solve the problem, and it is not what they are asking him to look into. If there is a question of whether Eastway Drive can handle this traffic, why does he not go out and put up some temporary no left turns on Eastway Drive or block the street at Country Club, or do whatever, just to see what will happen to traffic. Everything he has said is theoretical; he does not know what is going to happen. The traffic that is bothering them is only two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon, and to divide a neighborhood totally in two by a proposed four-lane thoroughfare road as a long term solution to this problem that is bothering them today, he thinks is absurd.

Councilman Davis stated that today we have this problem in 20 areas and probably within a few years we will have it maybe in 40 areas. The only thing that is going to change that is some alternate means of transportation. What we are talking about doing here is just putting a Bandaid on a cut in a jugular vein. He has a proposal which he is going to circulate in today's mail to members of Council that he would like them to bring up for consideration at a later date. He hopes the community groups that have been coming to them about the roads will help support this. Mr. Abernathy asked Mr. Davis if he would clarify something before they leave. For two weeks they have been reading in the paper about City officials denying that Shamrock will be widened or is planned for widening, because the people out there have questioned the sidewalk. He thinks Mr. Corbett has confirmed that there is a plan to widen it. That will mean those sidewalks to be built will have to be torn up. Councilman Davis replied if he puts that in writing he will get an answer on it.

Councilman Gantt stated that he thought that was a misconception. He does not think that Mr. Corbett did say that this Council has approved the widening of Shamrock. It is not even in the capital improvement proposals. Mr. Abernathy stated that the statements in the paper say that there is no plan to widen Shamrock.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 282

PURCHASING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, COUNTY OF MECKLENBURG AND THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CHARLOTTE FOR THE PURCHASING DEPARTMENT TO PURCHASE EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES FOR THE AUTHORITY, APPROVED.

Upon motion of Councilman Davis, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and un-animously carried, the subject purchasing agreement was approved as recommended by the Purchasing Director.

LEASE WITH FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FOR SPACE IN THE FAA BUILDING AT DOUGLAS MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Davis, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and un-animously carried, approving a lease with the Federal Aviation Administration for rental of 2,934 square feet of city-owned office space in the FAA Building, at an annual rent of \$16,137.00.

CONTRACT WITH ARTHUR ANDERSON AND COMPANY FOR THE ANNUAL AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL OPERATIONS FOR THE CITY FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1976, APPROVED.

Councilman Davis moved approval of a contract with Arthur Anderson and Company for the annual audit of the financial operations for the City for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, at a maximum fee of \$30,000, which motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and un-animously carried.

CONTRACT AWARDED BEN B. PROPST CONTRACTOR, INC. FOR SANITARY SEWER CONSTRUCTION IN ANNEXATION AREA I(1), (2), (4) AND III (6).

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Davis, and un-animously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder, Ben B. Propst Contractor, Inc., in the amount of \$329,297.02, on a unit price basis for sanitary sewer construction in Annexation Area I (1), (2), (4) and III (6).

The following bids were received:

Ben B. Propst Contractor, Inc.	\$329,297.02
Sanders Brothers, Inc.	347,778.35
Lockwood Construction Company	378,688.00
RDR, Incorporated	393,085.70
Rand Construction	397,250.20
Associated Equipment Company	397,570.15
R & G Construction	603,191.00

CONTRACT AWARDED MARTIN MARIETTA AGGREGATES FOR CRUSHED STONE.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and un-animously carried, awarding contract to the low bidder, Martin Marietta Aggregates, in the amount of \$223,200.00, on a unit price basis, for crushed stone.

The following bids were received:

Martin Marietta Aggregates	\$223,200.00
Vulcan Materials Company	235,250.00

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 283

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO ANNIE RUTH COOPER LOCATED AT 2500 ELSIE STREET (OFF BEATTIES FORD ROAD) IN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE FOR THE NORTHWEST JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AREA PARK SITE PROJECT.

Councilman Whittington moved adoption of the subject resolution authorizing condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Annie Ruth Cooper located at 2500 Elsie Street (off Beatties Ford Road) in the City of Charlotte for the Northwest Junior High School Area Park Site Project. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, at Page 421.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO SOUTHERN ASBESTOS COMPANY AT 1000 SEABOARD STREET IN GREENVILLE URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT NO. N.C. R-78.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Gantt, and unanimously carried, the subject resolution was adopted authorizing condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Southern Asbestos Company, at 1000 Seaboard Street, in Greenville Urban Renewal Project No. N. C. R-78.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, at Page 422.

CONSENT AGENDA APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and unanimously carried, approving the following consent agenda items:

- (1) Contract with William Trotter Development Company for construction of 4,750 lineal feet of 8-inch sanitary sewer mains to serve Sardis Forest Subdivision, Sections I and II, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$71,250.00. The applicant will construct the entire system at his own proper cost and expense, and the city will own, maintain, and operate the system, and retail all revenue, all at no cost to the city.
- (2) Encroachment Agreements.
  - (a) Resolution authorizing execution of an agreement with the Norfolk Southern Railway Company for the installation of a 12-inch water main across Norfolk Southern Company tracks within the right of way of Anderson Street.
  - (b) Resolution authorizing execution of a supplemental agreement permitting the City to use a 48-inch tunnel liner casing instead of a 36-inch steel pipe casing for sanitary sewer to serve Parkway Avenue trunk.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, beginning at Page 423.

