

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
REGULAR TOWN COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2013 - 7:00 P.M.  
MINUTES**

The Town Council of the Town of Weddington, North Carolina, met in a Regular Session at the Weddington Town Hall, 1924 Weddington Road, Weddington, NC 28104 on January 14, 2013, with Mayor Walker F. Davidson presiding.

Present: Mayor Walker F. Davidson, Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry, Councilmembers Werner Thomisser, Pamela Hadley and Barbara Harrison, Town Attorney Anthony Fox, Finance Officer Leslie Gaylord, Town Planner Jordan Cook and Town Administrator Amy S. McCollum

Absent: None

Visitors: John Steward, Dawn Panzeca, Jim Vivian, Bill Price, Sean Boyle, Charles Puckett, Judy Johnston, Dennis Taylor, Buffie Crothers, Eddie Leighton, Robert Gunst, Phillip Klein, Jim Leonard, Jane Duckwall, Jennifer Romaine, Nancy Anderson, Joanne McGuire, Keith Kelly, Brad Hoover, Mark Schmidt, Joachim Woerner, Ronald Garrick, Ginger Edgeworth and O. Rjbinski

Mayor Walker F. Davidson offered the Invocation prior to the opening of the meeting.

**Item No. 1. Call to Order.** Mayor Davidson called the January 14, 2013 Regular Town Council Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.** Mayor Davidson led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Item No. 3. Determination of Quorum.** There was a quorum.

**Item No. 4. Public Comments.** Ms. Dawn Panzeca - I am here representing the Rosehill Community. I am here to speak about the water tower and the issue of water pressure in our neighborhood. It is pretty bad and it has been increasingly bad over the course of the last three years. There are mornings and days where we cannot predict how bad the pressure is going to be. We may try to take a shower and the water is barely trickling. It affects our dishwashing and our irrigation. Our bills are going up and down because we cannot predict how much water we are going to get. We are here to ask that we move this process forward. We have heard lots of discussions about it but it does not seem to be moving anywhere. Weddington is a great place to live but how can you position it as a great place to live if one of the most basic needs is not being met? I have petitions I would like to give the Town as well.

Mr. Robert Gunst – I am also a Rosehill resident. I can easily attest to the validity of what Dawn spoke about. For example, on Christmas Day at about 2:30 p.m. my wife was preparing Christmas dinner. Fortunately or perhaps unfortunately, depending on how you look at it, it was only the two of us and we had no water. It has happened on more than one occasion. It is not a matter of whether or not we need the water; it is a matter of where we are going to put it. This matter has been addressed for many years. I have been living in this community only 4 ½ years and ever since I have been here it has been one of the prominent issues in Rosehill and obviously in other areas. Three or four attempts to my knowledge have been attempted between the Town and Union County to resolve this problem to no avail. Are we wondering do we need it or where we are going to put it?

Mr. Bill Price – I am a lifetime resident of Weddington and it is my intention to live here the rest of my life and dying here if it is God's will. I am here to speak against the proposed Land Use Survey that was sent out. You had a response of less than 20%. Of those responding, 26% have lived in Weddington less than five years and 49% have lived in Weddington less than 10 years and only 39.7% plan to retire here. I have asked various members of the community to attend these meetings and to present their ideas. Their response is "Why should I go? They are not going to listen to me or they have already made up their mind." This survey shows you that 80% of the people are content with the existing conditions within the Town or else just do not care. What are you going to listen to? Greenways have been discussed previously. They were rejected for the purpose that they would create trash and could increase the crime rate. At the present time, we have very little crime rate in Weddington. People do not want these greenways coming near their property. Who is going to pay for these greenways and for the upkeep and the patrolling of them? We are asking for a lot of things that I do not think are necessary.

Ms. Eddie Leighton – I am a Rosehill property owner and have been for over five years. I currently live in Matthews and I am living on property that is soon to be taken by NCDOT for an interchange. Looking ahead we bought the property in Rosehill because we were looking forward to the quality of life. I was one of the petitioners asking Weddington to take us in because Weddington is a wonderful place to live and I am looking forward to living there but I am concerned about the quality of life in Weddington when I hear about the lack of water. That is necessary and a part of living and life. I certainly hope that the Town will take some action to cure the problem and not keep it going and going year after year so I can joyfully look forward to building my new home.

Mr. Mark Schmidt – I live in Stratford Hall. We agree with what the folks in Rosehill are experiencing. We have a water pressure problem. In all due respect to the gentleman that spoke earlier, I do not know what survey he was referring to. I did not see such a thing. I would suggest to you that there is a substantial portion of Weddington that may not have a water problem but certainly on our end of Weddington there is a major issue. I am not even sure the water is going to hit the floor half the time when taking a shower. It is hard to get the soap off of you when taking a shower. We have to time our showers so that we do not take too long of one at one time. We cannot do the dishwashing and the washing machine and the shower at the same time. It is hard to get a shower on a day that the irrigation is even working. We have a serious water pressure problem. I had a situation over Christmas which was very embarrassing. We had out of town guests and they had a guest bedroom with a shower. They had to call me in there when they were trying to take a shower because it was just dripping. I had to invite them to the master bedroom to take a shower. That should not be. This is a problem that has been identified for a long time. I think you have the ability to correct this problem. It is just a matter of moving forward. We urge you do so. We really do have a problem. If there are any more houses added out there and any more demands on the water that is out there, we are not going to have any water. Please consider our water pressure problem and moving forward with the water tower that we need.

Mr. Joachim Woerner – I also live in Stratford Hall. We have some major issues with water pressure here in that area. If you want to take a look at my backyard with an irrigation system about 2/3 is brown and 1/3 maybe green. The brown is where the sprinkler system does not even hit the grass. It is really pitiful for the types of houses we have here in Weddington and I urge you to take some positive action on this.

Mr. Sean Boyle – I live in Stratford Hall. I moved down here about a year ago and basically right from the beginning experienced the same problems that everyone has discussed. There have been days when the water just does not turn on. The irrigation system is essentially useless. If it is programmed to run on a certain day we either shut it off completely or override it. Given that this is an ongoing issue, I urge you to take whatever actions are necessary to correct the problem and to allow this issue that is affecting all of us to be dealt with in as quick of a manner as possible.

Ms. Nancy Anderson – What happens when an applicant that has been awarded a conditional use permit (CUP) fails to comply? Regarding the Polivka property as I understand it there were several recommendations from the Planning Board that the Council adopted and added to the CUP. One of those had to deal with the heritage trees on the property. I understand that the information that the Council received that night regarding the viability of this tree has been directly contradicted by another arborist. The applicant advised you that it had a 10 year life expectancy but I think Jordan has since received another report saying that it was closer to 75 to 100 year life expectancy. I understand we are getting a second opinion. The Chesterbrook Academy was in conflict with our sign ordinance and it was an easy fix. We just had them fix the sign but if Polivka cuts down a 100-year old tree you cannot plant a 100-year old tree. What is the Town's recourse on that? Do they get a fine? A \$5,000 fine would not cause this applicant to blink. What is the plan? I believe that the applicant should be told up front. We have trees on the fence line/property line and half the root system is on my side and half is on their side. We have a 25 foot buffer that is required but I want to make sure it is a 25 foot undisturbed buffer. When they go in with their bulldozers and tear out all of that root system the trees on my side will be damaged. I want to make certain that is protected. Again it cannot be corrected after the fact. You will not be able to fix the natural habitat. I know that they are already working and surveying. I want to make sure that the Town Council's wishes are obeyed and you have adequate recourse because we know sometimes developers tell us one thing and do another.

