Charlotte City Council
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee
Summary Minutes
March 2, 2011

COMMITTEE AGENDA TOPICS

I. FY12 Focus Area Plan Follow-Up
II. Single Room Occupancy Text Amendment Follow-Up
III. Neighborhood Symposium Update
IV. Quality of Life Report Update and Proposed Enhancements Review (postponed)

COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Council Members Present: Patsy Kinsey, Patrick D. Cannon, Michael Barnes, James Mitchell and Warren Cooksey

Staff Resources: Julie Burch, Assistant City Manager
Debra Campbell, Planning
Tom Warshauer, Neighborhood & Business Services
Cynthia Woods, Neighborhood & Business Services

Meeting Duration: 12:09 PM – 1:31 PM

ATTACHMENTS

1. Agenda Packet – March 2, 2011

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

Kinsey: Opened the meeting at 12:09 p.m. Introductions were completed.

Burch: The first item on our agenda is the Focus Area Plan Follow-Up. The Committee has had several meetings to review this draft, and the draft was included in the Council's retreat materials. Full Council also had an opportunity to weigh in. We are here today seeking action on this Focus Area Plan. If you are prepared to do that, this will be included in the packet of all five Focus Area Plans for Council approval at the April 11th Council meeting.

Cooksey: I don't recall there being any comments about the plan from Council members who were not Committee members. Is that correct?

Burch: That is correct.

Barnes: Makes a motion to recommend to the full Council that we adopt this Focus Area Plan for the Housing & Neighborhood Development Committee.

Cooksey: Second's the motion.

Kinsey: Motion passes unanimously. Next item on the agenda is the Single Room Occupancy Text Amendment Follow-Up.

Burch: Debra Campbell and Josh Weaver are coming back to you today. We had a conversation about this at your last Committee meeting and gave you the opportunity to react. We briefed Council member Barnes because he was not able to be at our last meeting. If you are ready to do so, we are seeking action from the Committee today to move this on to the full Council. There were a couple outstanding issues from the last meeting so Debra and Josh are here today to bring that information back to you.

Campbell: Thank you for the time this Committee has put into this project and also thank you to our Citizen Advisory Board for the time they have spent. I'd like to review our revised recommendations and request that the Committee forward this to the full Council at a Zoning Dinner Meeting to officially file the text amendment to the Charlotte City Zoning Ordinance.

I want you to know that the language that you see on the screen today may not be exactly what goes into the official text amendment. This is "draft language", but the final document will certainly capture its spirit and intent.

We are only going to go over those outstanding issues where you expressed concern at the last meeting. (Walks through presentation).

Issue One:
Draft Proposed Changes – Referenced supportive services
H&ND Concerns – Support Services should be required with every SRO
Revised Recommendation – Change definition to include supportive services as a requirement.

Current ordinance does not require SRO's to provide supportive services.

Add the following to the definition of SRO:
SRO developments must provide support services for residents housed in the facility.

Current ordinance mentions, but doesn't define supportive services.

Add the following definition of supportive services:
Supportive Services: <u>should include, but are not limited to</u>: provision of meals; assistance in obtaining permanent housing; medical counseling, treatment, and/or supervision; psychological counseling, treatment, and/or supervision; assistance in

recuperating from the effects of, or refraining from, the use of drugs and/or alcohol; nutritional counseling; employment counseling; job training and placement; and child care.

Original definition said “may include”. There was some concern that was too loose in terms of definition of supportive services. We communicated with the City Attorney’s office and they don’t see an issue using “may” or “should”. Should does not mean that you have to include all of those services.

Cannon: So “should” means that you don’t have to?

Campbell: “Should” means that you should include it, but it doesn’t mean you have to include all of those listed.

Cannon: Could that not be confusing or misconstrued by someone who might try to interpret that one way when we mean another?

Campbell: Under the definition of a SRO, it says SRO developments must provide supportive services. The next slide defines supportive services - a range of services that can be provided in a SRO development. Supportive services are not just restricted to SRO developments.

Cannon: So if it should, but does not have to include all, why not just spell that out?

Campbell: We could say that. The thought was that the “but not limited to” would capture that.

Cannon: “Not limited to” is interpreted as there may be something even beyond these services.

Campbell: Yes

Cannon: So, there’s a difference. There is something beyond yet you are saying it doesn’t have to include all.

Campbell: Our goal was not to restrict the definition of supportive services to just this list of potential services because it’s my understanding that the industry is trying to provide to the needs of a wide range of constituents that come through the door. So, we listed examples of some of them, but certainly didn’t think we could include everything that may be provided to a client.

Cooksey: If we are going to require supportive services, and we attempt to define every possible supportive service, if a new challenge comes along in five years that will require a new supportive service that is not listed, we would need a text amendment to deal with it. So, we say “should include but not limited to”.

Cannon: I just didn’t want someone to read that and interpret that another way. But I’m fine with it.

Campbell: Again, our original language was “may include” and in response to Mr. Barnes concern we replaced “may” with “should”.

Cooksey: That is fairly typical language in my experience. Anytime you use “may” or “should” you usually say “but not limited to”. Let’s say in five years, someone comes along and wants to build a SRO in a by-right location offering a service not on that list, what would the procedure be for allowing such an organization to build a SRO with a service not on that list?

Campbell: They could build because of the “but not limited to”. The requirement for a SRO would simply be to provide some type of supportive service.

Cooksey: What if there is a difference of opinion between the entity building the SRO and the adjoining property owner on whether the service not listed is truly a supportive service?

Campbell: It would be the Zoning Administrative interpretation with an appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustments.

Cooksey: So, we either lock it down now or if we allow for variability. The process is administrative rather than a text amendment.

Campbell: I think we have to be really clear about what we are locking down. We have said SRO developments have to provide supportive services. It doesn’t say 20 services or 10.

Barnes: Mr. Cannon, when the word “may” was in the definition; my concern was that it didn’t provide a floor or a ceiling. By including “should” and “but not limited to”, we are providing a floor to the definition. If you simply left “may”, people could choose not to do any of it.

Campbell: (Continues with presentation)

Final Issue:
Draft Proposed Changes – No change in terms of referencing the Housing Locational Policy in the Zoning Ordinance.
H&ND Concern – Housing Locational Policies should be reference and compliance required even when public funds aren’t used.
Revised Recommendation – No change. Proposed changes include a recommended separation of ½ mile distance between SRO developments which would limit clustering of these uses.

It is extremely rare for a SRO development to be 100% privately financed and not adhere to the Housing Locational Policy.

Kinsey: The Housing Locational Policy just applies to public funds. If we said SRO’s had to follow the Locational Policy, even if they are privately funded, it wouldn’t mesh with our current Locational Policy.

Campbell: It would be treating SRO’s very different than we treat all the other assisted housing.

Barnes: Should we put it in a separate category? Is it addressed in the current ordinance?

Campbell: I don't think we should put it in a separate category. It is not addressed in the current ordinance. The Locational Policy would kick in because 99.9% of the time, SRO developments will seek public funds.

Barnes: Are you saying that the private funding piece will not be included in the revised recommendation?

Campbell: The private piece will not be included because the Housing Locational Policy does not include privately funded developments. You would be isolating and treating this type of affordable housing very different.

Cannon: At our workshop on Monday, we heard mention of taking away the ½ mile radius in the Housing Locational Policy. If that ½ mile radius is removed, I'm concerned what it could really cause in terms of the clustering that could happen. I don't know that the Housing Location Policy was well received or understood as to why that ½ mile needs to be in place.

Campbell: I understand the rationale for the ½ mile distance in the Housing Locational Policy. It was strongly advocated for by the citizen advisory board related to SRO. If you agreed to forward these proposed changes, the ½ mile radius distance from one another, in terms of SRO's, moves forward regardless of what is adopted in the Housing Locational Policy.

Cannon: This is important because this is what the citizens and industry are asking for. We need make sure we make it clear the people are engaged in this process.

Mitchell: Makes a motion to forward proposed text amendments to full Council based on the schedule Staff has provided.

Barnes: Second's the motion.

Kinsey: Motion passes unanimously. Next item on the agenda is an update on the Neighborhood Symposium.

Burch: Cynthia Woods and Tom Warshauer are here to give a brief presentation on the planning of the Symposium on Saturday, April 16.

Woods: The Symposium is something we do every year and we wanted to let you know what we have planned for 2011. (Walks through presentation)

Mitchell: We have always had discussion about lunch for the participants. Did we take it out of the budget last year?

Burch: We didn't do lunch last year. There are a lot of vendors as part of the other events going on so people can take advantage of that.

Mitchell: What is the total cost if we provided lunch?

Warshauer: In previous years, it was $10 - $12 per person.

Mitchell: And we expect an attendance of about 600 people?

Warshauer: We had a couple hundred people last year so we could have more than that this year. The goal of having partnering events with Sensoria and Clean and Green is that a lot of other people gain exposure to our event and our folks get a lot of exposure to the other events.

Mitchell: I'd like to see the cost if we provided lunch to the participants. We don't do a lot of things for our citizens in their minds and I look to this as a goodwill effort to show that we appreciate them coming and I don't think that's a lot for the City to do. I'd like Staff to give us a cost associated and we can have a discussion about putting it in.

Woods: The year before last, the budget was reduced and we had boxed lunches instead of a sit down meal. Last year, at CPCC, lunch was on your own. We did do breakfast.

Warshauer: We could provide lunch in terms of coupons so people could go outside and participate in the events and take advantage of the vendors rather than provide a sit down lunch.

Mitchell: Any options around lunch, I'm open to discussion.

Warshauer: We can take a look at that. That might be a good way to encourage people to have some healthy food.

Cooksey: I would be curious to know logistically, how we distinguish between the hundreds of people attending the Symposium and the thousands attending the other events. We may be opening ourselves up to the cost without providing the actual service of the Symposium.

Woods: We would try to work in a lunch ticket to prove you were at the Symposium.

Cooksey: If we didn't provide lunch last year and all went well, that's an indication we don't need to provide it. I'm not a big fan of the lunch at this stage.

Barnes: What was the total budget for the Symposium last year?

Woods: Last year, our expenses came to about $25,000 and we hope to be able to do the same.

Barnes: Hope?

Warshauer: The budget is the same as last year. We don't exactly know where it will come in. We have to provide tents for exhibitors this year so it will depend on how many sign up, but we are saving money on design costs. So there are some changing variables.

Woods: I need to correct myself. Our budget from last year was $30,000, but we only spent $25,000.

Barnes: I disagree with my colleague on lunch. If it wasn't a problem last year and people were getting out and spending money with the vendors, I'd like to continue that. I remember when we were at the Convention Center, we had a number of people from distressed families who couldn't afford parking or lunch as well; if those same people follow us to CPCC, then that same issue is probably still there. What was your experience from last year?

Woods: We had some of the same people who came. There were some that did not make it to CPCC and we don't know all those reasons. We think some of it is the change in location and people weren't aware of it. We are stepping up our marketing efforts this year to make sure that doesn't happen.

Barnes: Did you feel like cost of lunch was a barrier to anybody last year?

Burch: Last year we didn't provide lunch.

Barnes: I mean were people coming back at 1pm hungry because they couldn't afford lunch?

Woods: I was not aware of that.

Cannon: I became aware of it.

Kinsey: My understanding is last year, because there wasn't lunch on site, some people didn't come back for the afternoon sessions. Are we getting rid of the afternoon sessions this year? If we are, that may make a difference as to whether or not we need to provide lunch.

Woods: There are no afternoon sessions.

Kinsey: I think that would play into the decision.

Burch: The Symposium will be over by Noon and we want to encourage people to go take advantage of the exhibits and other activities going on.

Cannon: So you have 12pm – 4pm just for them to walk around and take a look at the exhibits? I will tell you I had a lot of people coming up to me and asking why were weren't serving lunch and I didn't know what to say. The attendance levels were extremely low at the event last year. I was in one of the rooms conducting a workshop and nobody showed up. It wasn't just my workshop, it was others as well. A lot of that may be in part because of the move to CPCC and the level of marketing. How much are we budgeting for marketing and what will be done specifically to get people to the event this year?

Woods: We have postcards that we are sending, flyers, posters - contacting various businesses and organizations to see if we can put the posters up. We are also advertising on

Channel 16, doing radio spots, press releases, Cmail, and talking with neighborhoods to help spread the word.

Cannon: Can we also have television do a PSA for us if there is such a thing anymore? Also get on community calendars.

Woods: I think our Communications Team is working those kinds of things.

Cannon: I'll help along the way.

Mitchell: I'd be interested in seeing the numbers. I know we have moved around over the years but it seems there is a trend occurring here that I think none of us like – attendance is dropping off. It could be also, that we are shortening the program. I don't want us to lose the substance here. It's a good opportunity for the neighborhoods to really get engaged. Some people did complain they used to be too long, but I didn't realize we were shortening it to end at noon. I don't want our citizens to feel like we short changed them. I'd like to see that reflected in the agenda. How many breakout discussions will we have?

Woods: There will be about eight and they will be around the project implementation piece.

Mitchell: I think the synergy is great, but by the time you take out the welcome you are only getting a few hours of programming if we end at noon. I don't think that's the type of message we want to send. That's a two hour program talking about housing. I think we can make it meatier.

Burch: It's not just about housing. This covers a whole host of neighborhood issues.

Mitchell: I think if you talk about a whole host of other issues you can go longer – talk about Crime Watch and new issues with SRO, etc. Maybe we end at 2pm instead. I feel like we shortened our program to take advantage of synergy, but there is so much substance to talk about. This should be an event neighborhoods look forward to. We don't hear that buzz anymore and we really need to figure out why the attendance has dropped for the Symposium.

Barnes: I believe we have done this to ourselves. The budget used to be $75,000. We told them to take out all the facilitators. I think the question for us to ask is should we direct staff to increase the budget again and make it a more substantive program again? Why did we move from the Convention Center to CPCC?

Warshauer: We think there is great energy around being a part of this event. It's a good platform for us to encourage other people that are interested in energy to think about being engaged in their communities. We were getting a lot of the same people so we wanted to be able to let other people in the community know about the work we were doing in neighborhoods. We also think it's good for people to get use to coming to CPCC. It's an opportunity for people to experience being on a campus and getting around on campus. People can be cross fertilized. We didn't have the attendance that we had previously. With moving, you will always have some of that. Our thinking this year is that this event

is a celebration of neighborhoods, where neighborhoods get to talk about what they are doing and follow this event up with a district forum that would be more of a planning day that is content led where neighborhoods can plan projects for the next year.

Barnes: One of the issues is that a lot of the neighborhood leaders that attended at the Convention Center may have represented a more traditional constituency that would be interested in more organic neighborhood issues rather than energy, etc. I think the energy piece is very important but I'm worried we may have lost some of the people that are interested in some of the problems that aren't being addressed. Because the Convention Center is a block away from Duke Energy, I wonder if there might be an opportunity to partner with Duke to accomplish a similar goal. I do appreciate what's happening at CPCC, but I'm just worried we may have lost that connection to some folks who have historically relied upon that day to share messages with their communities. Again, I believe we did this.

Woods: I would encourage you not to look at this as short changing people because we are stopping at noon. It's really going to give them more variety. One of the things we heard from the exhibitors last year was that they felt like they were in competition because we had the exhibitors there while we were expecting people to be inside with us. Now we are giving people the chance to go outside after they have done the formal workshop event.

Cannon: There are some vendors who may be willing to donate boxed lunches for the first 200 participants. Maybe that's an incentive you give people. I would be willing to share a few ideas of vendors. This would help us streamline costs. The vendor will get a little plug. Food does get people to come out. In another effort to cut costs, Crossroads Charlotte will have some things coming up where they will be engaging the public. Maybe that's something we can work to collaborate with them on. I put that out there for consideration.

Mitchell: I apologize to Staff, Council Member Barnes is exactly right. We chopped your budget from $75,000 to $25,000. If you could, put together a nice Symposium with some options. Let your creative juices flow. I would love to see a Symposium to be proud of that would be great for the community and then we can talk about the dollar figure. Neighborhood registration with City of Charlotte is a great topic.

Cooksey: From an event planning standpoint, not much is going to change six weeks out. The lesson learned here is perhaps Council should look at the objectives of the Symposium when we have time to provide some suggestions you can act on. I don't see you being able to act on any suggestions being made today.

Mitchell: I don't agree with that opinion. I think you all do have the ability to change some things.

Burch: We may be able to make some changes, but there is certainly a limitation being only six weeks out. We can explore the lunch idea if you have some thought who we can contact about that.

Warshauer: It will be really hard for us to make changes to this event other than adding lunch. We would like to come back to you with some ideas for a second event.

Cannon: When do you normally start to plan for the Symposium?

Woods: Mid summer or early fall.

Cannon: Could you engage us as you start that process to let us know what you are thinking and we can provide some thoughts?

Woods: Sure.

Burch: When we made the change in location, we knew that would be a trial to see how it would work. We had it uptown at hotels or at the convention center for a number of years. Like a lot of things, a concept can get tired so the CPCC idea came along and had a lot of attraction. Now we can refine again. We just need to have enough resources to make the requested changes.

Mitchell: How long would it take to add four additional workshops from 12 – 4?

Warshauer: We can add them, although a lot of the PR has already gone out. We didn't find that people wanted to attend our workshops in the afternoon. People want to go outside to visit the exhibits and participate in activities.

Mitchell: Is that based on a survey?

Warshauer: That's based on our attendance in the afternoon. People just didn't come back after lunch.

Mitchell: But there was no lunch. People didn't come back because there was no lunch. Where is the data about why people left? Six weeks to add four workshops seems doable to me. What is so hard that in six weeks that you can't change it a little bit? I can lead a workshop about how neighborhoods can register with the City of Charlotte. I think there are other workshops we can incorporate. I just struggle why it can't change in six weeks.

Warshauer: We can add other workshops, but we have printed material already.

Barnes: I am sensitive to what Mr. Mitchell is saying, I wonder if we should go through this budget cycle and see what we are going to look like financially and determine going into the 2012 Symposiums whether we can expand it back into a more robust event that we are talking about. I sense that staff is a ways down the road to prepare for the April event and there is not much flexibility at this time.

Mitchell: To me, it's more about substance. I'm sensitive to the budget. Can we add one thing this year? Let's make sure we add a survey to find out what citizens think.

Burch: Conclusion is, because of the timeframe, we will stay with the idea we have, but will pursue the idea of lunch. If the Council wishes to revisit the concept of the Symposium and budget, that can be done.

Woods: And we will do a more concentrated survey.

Burch: We will wait to discuss the Quality of Life at the next meeting. It will not be too late to make suggestions. We do have a couple important topics coming up in the next few months so be mindful of that.

Kinsey: Adjourned the meeting at 1:31 pm.

City Council
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee

Wednesday, March 2, 2011
12:00 p.m.
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room – 280

Committee Members: Patsy Kinsey, Chair
James Mitchell, Vice-Chair
Michael Barnes
Patrick D. Cannon
Warren Cooksey

Staff Resource: Julie Burch, Assistant City Manager

AGENDA

I. FY12 Focus Area Plan Follow-Up

II. Single Room Occupancy Text Amendment Follow-Up

III. Neighborhood Symposium Update

IV. Quality of Life Report Update and Proposed Enhancements Review

Attachments:
- FY12 Focus Area Plan (Attachment A)
- Green Neighborhood Assessment Tool (Attachment B)

Future Agenda Topics:
- Assisted Multi-Family Housing at Transit Stations Policy (April)
- Inclusionary Zoning/Density Bonus (April)
- Impacts of Tree Ordinance on Affordable Housing (TBD)

Distribution:

Mayor/Council
Curt Walton, *City Manager*
City Leadership Team
Corporate Communications
Debra Campbell – *Planning Department*
Anna Schleunes- *City Attorney's Office*
Mujeeb Shah-Khan- *City Attorney's Office*
Saskia Thompson- *Manager's Office*
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Coalition for Housing
Neighborhood Leaders

Budget Office
Ruffin Hall
Phyllis Heath
Lisa Schumacher
Ann White
Charlotte Housing Authority
Charles Woodyard
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership
Pat Garrett
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Chief Rodney Monroe
Deputy Chief Ken Miller

Community Relations
Willie Ratchford
Ledger Morrissette
Neighborhood & Business Services
Patrick Mumford
Walter Abernethy
Steve Allen
Jamie Banks
Brad Richardson
Pamela Wideman
Tom Warshauer
Richard Woodcock

HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEV.

FY2012 Strategic Focus Area Plan

"Creating and sustaining communities of choice for living, working and recreation."

The City of Charlotte's long-term health, vitality, and distinction as a competitive city is predicated upon its ability to utilize national and local best practices to create and sustain communities of choice for living, working and recreation.

The City's housing and neighborhood strategy focuses on creating and sustaining communities by creating places where people and businesses are safe, where civic infrastructure supports neighborhood quality of life and business success, where families have access to quality education, jobs, and services and the environment is preserved and strengthened. (*Also see Community Safety, Economic Development, Environment, and Transportation & Planning Focus Area Plans for more housing and neighborhood development initiatives.*)

Housing and Neighborhood Development

Invest in Infrastructure

I. H&ND. Focus Area Initiative: Create healthy and vibrant neighborhoods by improving and implementing quality physical infrastructure

A. FY12 Measure: 90% of voter approved bond projects (Neighborhood Infrastructure and Business Corridor) will be completed or forecasted to be completed on schedule.

1. FY12 Target: Neighborhood Improvement Projects
Belmont Plan – Gateways
Lincoln Heights
York/Cama NIP

Promote Economic Development

II. H&ND. Focus Area Initiative: Strengthen opportunities for public and private partnerships to encourage the integration of education, recreation, employment and housing resources in identified redevelopment areas.

A. FY12 Measure: Achieve a leverage ratio within the corridor of1:10 for business corridor funds.

1. FY12 Target: 3 projects

Strengthen Neighborhoods

III. H&ND. Focus Area Initiative: Develop and recommend policies that will assist with increasing the supply of affordable housing

A. FY12 Measure: Develop and Revise policies

1. FY12 Target: Assisted Multi-Family Housing at Transit Station Locational Policy for Transit Stations, Impact of Regulatory Ordinance on Affordable Housing, and Housing Trust Fund Guidelines

IV. H&ND. Focus Area Initiative: Redesign the QOL study to more accurately reflect the City's neighborhood conditions

A. FY12 Measure: Completion of the 2012 Quality of Life

1. FY12 Target: Complete redesign of the report

Single Room Occupancy Residences (SRO) Standards Follow-Up
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee Meeting
March 2, 2011

Committee Action:
Review Planning staff and Citizen Advisory Group proposed revisions to the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) standards of the City of Charlotte Zoning Ordinance. Staff requests the Housing & Neighborhood Development (H&ND) Committee consider recommending these revisions to City Council for consideration.

Policy:
City Council has requested a review of the (SRO) standards.

Explanation:
A Citizen Advisory Group was formed to review the existing SRO standards.

Staff has provided a number of updates to the H&ND Committee.

- November 3, 2010 - Staff presented draft SRO recommendations to the H&ND Committee, and received comments.
- January 6, 2011 - Staff met with the SRO Citizen Advisory Group and reviewed the H&ND Committee's comments.
- February 2, 2011- Staff presented revised draft SRO recommendations to the H&ND Committee, received feedback, and was asked to follow-up at the next meeting in March.

The purpose of this presentation is to provide revised information on proposed SRO changes. Staff requests the committee recommend these revised regulations to City Council for consideration.

Neighborhood Symposium Update
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee Meeting
March 2, 2011

Committee Action:
Receive an update on plans for the 2011 Neighborhood Symposium

Policy:
The City Council's Housing and Neighborhood Development strategy supports strengthening neighborhoods through initiatives and collaborations that improve and sustain Charlotte's quality of life.

Explanation and Background:
- The City of Charlotte hosts the Neighborhood Symposium annually in partnership with several public and not-for-profit partners. The event is presented as a citywide conference of neighborhoods, which provides opportunities for citizens to learn about community services and resources, strategize about successful neighborhood practices, network and participate in dialogue with other neighborhood and community leaders.
- In 2010, Neighborhood & Business Services redesigned the Neighborhood Symposium format and collaborated with new partners, Charlotte Clean and Green (CCG) and Central Piedmont Community College (CPCC) to sponsor three concurrent community events. The City's Neighborhood Symposium, CCG's Earth Day Festival and CPCC's Sensoria Celebration of the Arts were held on CPCC's campus. The collaboration attracted a diverse audience, with thousands of Charlotte citizens participating in the three events.

Overview of the 2011 Neighborhood Symposium:
- The 16th annual Neighborhood Symposium will be held on Saturday, April 16, 2011 at CPCC's central campus on Elizabeth Avenue.
- Focusing on this year's Symposium theme, "Connecting Community," the opening program will feature brief neighborhood-led presentations about successes and best practices in implementing projects that make Charlotte's neighborhoods and business corridors healthy and vibrant. Dialogue sessions will follow the presentations to allow for more information sharing and networking. The sessions will end at noon, at which time participants will enjoy outdoor activities, including lunch (on your own), City, County and neighborhood exhibits, environmental exhibits and vendors, art displays, children's activities, and more.
- More than 40 Symposium exhibitors are expected, including City and County departments, neighborhoods and non-profits. This year, Symposium exhibitors will be located outside along Elizabeth Avenue and on the lawn of CPCC's Terrell Building.
- 2011 Symposium Schedule:
    - 8:00 am – ongoing — Symposium Registration/Check-in (Overcash Building)
    - 8:00 am – 8:45 am — Networking Continental Breakfast (Overcash Cafeteria)
    - 9:00 am – 10:30 am — Program (Halton Theatre, Overcash)
    - 10:45 am – 12 noon — Break-out Dialogue Sessions (Overcash classrooms)
    - 10:00 am – 4:00 pm — Exhibits + Sensoria and CCG Activities (Elizabeth Ave. area)

- This year's partnership between the City, Sensoria and Charlotte Clean and Green is expected to feature more than 150 total exhibitors and vendors, numerous workshops and activities for all ages, and record-breaking attendance of area residents.

Quality of Life Report
Update and Proposed Enhancements
Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee Meeting
March 2, 2011

Committee Action:
The purpose of this presentation is to provide the Housing & Neighborhood Development (H&ND) Committee with an update regarding boundary revisions and energy data being added to the Quality of Life Report. No action is required at this time. A proposal from UNC-C for the 2012 Quality of Life Report will come to Council at a later time.

Neighborhood Boundary Refinement:
Current Neighborhood Statistical Areas (NSA's) represent multiple neighborhoods and do not account for changes over the last 10 years due to new roads, new housing developments and neighborhood perceptions. The boundary refinement process will solicit feedback and counsel from citizens, neighborhood leaders and community representatives. Additional feedback will be requested from city, county, civic organizations and support staff. Current activities are:

- UNC-C and Community & Commerce staff are meeting to discuss current neighborhood boundaries in relation to Census Block Group, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department and Charlotte Department Of Transportation geographies to understand the availability and reliability of data in relation to new boundaries
- Community & Commerce will then schedule community meetings to solicit their input and advice
- H&ND Committee will then review the geography

Neighborhood Energy Challenge:
The Energy Data project incorporates the development of the energy and environment assessment data in the Quality of Life report. The data collected will provide a snapshot of energy and environmental performance in neighborhoods across the city, foster individual and community-based neighborhood energy action plans and evaluate trends in energy use and environmental performance at the neighborhood level across the City. This portion of enhancements to the QOL is funded through the Energy Efficiency & Conservation Block Grant.

UNC-C is currently developing a Energy & Environment Assessment Tool that will identify specific neighborhood-scale variables that impact Energy & Environment performance including. Examples are energy consumption, including gas and electric, bicycle amenities and accessibility, connectivity and auto usage, transit accessibility and utilization, pedestrian amenities and accessibility, recycling/waste elimination measures, water use and conservation and tree canopy. Current activities include:

- UNC-C has submitted to C&C staff proposed Green Variable measures for review and approval

- UNC-C is currently working with C&C staff, City Departments, Duke Energy, and Piedmont Natural Gas to obtain data for the energy & environment variables
- UNC-C is currently requesting Duke Energy Corporation to approve the new Energy Consumption variable
- Final analytical results will be used as a baseline for comparative analysis of Energy & Environmental performance in both the NEC neighborhoods and neighborhoods across the City.

2012 Quality of Life Enhancements:
The 2012 Quality Of Life Enhancement includes partnering with Mecklenburg County to extend the Quality of Life study to the entire county, including the municipalities and towns. Additionally, the Enhancements will review all current data to determine its continued relevance, explore availability of other data that may merit inclusion, explore the presentation of the data to insure it is easily understood, and explore other neighborhood 'grading' platforms to arrive at a methodology that more accurately describes the attributes of a neighborhood. Staff will continue to work with the partners and place this contract on a future Council Agenda.

Attachment:
Proposed Green Variable Indicator Measures

PROPOSED/POTENTIAL INDICATOR MEASURES

TRANSPORTATION-BASED INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Reduced Automobile Dependence	This will include a proportional measure of transportation mode by neighborhood.	Allows us to infer automobile dependence, affecting air quality and dependence on fossil fuels.
Automobile Count	The number of automobiles owned in each neighborhood.	Profile Variable
Street Network	A neighborhood with a high level of street connectivity, reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and promoting non motorized modes of transportation.	Look at street patterns to determine if connectivity is high and neighborhood can easily transition into alternative transportation.
Bicycle Network	A neighborhood that is accessible to a city bicycle network.	Allows us to determine viability of using bicycle (Use Bikeway Improvement data).
Walkable Streets	A neighborhood that has sidewalks connecting homes to businesses. May include speed limits for residential streets and mixed-use streets and requirements for building façade and distance to storefront from sidewalk.	Allows us to determine viability of walking (sidewalk data).
Transit Facilities - Existing	A neighborhood that has transit facilities close to transit stops and home or business locations, as well as having safe facilities with ample lighting, resting furniture and bicycle racks.	Allows us to determine viability of transit use.
Street Friendliness/Safety	A neighborhood that has sidewalks and safe driving speeds and a low occurrence of automobile accidents (either automobile-automobile, automobile-bicycle, or automobile-pedestrian).	Allows us to determine critical automobile safety issues.

TRANSPORTATION-BASED INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Trends in Transit Use	A neighborhood that is showing a stable ridership or increasing ridership of available transit.	Allows us to determine the current trend in use of transit facilities and reduced dependence on automobiles. Can be further used to determine the need for more transit opportunities or to be compared at later dates to support increased investment in transit.

HYDROLOGIC INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Impervious Surface	Neighborhood impervious area.	Allows us to determine risks of non-point source pollution.
Floodplain Avoidance	Proportion of developed areas located inside the floodplain or potential new development in floodplain.	Allows us to determine flooding potential in neighborhoods and areas for future development.

BIOLOGICAL INDICATOR		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Tree canopy	Tree canopy coverage for neighborhoods.	Allows us to determine heat island reduction, as well as neighborhood visual greening.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Solid Waste Management	Neighborhood solid waste generation (per household).	Allows us to determine which areas have highest rates of solid waste generation including yard waste, recycling, and bulk waste.
Recycling Behavior	Neighborhood recycling activity (per household).	Allows us to determine resident behavior favoring recycling and perhaps openness to other sustainability techniques.
Water Consumption	Neighborhood's average per capita water consumption.	Allows us to monitor the use of CMUD water and offer insights on how to reduce water consumption.

ENERGY INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Energy Consumption	TBD.	Allows us to determine the use of energy by neighborhoods (aggregate/neighborhood level data).
Structural Age	The average age for residential buildings in a neighborhood.	Profile variable
Structural square footage	The average square footage for residential buildings in a neighborhood (to be used in conjunction with the Energy Efficient Building indicator).	Profile variable
Energy Efficient Building	Structural energy efficiency per square foot for single family residences in a neighborhood.	Allows us to determine older structures that may require retrofits for increase in efficiency - based upon the Energy Estimator for Structures.
Onsite Renewable Energy Resources	Identified neighborhood assets that incorporate solar, wind, geothermal, or biomass energy sources.	Allows us to recognize those structures that have solar panels, water reclamation systems, etc.

GREEN LAND DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Walkable Communities	A neighborhood that is within 1/4 to 1/2 mile to local amenities, such as grocery stores, movie theatres, convenience stores, etc.	Allows us to determine viability of walking (Walk Score compilations for neighborhoods).
School Proximity	A neighborhood is connected by bicycle network or sidewalk network to a local school - typically within a 1/2 to 1 mile distance.	Allows us to determine viability of walking or biking to school sites.
Public Open Space Proximity	A neighborhood that is within 1/4 mile walking distance from any public space, such as parks, plazas, or other open spaces.	Allows us to determine viability of walking or biking to public spaces.
Access to local foods	Neighborhood access to a community garden, or farmer's market selling local food, within 1/4 mile walking distance.	Allows us to determine viable local food options for neighborhoods.
Housing Density Index	The ratio of housing density to the city housing density	Allows us to determine compact development as compared to the city average density.
Diversity of housing types/Affordable Housing	A neighborhood that includes a portion of the housing at a price point under the area median income (AMI).	Allows us to determine availability of housing for all citizens (especially in neighborhoods within walking distance to amenities and transit).
Access to Basic Retail Functions	Allows us to determine if there is a "food desert" within or surrounding neighborhoods.	Neighborhood within 1/4 walking distance of grocery store and/or drug store.
Existence of Neighborhood Association	A neighborhood has an association that will help organize, encourage, and management green techniques used/completed in neighborhoods.	Allows us to determine if there is a unified community organization that can encourage/make "green" decisions for neighborhood.
Access to healthcare	Average travel time from neighborhood to local emergency or non-emergency healthcare.	Allows us to determine availability and access to healthcare overall and in the event of a hazard/disaster event.

RISK INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
Environmental Health Risk	A neighborhood is at risk for public health concerns, such as contaminated water, sewage leaks, etc. and strives to prevent such risks in the future (outcome determines the prevention techniques).	Allows us to determine possible future risks to neighborhoods, allowing adaptation or risk reduction.

LEED-BASED INDICATORS		
Variable Name	***Definition***	***Meaning***
LEED-certified buildings	A neighborhood that is LEED - ND certified or includes LEED certified buildings.	Allows us to determine existing green buildings in neighborhoods.
Preservation or reuse of Historic Buildings	A neighborhood that has at least one historic building and renovates historic buildings as opposed to demolition.	Allows us to determine reused buildings vs. demolition.
Diversity of Land Uses	A neighborhood where 50 percent of housing units are within 1/4 mile walking distance of 4 or more distinct land uses.	Allows us to determine access to numerous amenities in a neighborhood, leading to the availability of walking as a viable transport options.