- (3) Settlement in the case of the City of Charlotte vs. Marsh Realty Company, in the amount of \$102,000, in the acquisition of property to be utilized as Beal Street Park, as recommended by the City Attorney.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 284

- (4) Ordinances ordering the removal of a motor vehicle, weeds, grass and Trash, pursuant to the City Code.
- (a) Ordinance No. 79-X ordering the removal of weeds and trash from premises of 2904 Clemson Avenue.
  - (b) Ordinance No. 80-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass and trash from a vacant lot at 2323 Carmine Street.
  - (c) Ordinance No. 81-X ordering the removal of weeds and trash from vacant lot in the 100 block of McArthur Avenue.
  - (d) Ordinance No. 82-X ordering the removal of trash and rubbish from vacant lot in 2700 block of Estelle Street.
  - (e) Ordinance No. 83-X ordering the removal of an abandoned motor vehicle from premises of 428 East Kingston Avenue.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 23, beginning at Page 90.

(5) Property Transactions:

- (a) Acquisition of 233.61' x 45' x 207.91' x 36' x 23' x 48.86' x 219.14' x 35' x 180.40' x 52.75' of easement at 5301 and 5341 South Boulevard, from Sue B. Miller and husband, Marvin L., and Nan B. Yett, at \$1.00, for Tyvola Road Improvements.
- (b) Option on 403 square feet, plus construction easement at 1029 West Trade Street, from Eva T. Waggoner, at \$2,350.00, for Trade-Fourth Connector.
- (c) Option on 866 square feet, plus fill easement, at 920-22 West Fourth Street, from F.J.H. Realty Company, Inc., at \$250.00, for Trade-Fourth Connector.
- (d) Option on 8,401 square feet with a one-story frame building, at 918 West Fourth Street, from William Page and wife, Amelia B., at \$12,500.00, for Trade-Fourth Connector.
- (e) Acquisition of 180.91' x 137.32' x 9.97' x 41.90' of easement at 2414 Lester Street, from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, at \$1.00, for Lester Street Improvements at Amay James Center.
- (f) Acquisition of 23.01' x 23.01' x 38.91' of easement at 3200 Amay James Street, from Wade Hampton Ferguson and wife, Gertrude Ferguson, at \$100.00, for Lester Street Improvements.

COMMENTS ON USE OF LAND DONATED FOR SIDEWALK RIGHT OF WAY ON SHAMROCK DRIVE.

Councilman Williams stated in connection with sidewalks along Shamrock Drive, there was a story in the newspapers stating several people had declined to donate right of way because of apprehension the government would use that right of way later on for street purposes. He asked what would be wrong with an easement like the utilities get for power lines for sidewalk purposes only? This would be an easement instead of buying the Land? Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, replied unless they use a different kind of form than he has worked with, he thought it specifically reserved an easement area for a specific

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 285

purpose, and that being sidewalks. Our water and sewer easements read that way - they say for water and/or sewer lines only. Councilman Williams stated in which case it would remove that objection to the reason that later it could be used for street purposes. Mr. Underhill replied there is no problem at all with drawing an easement document form used for that purpose to obtain easements for sidewalks only.

Mr. Hopson, Public Works Director, stated they are now preparing a report to City Council on that. They had excellent results on Providence Road, and excellent results on Park Road. They met with these people last week; had a lengthy discussion; they tore up all the papers presented them, and threw them in the waste basket. He stated they are going to recommend to Council that they not install a sidewalk out there.

Councilman Williams stated he just wants it clear to everyone that this is a false issue about a street coming along later and using this land donated for sidewalks. There is a practical and legal way to arrange it so it can be used only for sidewalks. Mr. Hopson stated they offered that alternative and they were opposed to that.

#### CONFERENCE SESSION REQUESTED ON TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN VARIOUS NEIGHBORHOODS.

Councilman Whittington stated he is concerned about groups like the people who came here this afternoon as they go away with the impression that no one is concerned about their problems. He stated he knows the reason they go away with that feeling as they probably come here instructed.

He stated he thinks Council needs a meeting, if it takes all day, with Bernie Corbett, Bob Hopson and his staff, about this neighborhood, and they mentioned 20 others that Council is going to be confronted with. If we have to bit the bullet and do what has to be done, then he is for biting the bullet. That Council did not discuss the alternatives Mr. Corbett gave today except to widen that intersection. These people left saying that Eastway Drive was not crowded and neither was the Plaza. Everybody knows that is not true.

Councilman Gantt stated all of them have been going to Thursday night meetings, and they are all the same kind of thing. One is coming up on Fairview. The City Manager sent them a memorandum saying he would like to brief Council on that. He stated it would be helpful if staff has any additional information to get it to Council.

Councilman Whittington stated he is not trying to bring this up since these people left. But if you look at Shamrock Drive, that has been a thoroughfare from Sharon Amity at Dillard Drive all the way to The Plaza. It has been that way as long as he can remember. Then Eastway Drive runs north and south; the Plaza runs northeast back to the northwest, and then you have Shamrock in there. All these people are driving in there, and we have to face this issue. If it means widening that road, he thinks it has to be widened.

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, stated they have been over and over this with these people. There are some things they are planning to do to see if it will improve the situation. One is this intersection which can be done without too much money. If it can be made undesirable for these cars to get off on these other roads, and keep them on Shamrock, then it will make you want to widen Shamrock.

May 10, 1976  
Minute Book 63 - Page 286

Mayor Belk stated the people here today did not live on Shamrock. The ones on Shamrock would complain just as much if it is put on Shamrock.

Councilman Whittington stated he thinks Council should have these alternatives given by Mr. Corbett today, and have a half day conference agenda on them.

**NOMINATION OF H.A. (JAKE) BERRY TO AUDITORIUM-COLISEUM-CIVIC CENTER AUTHORITY.**

Councilman Whittington placed in nomination the name of H. A. (Jake) Berry to the Auditorium-Coliseum-Civic Center Authority to succeed himself for a five year term.

**ADJOURNEMENT.**

Motion was made by Councilman Gantt, seconded by Councilman Davis, and unanimously carried, adjourning the meeting.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk