

- 35 • September 9, 2020
- 36 • October 14, 2020
- 37 • November 11, 2020
- 38 • December 9, 2020

39 **4. Redevelopment Plan Community Question and Answer Session**

40 Chair Lee moved forward, telling everyone to review the newly updated webpage for the
41 Commission. Chair Lee scrolled through the website, showing where the public could access it.
42 Chair Lee then told everyone that the meeting would include a review of the Frequently Asked
43 Questions section of the webpage. Chair Lee opened the floor for the public to ask any questions.

44 Local citizen, Mike Avery, expressed concern about lot sizes. Mr. Avery stated that he is
45 concerned that lot sizes may not be adequate for housing because they are too small. Jeff
46 Ruggieri, director of Development Services, agreed that the lots are small but are just a minimum
47 and will expand opportunities for more people to own homes.

48 Local citizen, Bernard George of 1822 Opal Street, expressed that small lots continue a trend of
49 poor subdivision management. Mr. George explained that the purpose of the community
50 revitalization should be to stimulate investment and small lots will prevent this from happening.
51 Local citizen, Bernard White, stood with Mr. George to further express that it makes no sense to
52 have smaller lots. Mr. George stated that he did not have a proposed standard for the lot sizes.

53 Chair Lee asked Mr. George what he proposes to be optimum for lot sizes in the community. Mr.
54 George responded, stating that more incentives are needed to stimulate investment in the
55 community. Mr. George explained that special financing options and homebuyer programs can
56 be used as incentives.

57 Co-Chair Jaimee Bullock-Mosley thanked Mr. George for giving a great outline of how to
58 stimulate investment then redirected Mr. George to propose a new lot size that would be
59 appropriate for the community. Mr. George stated that he did not have a suggestion for an
60 appropriate lot size. Co-Chair Bullock sought clarity and concluded that Mr. George's biggest
61 concern was the potential exploitation of the community through the use of small lot sizes.

62 Local citizen, Terre Holloway of 1001 Main Street, stood up to mention a housing project done
63 in Havelock, NC. Mr. Holloway stated that if anyone knew of the housing project, it would be a
64 good model to follow for new homes.

65 Local citizen, Elijah Brown of 916 Fort Totten Drive, stood to express that a major concern with
66 small lot sizes is a lack of privacy and that citizens deserve better sizes for the community. Mr.
67 Brown suggested that the meeting not be focused on getting a size and that time be taken to
68 conduct a study and determine the best size for citizens.

69 Co-Chair Bullock-Mosley shifted the conversation to discuss her suggestion to focus on Queen
70 Street as a newly proposed place for economic vitality instead of 3rd Avenue. Citizens agreed that
71 this proposal would be better than extending 3rd Avenue.

72 Local citizen, Jabari Wallace, stood to express that the extension should be delayed and that the
73 community wants the recreational space to be preserved. Mr. Wallace declared that the
74 community is completely opposed to the extension and feels that it does not make sense. Co-
75 Chair Bullock Mosley sought clarity on the extension. Co-Chair Bullock Mosley stated that she
76 had heard the term “highway” used regarding the extension of 3rd Avenue and wanted to ensure
77 the public understood the difference between extending a street versus creating a highway.

78 Local citizen, Anne Shout, told the Commission that she felt it would be good for the
79 Commission to also be focusing on a stormwater project that could help the citizens of
80 Duffyfield have a better quality of life. Mrs. Shout also mentioned potentially coming before the
81 Commission to make presentation about what plans are currently in the works to address this
82 issue. Mrs. Shout explained that she could not share information about current plans because she
83 is not an engineer and did not want to give the wrong information.

84 Before closing the meeting, the Board held a discussion on eminent domain, explaining to the
85 public that it is not an intention of the Commission to take someone’s home. The Commission
86 also explained that eminent domain is a last resort and would be the ending of a long process in a
87 series of attempts to get the problem solved.

88 Chair Lee thanked everyone for attending the meeting and bringing forth questions.

89 Chair Lee adjourned the meeting at 7:15pm.


90

91

92 Date approved: 5/12/2020

93

94

95 Attest: 
96 D. Aja Fulmore, Recording Secretary

96

97


Theresa Lee, Chairman

98