Ms. Judy Johnston – I live in Providence Woods South and I also am the Secretary on the Providence VFD Board of Directors. I am here representing the fire department with a formal invitation and request for Council to join us and attend our monthly board meetings. In light of the topics tonight I would also like to extend that invitation to the public. They are open board meetings. Rosehill and Stratford Hall and that north side of Town certainly have some safety concerns. I invite and encourage Council to join us and stay informed.

Mr. Keith Kelly – I am a resident of the Rosehill Subdivision. I want to address the Council once again on the issues of water pressure as well as the volume supplying our neighborhood. I just finished a three year commitment to our community as one of the members of our HOA Board and during the course of the three years that was a major economic and requested item that had been borne by the residents of our community. A number of residents have been forced for the issues of irrigation to use non potable water resources and to pay for wells. In addition I would say half to two-thirds of the neighborhood has gone to the additional expense of putting in pressure boosters. I have had numerous conversations with Public Works wondering if there was an actual minimum standard that is required by the State, whether it is in gallons per minute or actual pressure that needs to be provided to a residence. We all pay taxes to Weddington as well as the County itself and certainly within the services we are paying for are our monthly water bills and I would assume that the minimum standard probably cannot be met. The pressure for the fire hydrants was a concern for a number of residents as well. I would urge the Town Council to consider putting this to rest once and for all. We do feel that the Council has had an economic moratorium where you have been able to push this to the side due to the recession and the number of homes and construction that did not occur. The concern is how do you add 100, 200 or even 300 more homes to what I consider an undersized and under pressured water main? I will ask you to be proactive about this. The concern that we had on the board was how are new homes going to go in this neighborhood and how will it be serviced? You had a five year break but it is time to address it now because we do see construction picking up and other builders moving into the area with those vacant lots. We would urge you to take action now and to not delay this.

**Item No. 5. Additions, Deletions and/or Adoption of the Agenda.** Mayor Davidson asked to move the update regarding the water tower location up on the agenda to under the Consent Agenda. Mayor Davidson stated, "There is an issue with the name of the new road behind Weddington UMC. I would like to add that to the agenda as well."

Mayor Davidson asked the Town Council to approve the agenda with the two amendments. There was not a motion. Mayor Davidson removed his item to discuss the street name of the road behind the Weddington UMC.

Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry moved to approve the agenda with the one amendment by Mayor Davidson. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 6. Approval of Minutes.**

**A. November 13, 2012 Regular Town Council Meeting Minutes.** Councilwoman Barbara Harrison moved to approve the November 13, 2012 Regular Town Council Meeting Minutes. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 7. Consent Agenda (Public Hearings to be held February 11, 2013 at the Weddington Town Hall at 7:00 p.m.).**

**A. Call for Public Hearing to Review and Consider - Proposed Text Amendment to Section 58-9-Entry Monuments.** The Town Council received a copy of the proposed text amendment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to call for a public hearing to review and consider the proposed text amendment to Section 58-9. The public hearing is to be held February 11, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**B. Call for Public Hearing to Review and Consider - Proposed Text Amendment to Section 58-152-Subdivision Identification Signs.** The Town Council received a copy of the proposed text amendment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to call for a public hearing to review and consider the proposed text amendment to Section 58-152. The public hearing is to be held February 11, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**C. Call for Public Hearing to Review and Consider - Proposed Text Amendment - Appendix 1-List of Acceptable Plant Species.** The Town Council received a copy of the proposed text amendment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to call for a public hearing to review and consider the proposed text amendment to Appendix 1 – List of Acceptable Plant Species. The public hearing is to be held February 11, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**D. Review and Consideration of Renewing the Waybridge Construction Trailer Permit.** The Town Council received a copy of the following memo from Town Planner Jordan Cook, the Application for Temporary Placement of the Construction Trailer and the Site Development Plan showing the area:

John Wieland Homes requests an extension for a temporary construction trailer located on Lot 18 in the Waybridge Subdivision. The address of Lot 18 is 1512 Waybridge Way, Weddington, NC.

**General Information**

- A renewal for the temporary construction trailer is required per *Section 58-13 (4)* of the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- The applicant is required to apply for a renewal every 12 months.
- The first permit was approved by Town Staff in 2006 for a one year period. The Town Council has granted an extension every year thereafter. The last extension was granted in February 2011.
- Every extension after the initial two years must be approved by the Town Council.
- *Section 58-13 (4)* of the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance* states that three or more lots must be remaining to grant the extension. The Waybridge Subdivision currently has 8 lots remaining, therefore complying with the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.

**Conclusion**

Staff has reviewed the application and submitted documents and finds the Construction Trailer Renewal Permit Application is in compliance with the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to renew the Waybridge Construction Trailer Permit. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES:	Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry
NAYS:	None

**Item No. 8. Old Business.**

**A. Update on Water Tower Location – Mayor Walker F. Davidson.** The Town Council received a copy of the June 11, 2012 Special Town Council Meeting minutes. Mayor Davidson - We have had some public comments about water pressure. I am going to take some time and go through an update on some recent history regarding this topic.

Attorney Anthony Fox – I want to caution the Council that the water tower issue and its discussion is an item that the Council anticipates coming to them from another public body. This body does not control the actual location or the actual determination of what will be proposed to it for the location of the tower. This body does however have to approve what might be requested by a third party. I want to make sure that we do not jeopardize the process that this Council has to undertake as a governing body to ultimately make a decision on what might be requested and approved.

Mayor Davidson - Council created a Water and Sewer Liaison position during our December 10 meeting in order to make sure that the Council stays up to date on the County's process in the site selection of a water tower in Weddington. There seemed to be some sense of urgency on the part of Council. Barbara had stated that it had been so long since we have heard anything. The Council felt that Dan Barry was the best candidate for the position. Communication between the Town Council and the County was the primary reason for creating the liaison position. I received an e-mail from Cindy Coto, the County Manager, on December 14 asking for a time to meet with Cindy and Ligon Bundy, the Attorney for the County. Given the sense of urgency of Council, I scheduled the meeting as soon as I could. I scheduled the meeting for December 18 at 10:30 am. Dan attended the meeting. When I got to the meeting I asked Cindy Coto at the beginning of the meeting for the purpose of the meeting. She said that the County

Commissioners would like to have some reassurance of where the Council stood on the water tower location that they were working on with property acquisition. Prior to the meeting I had sent Cindy the minutes from our special meeting with Ed Goscicki, Public Works Director, that the Council held on June 11. She and Ligon had not seen the minutes before. My intent was to use those public minutes to help give her as much reassurance as possible to the County Commissioners regarding where Council stood on the water tower location. If we go back in time a little, we remember that after the vote was rescinded by the prior Council for the Highway 16 location there was a joint meeting of the Town Council and the County Commissioners on October 10, 2011. Two things I want to point out from that meeting are that County Commissioner Todd Johnson said that, "I would ask the Town Council to tell me where you want a water tower." Dan Barry pointed out that the County should take advantage of the new legislative process where conversations can take place between the County and the Town before the County requests conditional zoning. Three comments that Dan Barry made:

1. We changed our zoning rules in Weddington 18 months ago to have the ability to have a face-to-face conversation about issues. The County never approached us about where to put a water tower. They showed up with engineering work and said this is what we want to do.
2. Weddington recognizes and supports the County's desire to improve water pressure and storage in Western Union County. We made that decision. The challenge we have is the style, location and scope of the facilities. We have not been engaged; we just keep getting engineering drawings. We are ready to help to find a solution. We just need to be invited to the table.
3. We are going to sit tight for 45 days and have Jordan be the staff contact with the County on this issue.

The current Council and Mayor took office in December of 2011. I asked Ed right away and probably even before I got in office for a meeting date to talk to Council about site location. Ed said he wanted to wait until they finished the new Water and Sewer Master Plan for the County and after the County Commissioners had approved it. That was the first delay. We tried right out of the gate to get them to meet. One thing that may be frustrating to your neighborhood is that they said the site on Highway 16 was no longer a good site based on the new master plan. We went through all that and the new master plan said that is not where we wanted it anyway. So after the master plan was approved, we held our special meeting on June 11. The purpose of the meeting was for exactly what Todd Johnson said, for Council to tell the County where to put the water tower based on the possible locations identified by Ed from the new master plan. The process that we were taking advantage of was exactly the process called out by Dan Barry during the joint meeting of the County Commissioners and the Town Council held on October 10, 2011. Ed presented the Council with four sites that would meet his needs of cost and effectiveness – the Pittenger property at the corner of Rea and 16, across the street from the Pittenger property, down the road which I believe ended up being the Delaney property (we never did name it in that meeting) and across the street at the King Property. Those were the four sites that Ed talked about. I attempted to get answers out of each Councilmember regarding the four sites to achieve the goal of the meeting. Werner would not commit to commenting on a location and he said, "I have to evaluate further." Dan would not commit to commenting on a location, reviewed the process that we were in and acknowledged the four properties that Ed listed. Barbara said "my preference would be downtown." She did not say the King property but I do not think Pittenger is downtown and across the street from Pittenger is downtown and down Weddington-Matthews Road is downtown so it may be King. I do not want to put words in her mouth. Pam said "I am a firm believer that we need it and that it should only be in commercial and this is our commercial so that is what would get my vote" (may be the King property). I said, "I think the King property is the obvious choice given what we have been through with the neighborhoods." At one point Ed was asked "What is your ideal location for the water tower?" Ed said, "Across the street which is the King property." He stated at the end of the meeting, "It appears that the King property is a property that the Board can support. I am not hearing any other properties being offered. If you are planning any type of road improvements, we would like to know before we work on any engineering work." I think that was a location on the King

property site of where a road may could go on the side. Dan asks if he can give Pam the engineering work done on the King property. Ed says that he can. We had that meeting and did not hear anything. I would call Ed and he would say that we have new commissioners coming in December. During that whole fall he was telling me I want to wait to get the new commissioners and they were sworn in on December 3. I got the phone call December 14 so that sounds like that held up. Eleven days later after they get sworn in they are ready to talk. On December 18, it looks like they were ready to come to us with the King property and wanted some reassurance. Frankly, given the history of the Town back and forth, back and forth, I can see where we are about ready to go. Let's go back and talk to them again. Ligon said he would call each Councilmember that week to see where they stood on the King property. However, Dan mentioned the possibility of a fifth property in our December 10 meeting, six months after we gave Ed direction on the King property. If there is a fifth property I think the next step would be to get Ed back and put it back on the board and compare it the other four sites and give him feedback and direction.

Councilmember Thomisser – I had the opportunity to review the minutes of June 11. I do not recall reading that the Council discussed four specific sites. I recall what you just said but the four sites that you mentioned were not in the minutes. My concern all along has been do we need a water tower? We only have about 14 or 15 neighborhoods that have water. I have asked Public Works to go into those neighborhoods and test the water pressure. I am still waiting. I have been in those neighborhoods myself. This is the third time around for me – the first time there was an attempt made to put the water tower on the King property and that did not succeed. The second one was at Highway 16 and Rea Road. At both public hearings I stated that before we start worrying about sites we need to determine do we have a water pressure problem? I have been in all of the neighborhoods and Rosehill said that they have lousy water pressure. The surprise tonight is that Stratford Hall has a water problem. I have been in there and talked with some of the residents and they said that the water pressure was fine. I believe the people that were here tonight. That leaves approximately 12 or 13 other neighborhoods that have water but are not complaining and I would like for Public Works to come with the statistics that show us that there are water pressure problems in other neighborhoods. That is not to say that we do not need a water tower because two neighborhoods have lousy water pressure and the others are in fact happy. I would like that information. We voted to give Providence VFD a computer and they have a software program where they could measure residual and static water pressure. I have heard that we have a problem with fire flow. The only thing that I want is a professional approach to this and statistics that back up that we have lousy fire flow and lousy water pressure in more than two neighborhoods. That is not to say that we do not need a water tower because everybody else is happy with their water pressure. I would really like to see those statistics and I for one would wholeheartedly be for the water tower. The question is where are you going to put it? I cannot recall anyone on this Council specifically saying that they wanted a water tower in a certain place except our Mayor. Was I hearing that correctly or was I reading the minutes correctly?

Councilwoman Pamela Hadley – I would like to thank everyone that came out tonight. I live off of Beulah Church Road and they have been quickly building Phase II and my pressure is going up and down with the addition of the new construction. I believe you and I think one of the reasons that we voted for a liaison was to get things going. The results are in from the hydrants and I can give you that report. We need better flow for the fire hydrants. We need for my pressure to stabilize and for you to have some pressure. Having said that there are other locations that are diligently being looked at and I think it would be very inappropriate to have a discussion and to put that on the board while the County is trying to work with that as well.

Mayor Davidson – On your comments regarding inappropriate to talk about the other sites, was our meeting on June 11 an inappropriate exercise?

Councilwoman Hadley – I do not think it was inappropriate. I have received feedback and information since the June 11 meeting. I actually spoke with the County Attorney this afternoon and I just feel like at

this point that it would be inappropriate to go any further with any locations with them, having contact with Counsel and with them moving in that direction.

Mayor Davidson – So we did not meet our objectives in the June Meeting? The objective was what Todd Johnson said, “Based on the Water and Sewer Master Plan, where do you want the water tower?” We did not meet that objective.

Councilwoman Hadley – Perhaps we met it for that evening and with the information that we had at that time. We did not get the map from Ed Goscicki until that night with the different colors and the elevation and the undeveloped parcels. I have been studying that map and I have been going and looking. I think this Council is being proactive and they want to make a decision for the water tower. I would like to convey that to the public.

Councilwoman Harrison – I have been very vocal but I am frustrated. Because in August when they proposed the water tower to be right across from my Association it needed to happen immediately. That was 18 months ago. What I have heard from Ed Goscicki is, “I want to wait because we have a new water plan and by the way do not worry your neighborhood does not meet it any more.” They had six months before an election to when the new commissioners came in. I just got an email that they are in Closed Session about the budget. What do you think that means? I bet they are going to take enterprise money which is going to be the water money and use it someplace else. I am just frustrated. I heard in December I was going to be called by the attorney and I am still waiting. I am available. Nobody is calling me and asking me. To Werner’s question and yours, I said I thought this area should be where a water tower should be based on what I saw on that map. If you remember prior to that, I was going why can it not be on Tilley Morris or Weddington-Matthews Road where it is closer to the affected areas and the areas that are going to be built up more? Public Works is drawing this out and I am not sure why. I have heard stories that the Kings want to sell, they don’t want to sell or they want to sell for too much. I do not know what the right story is any more based on what is going on. I just bet you that there is going to be another scenario going on based on the Closed Session dealing with their budget.

Councilmember Thomisser – I believe that Attorney Fox cautioned us at the beginning of this agenda item not to be specific as far as site location.

Attorney Fox – The County is looking for a signal from this Board because of prior failed efforts of the County. Typically the applicant would come before a governing body and present what they seek to do as an essential service and to identify the location. This board established a liaison and the purpose is really to allow the County a vehicle where they can communicate with an individual on this board and to talk about options and to glean some type of indication. The County does not want to make substantial investments in the preparation of a tower site until it has some assurance it has a reasonable chance of success. It is not going to get 100% assurance on that. Ultimately the County is going to have to make a call about where it wants to go and site the property where it thinks is in the best interest and come before the board for an up or down on it. Part of the dilemma this board has is the County is putting this board in a position of trying to help identify where the site will go when it is ultimately the County’s responsibility. My caution earlier was to say that this board will ultimately have that determination where the site is and a vote based on the zoning on the site. My advice to this board and you as my client is to make sure when you do that exercise and that exercise is subject to some challenge because someone has construed all the discussions to be some form of contract zoning or something like that.

Councilmember Thomisser – What I do remember from the June 11 meeting as opposed to certain site locations is we were given a map from Mr. Goscicki with different shaded colors and the intent of the map was to let Council know where a water tower would work assuming that there was a willing seller in a particular location. In looking at the map there were several areas that would work and that was based on



elevation because elevation determines the height of the water tower - the greater the elevation the lower the water tower. I do not remember any specific locations that were discussed. Am I correct?

Councilwoman Harrison advised that she remembers discussing locations.

Mayor Davidson – Anthony, I appreciate what you said but we had the June meeting to go through this process and there was nothing wrong with that process and nobody told us that we shouldn't be talking about properties. It was out in front of everybody. Ed left here and it appeared that the King Property was a property that the board could support. I do not know what direction was given by the County Commission. We were called down to a meeting looking for reassurance and I was told we would hear something after the County Commissioners were sworn in. They were sworn in December 3 and I was called into a meeting December 14 looking for reassurance. To make you comfortable I know what they want. They want to know the answer before a public hearing. I told them that we were not giving that. Everybody wants that and we are not doing it. This is as close as we can get to reassurance, the minutes from the June meeting. He has asked us if you have any other properties let me know. Has anyone here given any other properties since that June meeting?

Councilwoman Hadley raised her hand that she had given him some properties.

Mayor Davidson – Will you share with us what property you gave him?

Councilwoman Hadley – No.

Mayor Davidson – Where does that put us? Are we going to have a meeting with Ed to see if the rest of us want that?

Councilwoman Hadley – I don't know.

Mayor Davidson – Well, that is your delay. I do not see blaming the County when the Council is not talking with each other about these other sites. I did not know that you have given them other sites.

Councilwoman Hadley – It did not happen until about 4:30 today.

Mayor Davidson – We were called to a meeting last December about this and Ed asked in June if you have any other sites let us know so we have waited seven months now for other sites to be brought up. I am okay if the site is better for Ed but I want the people to know why there is a delay.

Councilwoman Harrison – After we talked with Ed on June 11 and discussed the King property I assumed that he was going to go out and start the negotiation to buy the King property. That was my assumption. Do not say we are delaying it seven months later when obviously they have not started that process and there is no way that we can give him a yes - go out and buy that property before a public hearing. That is not fair to anybody. I feel they are playing some kind of game and they are wrapping us up in that.

Councilmember Thomisser – Last Tuesday when we had a meeting I communicated to you another site. I do not believe it is a positive thing for any one of the Councilmembers to get up on a soap box and to start yelling about sites because there are a lot of things that go into whether the site is workable. I am not a hydro engineer but I would like to think that the Council is running this Town and not the water company and it is our decision as to where that water tower goes. To sit here and accept what they want to ram down our throat - I do not go for that. I think that should be a decision of the majority of this Council.

Mayor Davidson – Ram down our throat – we went through four sites. He came here - we asked him to come here to go through the process that we invited him to go through and he left here saying, “I think the King property is something that the Council can support.” When someone makes a statement like that if you do not agree with it, raise your hand. That is not what we said. That is not what happened.

Councilmember Thomisser – I was noncommittal.

Mayor Davidson – If you have any other properties, let me know.

Councilmember Thomisser – I do want to thank the people from Rosehill and Stratford Hall. This is the first time that we have had a group of residents to come from these two neighborhoods and advise Council of the problem that they have. Yes, we have had a couple of public hearings and I recognize that a couple of them came and talked about the water pressure. This is a show of force tonight and I appreciate them taking the time to let us know. There is a big problem over there. What I learned here is that Stratford Hall has a problem which I was unaware of because I talked with some people in there over a year ago and they were happy with the water pressure. I believe what the people say here tonight and if Councilwoman Hadley has any statistics regarding fire flow I am going to go with a water tower. The only question is where is the best place to put it?

Councilwoman Harrison – I would like to have Amy make a copy of the petitions and a copy of all of the comments and send them to Ed. This is the first time that we have had this force. I have said that before. Where is Rosehill if they have an issue? I am glad that you are here and I think that we should take all that data and give it to Ed.

Councilmember Thomisser – Almost a year ago Councilwoman Harrison and I met with Mr. Goscicki and we talked about the water pressure in Rosehill. Stallings Mayor Lynda Paxton had a concern because there are severe water pressure problems on Chestnut Lane and they are going to do some type of shopping center at the corner of Antioch Church and Weddington-Matthews Road and so we had a discussion about that. Mayor, this whole process evolved over the past six to seven months and we have more information and we were able to look at this more intelligently. That is the way I look it. It is not that anyone has been dragging their feet.

**B. Review, Discussion and Acceptance of the Land Use Plan Survey Results along with Discussion and Consensus of Land Use Plan Amendment Process Moving Forward – Councilmember Werner Thomisser.**

Councilmember Thomisser - We had a survey done in 2000 and it was amended in 2006 and then we had another done in 2007 – it was not as in-depth as this one. Then we have what Hadanstanziale did in 2009. For the most part, the same results keep coming back. The latest survey results – there are a couple of surprises but 98% of the people that live in Weddington like it here. They enjoy the low taxes, great schools and rural character and open space. What my intent today is to look at the response rate. It was 19%. Nadine Bennett with COG who does surveys for other municipalities said that it was a good cross section of the people that live in a particular municipality. I was expecting a higher response rate but if the experts say 19% or 20% will give you a pretty good indication then I am willing to go with what the experts say. There was some talk about is the survey valid? I like to think that most of the people in Weddington are honest people. I asked Nadine in December because we did it via computer was there a possibility that six or ten people might have taken it twice would that significantly alter the results and she said no. So based on what she said I am willing to accept the results. It is what it is. Yes – I would like a 40% response rate but everybody knows in the last election we had 19% turnout. There is a lot of apathy for whatever reason in Weddington. We have to move forward with what we got and according to Nadine this is a good representation. My objective is to get you thinking as we go into the rewriting of the Land Use Plan. Number 1 was greenways. That is nice. How are you going to do greenways? We do not have a park. Marvin has a park. Wesley Chapel will have a park. Indian Trail has a park and generally

speaking that is where you put greenways. Looking here a passive park only scored 34% and greenways scored almost 57%. It is almost like the cart before the horse. I think you need a park before you have greenways.

Councilwoman Harrison – Will you define greenways?

Councilmember Thomisser – McAlpine Greenway.

Councilwoman Harrison – My only issue is the survey results and the comments do not add up. I think everybody looked at the word “greenway” and had their own interpretation. How and what do we do with that? If 50% of the people want greenways, then 50% of the 19% responding is 10% rounding up - 10% of 10,000 people want greenways. We did not put better definitions. I am concerned with what we do with that information. I got five calls and 10 emails saying please do not vote on greenways. Where am I seeing that I am voting on greenways? Mr. Price got up and spoke about it. Somewhere there is something that is being mixed up that I do not even get. This Councilperson is not going to vote to spend money to buy land to have greenways. Werner brought up validation. At this point, I already had 10 people tell me that they took it twice. My whole issue is what do we do with a schizophrenic survey? If you look on one part 57% said they wanted assisted living and you look at another one and it said something else about assisted living and 57% of the people said no. It is the same question worded differently. What I am supposed to do with that information when we are rewriting a Land Use Plan? If we are going to put that we are going to pursue greenways because 10% of the population wants greenways we should say that in the Land Use Plan versus saying something like the majority of the people of the Town wanted greenways because that is not true.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – There is the whole density question. If you have got senior centers you’ve got to change your density model unless it is in one building. I don’t think there is a lot of appetite for that. I did not think we were validating the results we were just accepting the results. The other question is how do the survey results impact the process of rewriting the Land Use Plan?

Mayor Davidson – Are we doing another survey?

Everyone said “no” for the record.

Mayor Davidson – We are not doing another survey. Then we need to decide the process to move forward.

Councilwoman Hadley – I have had a lot of concern about the survey from the beginning and then I had a lot of concern obviously when Barbara was approached at the Harris Teeter by someone bragging that nothing else would ever be built in Weddington because of the ability to take the survey more than once. I have asked a lot of people what do I do? How do I vote? Do I validate or not? It has been a question in my mind for a while and as I talked with someone today an argument could be made for both sides. An argument could be made to throw it out and an argument could be made as Nadine presented that it was acceptable and she did not see any obvious manipulation. I do not want to send out another survey. We all know the issues that came up with having the survey online and we all know about not having control numbers and we all know what happened. I want to make sure that in five years when they are updating the Land Use Plan that they understand our questions and our concerns with validating the survey. I just want it to go on record that we did have issues with it and there were problems with people taking it more than once and we will never know whether it was 10 or 50 people. I personally am like Barbara I like the comments better than the percentages. I will probably go more with the comments section of the survey than the percentages because there is such a low amount. I did have one resident call about giving such validity to the percentages to something as important as a Land Use Plan. She said surely you are not

going to use the 10% to be absolute in determining the new updated plan. I think if it is taken in that context when we go through the update that it is not absolute, that there were problems with it and we do have questions about it, but still have it as part of the process of updating the plan then I am okay with it.

Councilmember Harrison – If you say to me are you willing to accept what is there I will say yes. If you say are you willing to validate it – oh no. Again, I heard Nadine say you can tell where people took it twice and you go through the comments and you see the same kind of comment two or three times you go I am seeing it. I do not like the word validate.

Mayor Davidson – We were very methodical and we went through the questions the best that we could. Jordan brought up the repeat thing and we talked about if we just wanted to use paper and you said you were not worried about duplicates. The participation was within the consultant's base. Could we have done anything more? That is what we have to ask ourselves.

Councilmember Harrison – I had a discussion with Dorine and I asked how they got such a big participation rate in 2000. And the answer is that they were here on Saturdays, they had all kinds of charettes. They had consultants working with them and they really got a lot of communication and feedback. We did not do all of that. Could we have done that? Yes. Do I think it would have raised the participation rate? Yes. It shows that 53% of the people want mixed use. I have a feeling that they do not know what mixed use means because if they did they would not be saying no to all that other stuff. I do not want to use numbers like we have heard in the past because those numbers are not valid. The other thing is the fact that you have to tap into Dorine about 2000. If we use this we better really clearly say what we are saying when we rewrite the Land Use Plan.

Councilmember Thomisser – One of the things that scored high were sit down restaurants. I know Councilwoman Harrison and Councilwoman Hadley have spoken with people in the restaurant business. We have four residents that live in Weddington that are in the restaurant business. These are young men that are sharp and they have the demographics. I have had conversations with them because I have gone to their restaurants and what they say is you need to understand the restaurant business. If we open up a restaurant it takes three years before you make a profit and if you want to have a freestanding restaurant, you have to buy the land, you have to put in the bricks and mortar. If you lease in a shopping center, that is a \$1 million investment with the kitchen. The people that are in the restaurant business are willing to do this but you have to have foot traffic. That is why they go in places like Blakeney and Rea Village. We do not have that here. We want to deliver what the people told us but how are we going to do that? Passive park – are the people in Weddington willing to invest a million dollars like Marvin did to buy a park then they have to invest another \$200,000 to put a barn and things for the kids not to mention the security? It is a huge investment. Wesley Chapel was in the news recently. They spent a huge amount of money and now they suddenly found out it is going to cost them another \$750,000 to improve the land to make it suitable for a park and they are in the process of negotiating that trying to get it down to \$500,000. Indian Trail has invested a huge amount of money – do the people of Weddington want this Council to go out and buy \$1 million worth of land for a park? Are you willing to have your taxes increased to get that park? The County runs the library system. At best Weddington can give them the land for a library. I was on the library board of the County when they wanted to build a library in Western Union County on Providence Road - so does the YMCA. As we go into this rewriting of the Land Use Plan I think we have to ask ourselves a question: yes we want to be responsive to the people of Weddington but is it feasible? Do we have the financial resources to do this and how do we do it? I know a way to do it.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to accept the 2012 Land Use Plan survey results. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry

NAYS: None

Town Planner Cook - What I was asking for was a process moving forward. As everybody knows we have discussed these Thursday workshops for a total of six meetings. There was a deadline set of having the Land Use Plan done by March 31. There has been consensus that we need to do this and we need to address the plan and start working on it. How we do that is what I want to get into tonight. I have got some things such as discussing the Planning Board's role in reviewing the LUP. If the Town Council has six of these workshops the Planning Board is probably only going to meet two or three times during this process. What role does the Planning Board have in this and what is the Planning Board's method in giving their comments to the Town Council? Do we want to go chapter by chapter or we look through the plan and we comb through it and just take all the factual information and correct that? There are things that everybody knows are not right any more and we can change. I really want to open it for discussion so when we have that first Thursday night meeting we can hit the ground running and start the process.

Mayor Davidson – When you are looking at the document and you are trying to figure what can be done such as the facts you do not have to debate about. It looks like Jordan and Dorine could go through and update the facts – the noncontroversial items such as dates, population. Second piece is I think there is a screening by Anthony to review and show what language is protected. On the front end Anthony can show language that is protected and language that we have to have in there and highlight it in the document so we know. I ranked what was the highest response rate – apartments, we could cut it out. Get the obvious ones out. Then there is the middle. It is going to be what it is going to be. Given what you talked about with the survey, Council is going to have liberty in making our arguments. I will put 40% weight on the survey in just talking with people and what I ran on and what I wanted to do. The quickest way to get this done is cut to the chase. If each Councilmember gets a Land Use Map and puts what they want and then we will come together and say this is where I see commercial and this is where I see residential. This is where I see older adults and this is where I see the buffer. The buffer has been the issue forever. How are you going to separate residential from commercial? Then if we all have our maps of what we think the Town should look like and we can go back and say how can we validate that with what you want and where did you see that in the survey? We are going to argue with each other and three people are going to win. I think doing the map is the quickest way to get to it. The structure would be factual, legal, get the map out and crayons and draw what you want on there, validate with the survey or whatever input you want to use and then we could start with the Council just telling their story and what is your vision. We have to work in the Planning Board.

Councilwoman Harrison – I do not want to get rid of the Planning Board. I want Dorine and Rob to write the history. That is for future generations. I think the Planning Board should be involved. I also want the public to verbally get up and talk with us whether I like it or not. I don't want it to be just our vision. I want it to be something that at least a portion of Weddington is going to say I agree to that vision.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – The whole Planning Board.

Councilwoman Harrison – I am not saying they have to be at every meeting but they should be accessed and told we want your input.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – One of the thoughts I had was to empower the Planning Board to provide their input however they want to through their leadership. I don't want to dictate to the Planning Board how they engage or how they deliver it. I think if we had 12 people sitting around here we will not get finished by March 31.

Councilwoman Harrison - I agree.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - The redlining the Land Use Plan verbiage I think is a great idea and then Jordan can make one document that says Page 1 here are the comments or there is consensus around this one block. Your idea is intriguing to me and I have not thought about it which was taking the map and then backing into the document. I had always thought let's take the document, figure out where we are going to go and then sit down with a big piece of paper and say this is what we said we wanted to do, just a different way to do it and then put on the map. Your idea is let's put the map out there and then write the document to back that up. You had sent me an email about outside input from Union County, Fire Departments, Power Company, etc. and when do we engage them? There is a whole section on infrastructure and that is when those folks should be engaged if we include them.

Town Planner Cook - There are three Planning Board meetings in this time frame. I can talk with Dorine about this. Their first meeting is January 28. Do I need to send something to them tomorrow and be prepared to make comments on this? Do we know how we are going to proceed if our first meeting is this Thursday at 4:00 p.m.? What will that agenda look like and what is the process going to look at? Am I sending this Land Use Plan to everyone to look at facts and to Anthony to look at the legal part?

Councilwoman Harrison - I liked what Walker said for you and Dorine to deal with the facts. We are going to get involved in the middle information.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - We had originally planned to have the meeting on Thursday and I have been called out of Town. What is your schedule like on the 24<sup>th</sup>?

Everyone said that they could do the 24<sup>th</sup> but wanted to stay on schedule and meet the 31<sup>st</sup> as well.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - The second thing that Jordan and I talked about is that we will call each meeting with a specific agenda for that meeting so whatever the objective that we consented to calling for is what we will be dealing with. I want a fixed time. The agenda will be set so if you are the greenway person when we start talking about parks then that is the night you need to show up and participate in the discussion on greenways. If you are the water and infrastructure person then that is the night to come.

Mayor Davidson - I want to see if everyone likes the map idea. If you do the map it is going to be more of your vision in the visual form. We have people talking with us about commercial properties and when this is done what I would like to see is the guy that we have talked with regarding the 41 acres on Weddington-Matthews Road and Antioch, if you think that should be commercial I want you to put in on your map. I don't want to do all this and the guy shows up a week later and says by the way then we entertain it. I would like to encourage us to do the map first and say where you think commercial ought to be and where is the buffer going to be.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - I am okay with that if we start with the same baseline. Not that we just identify residential and commercial but we take all of our conditional uses and we outline them in addition. It is not fair to say that the daycare center on 84 is a residential parcel. It is a conditional use which is very different and we need to go around and pull all of those out so we see this is where our residential is, here is our commercial and then we have these other commercial uses and come up with a couple of colors showing public service such as fire departments, utilities. Then we are going to see a very different picture. We have been talking at length about having new zoning categories.

Councilwoman Hadley - I like the idea of the map other than I think the map will evolve as we get more into the different chapters of the Land Use Map.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - I think what the map does is it sets a baseline. I think it is going to be interesting to see if there are a lot of inconsistencies or a trend line. Every week we are getting an updated map so we can see the evolution of the map based on the language that we are implementing.

Councilwoman Harrison - I definitely need the map that has conditional uses. The Weddington Swim and Racquet Club is a commercial entity and it is a business and all we did was disguise it in residential. Once we all see it they are going to realize we have more. There is a lot out there but it is hidden.

Councilmember Thomisser - We have had discussions on who we have thought about inviting. I would like us to consider inviting all three fire departments, for sure Providence VFD since they cover most of Weddington to tell us what they need such as plans for expansion, more property, or a new fire station.

Mayor Davidson – Jordan and Dorine may be able to get through the first 2 to 3 chapters to get the facts updated. Then Anthony will start reviewing the legal language that should be protected. Are those first steps okay with Council? Jordan will get the conditional uses on the map. First thing may be to wipe out the extremes such as apartments and get rid of the low numbers and define what we are going to be talking about. Then we can start on the map. I think that is enough for our first two hour meeting.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - At that meeting before we adjourn we will set the plan for the next meeting so we will call it for specifically what we want to do.

The Council agreed that Attorney Fox would not be in attendance at the Land Use Plan meetings but may be available through conference call.

**C. Review and Consideration of Participating in the Monroe/Union County Economic Development Program – Staff.** The Town Council received the following information from Town Administrator McCollum:

Effective this month, Union County will be transitioning to the City of Monroe in the establishment of a joint county-wide economic development program. The Union County Board of County Commissioners approved the Interlocal Agreement at their November 19 meeting and the City of Monroe Council approved it at their December 4 meeting. They plan to create a 24-member advisory board with eight (8) voting members appointed by the City; eight (8) voting members appointed by the County, and eight (8) ex officio members. In order to give the municipalities an opportunity to buy into the program financially or through strategic planning, no more than six (6) of the County's eight (8) appointees may be representatives of municipalities, with no municipality having more than one (1) seat on the board. The remaining two (2) County appointments shall be at large members. The Board of County Commissioners will be making their appointments to the Economic Development Advisory Board on January 22. The cost of this representation is \$7,500 annually. Chris Plate' will be contacting each municipality to determine if they wish to be part of this county-wide initiative and included within the Work Plan that will be developed and included an amendment to the Interlocal Agreement. The Plan of Work is separate and distinct from the financial commitment which allows your municipality to be a voting member on the Economic Development Advisory Board. If the six seats initially reserved for municipalities by the Board of County Commissioners are not requested by the Towns, the Board of County Commissioners will be making these appointments. As this is a new Board the initial appointments will be staggered with one, two and three year terms. It is anticipated the first meeting of the Advisory Board will occur in early February. I emailed each Union County municipality to see if they were planning to participate. Here are their responses:

Stallings	Not going to participate financially
Mineral Springs	Has opted not to participate financially

Fairview	Fairview has voted to ask the County for a voting seat on the ED Board and agreeing to the \$7,500. They have also selected a person to be their representative
Indian Trail	Council directed the Town Manager to ask for a seat on the board but not to pay the fee, as they have Econ. Dev. Dept. and they feel that they have incurred that expense and can provide information and assistance.
Marshville	No response
Hemby Bridge	No response
Lake Park	No response
Marvin	No response
Unionville	No response
Waxhaw	Waxhaw Board voted not to participate at this time due to large agenda already on their plate this year.
Wesley Chapel	No response
Wingate	This item is on their next agenda. Their Town Manager plans to recommend participating financially.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to advise the County that Weddington would love to participate but is unwilling to share in the costs. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

Councilmember Thomisser - I concur with Mayor Pro Tem Barry. I think we are already paying the \$7,500 in our Union County taxes. I think it is an important issue. I want people in the audience to understand that we are not putting a steel plant in Weddington but we do need to support economic development such as aerospace, pharmaceutical companies and light industry. A professor from Wingate University said if Union County does not change their ratio we will be forced to double our residential property taxes within the next five years. I think we should have a voice and also support what they are trying to accomplish but this in no way means that we are going to put light industry in Weddington. People say they want to maintain the rural character of Weddington and gave that as one of the reasons that they love Weddington.

Mayor Davidson - I am glad we did not vote to approve the money. It is double taxation. We are paying through our county taxes. I am still confused about economic development because we try to diversify our tax base and one way to attract companies these days is to not make them pay taxes and I have arguments about diversifying the tax base and if somebody can take the Union County tax rate and put it up against Mecklenburg where they have more businesses which one is higher? It is not Union County.

#### **Item No. 9. New Business.**

**A. Review and Consideration of Amendments to the Town Council Rules of Procedures – Item 3 (d) – Work Sessions and Committee Meetings (Councilwoman Pamela Hadley).** Councilwoman Hadley discussed the proposed amendment with the Town Council. Councilwoman Harrison moved to approve the amendment to the Town Council Rules of Procedures.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

(d) Work Sessions and Committee Meetings



The Town Council may schedule work sessions, committee meetings, or other informal meetings of the board or of a majority of its members at such times and concerning such subjects as may be established by resolution or order of the Council. A schedule of any such meetings held regularly shall be held in the same place and manner as the schedule of regular meetings. Work sessions and other informal official meetings not held regularly are subject to the same notice requirements as special Council meetings. ~~Town Council Work Sessions will follow the same rules of procedures as a regular Town Council Meeting with the exception that the Council may elect to include the public in the discussion.~~ This will be established at the beginning of each work session. **Town Council Work Sessions will follow the same Rules of Procedures regarding reasonable standards of conduct as a regular Town Council Meeting.**

**COMMENT:** The open meetings law requires that any “official meeting” where a majority of the Town Council deliberates on public business must be open to the public and notice must be given. The **third** ~~last~~ sentence of this rule embodies that principle. The rule goes beyond the open meetings law in requiring a published schedule of work sessions or committee meetings held regularly.

G.S. 143-318.13 (a) provides that if the Town Council holds any regular, special, emergency, or other official meeting by conference telephone or other electronic means, the clerk shall provide a location and method whereby the public may listen to the meeting and notice of the meeting shall specify that location.

**Item No. 10. Update from Town Planner.** The Town Council received the following update from Town Planner Cook:

- Polivka International has submitted a portion of their construction documents. The Planning Board will act as the Design Review Board for the elevations and construction document review. *Town Planner Cook stated, “I spoke with John Temple today. They are months away from taking the tree down. I have forwarded the tree report to the new Union County Urban Forester for his comments.”*
- The Town of Weddington issued the following permits in 2012:

New Homes-89

Upfits (Interior Modifications to Home) and Additions-71

Accessory Structures (Pools, Detached Garages, Buildings, etc.)-37

Certificates of Compliance (Homes Completed)-50

In 2011 the Town issued 51 permits for new homes, 74 upfit and addition permits, 31 accessory permits and 42 certificates of compliance permits. In 2010 the Town issued 34 permits for new homes, 80 upfit and addition permits and 51 accessory permits.

- Town Attorney Anthony Fox has provided feedback on the proposed Agritourism and Agricultural Use Definition text amendments. This will be an item for the Retreat.
- I had a conference call with Charlotte Planning Director Jonathan Wells to discuss the extension of the Weddington-Charlotte Annexation Agreement. This agreement is set to expire in 2014 and includes Marvin and Stallings. This can be discussed further at the Retreat.
- The following items were on the December 17<sup>th</sup> Planning Board agenda:
  - Entry Monument Signs Text Amendments (Sections 58-9 and 58-152)
  - Text Amendment to Appendix I-List of Acceptable Plant Species
- The following items will be on the January 28<sup>th</sup> Planning Board agenda:
  - Beulah Church Road Minor Subdivision
  - Bromley Map 6 Final Plat
  - MX Review Process

**Item No. 11. Update from Town Administrator.** The Town Council received the following update from Town Administrator Amy McCollum:

- VC3 has provided staff with the information on how to pilot test our programs through the Cloud. We have begun that process and the end of testing will be February 8. Our emails are being switched from Perigee to VC3 as well.
- The newsletter will be mailed out to Town residents the week of January 14.
- Advertising for the 2013 Welcome Magazine is going slow and Bizwell has notified the Town that the new magazine may not be ready until February or March.
- The next Planning Board Meeting will be held on January 28, 2013. A training session led by Nadine Bennett of COG will begin at 5:30 p.m. A notice will be sent out advertising that a quorum of the Town Council may be in attendance for this training.
- The 2013 Retreat is scheduled for Friday, February 22 beginning at 9:00 a.m. The retreat will be held at the Firethorne Country Club. Please start sending me possible agenda items to be discussed. The Town Attorney, Finance Officer, Town Planner and Town Administrator along with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman from the Planning Board usually attend the retreat.
- I will be in a class conducted by the School of Government beginning January 30 – February 1 in Chapel Hill.
- The Town Hall will be closed on Monday, January 21 in observance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Day.
- A Special Work Session is scheduled for Thursday, January 17 at 4:00 p.m. to proceed in reviewing the Land Use Plan.
- This year is the Town's 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary.

**Save the Date:**

Easter Egg Hunt - March 23, 2013

Weddington Country Festival – September 21, 2013

Council asked that the Town Clerk send out the current list of proposed items for the retreat to the Council. Council also advised that they would like Dorine Sharp and Rob Dow to be present from the Planning Board and for the Planning Board to choose one other person to attend.

**Item No. 12. Public Safety Report.**

**PROVIDENCE VFD**

**Training- 185.00 hours**

**Union County:**

Fire	16	+	EMS	21	=	Total	37
------	----	---	-----	----	---	-------	----

**Mecklenburg County:**

Fire	3	+	EMS	1	=	Total	4
------	---	---	-----	---	---	-------	---

**Department Total:**

Fire	19
EMS	22
Total	41

The Town Council also received a copy of the following: Report outlining hydrants in Weddington (PVFD response area) in need of repairs, call statistics for 2011 and 2012 and the Income and Expense Budget Performance and Balance Sheet for December 2012

**Weddington Deputies – 681 Calls**

**Wesley Chapel VFD – 111 Calls**

**Item No. 13. Update from Finance Officer and Tax Collector.**

**A. Finance Officer's Report.** The Town Council received the Revenue and Expenditure Statement by Department and the Balance Sheet for December 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Finance Officer Leslie Gaylord stated, "The auditors will be on your February agenda. Please give me some direction on what level of budget preparation you want for the retreat. Do you want someone from the fire departments there for the retreat? Please send me any items you want included in the budget.

Council advised that they did want the fire departments to be invited to the retreat.

**B. Tax Collector's Report.** Monthly Report – December 2012

<b>Transactions:</b>	
Adjust Under \$5.00	\$2.64
Overpayments	\$(985.53)
Refunds	\$3,649.53
Penalty and Interest Payments	\$(70.47)
<b>Taxes Collected:</b>	
2010	\$(219.28)
2011	\$(389.13)
2012	\$(192,512.35)
<b>As of December 31 2012; the following taxes remain Outstanding:</b>	
2002	\$82.07
2003	\$129.05
2004	\$122.90
2005	\$252.74
2006	\$150.20
2007	\$144.42
2008	\$1,832.44
2009	\$2,548.25
2010	\$4,365.26
2011	\$6,607.04
2012	\$222,066.46
<b>Total Outstanding:</b>	<b>\$238,300.83</b>

**Item No. 14. Transportation Report.** Councilwoman Harrison – We have two MUMPO Meetings coming up. We have a new Governor and almost everything we have been working on has been put on hold.

**Item No. 15. Council Comments.** Council thanked Councilwoman Hadley for her hard work on getting the Town Hall painted and a new roof.

Mayor Davidson - I will be putting on the February agenda an item for discussion and consideration of changing the two Council seats on the Public Safety Committee to at large non Council seats. Amy and I met with Curtis Blackwood and he has advised that he and several neighborhoods would like to de-annex from Weddington. I also received a call from Jack Wilson who represents a group that wants to do a commercial project on the 41 acres at Antioch Church and Weddington-Matthews Road. This property is zoned residential. He is going to be on the agenda in February.

Councilwoman Harrison – I planned to talk about the Public Safety Committee at the retreat. They said they were not going to meet unless driven by the Town Council yet the entire agenda I saw was not a Council driven agenda. I feel like it would be better if we talk at the retreat and not at the meeting.

**Item No. 16. Closed Session – Consideration of Approval of Closed Session Minutes and Pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a) (3) To consult with an attorney employed or retained by the public body in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege between the attorney and the public body, which privilege is hereby acknowledged and (6) Personnel.** Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to go into Closed Session to consider approval of Closed Session Minutes and Pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a)(3) and (a)(6). All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 17. Open Session.** Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to come back into Open Session. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 18. Review and Consideration of Amending the Interlocal Agreement/Reimbursement Agreement – WCWAA.** The Town Council received a copy of the following: Amendment #6 to the Interlocal Agreement between Union County and the Town of Weddington and Amendment #1 to the Reimbursement Agreement between Union County, Town of Weddington and the WCWAA.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve amendments to the Interlocal Agreement and Reimbursement Agreement regarding WCWAA. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 19. Consideration of Resolution to Open Closed Session Minutes or Portions Thereof.** Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve Resolution R-2013-01:

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
RESOLUTION  
TO OPEN CLOSED SESSION MINUTES  
OR PORTIONS THEREOF  
R-2013-01**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the Town Council opens the following Closed Session Minutes or portions thereof:

<u><b>Date of Closed Session Minutes</b></u>	<u><b>Item Number</b></u>	<u><b>Item Entitled</b></u>
December 13, 2010	4	Future Park Site Pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a) (5)
June 13, 2011	4	Pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a) (5) To establish, or to instruct the public body's staff or negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken by or on behalf of the public body in negotiating (i) the price and other material terms of a contract or proposed contract for the acquisition of real property by purchase, option, exchange, or lease; or (ii) the amount of compensation and other material terms of an employment contract or proposed employment contract.
March 8, 2012	1	Open the Meeting
March 8, 2012	2	Consideration of Approval of Minutes and Unsealing of Closed Session Minutes
March 8, 2012	3	Adjournment
June 11, 2012	1	Open the Meeting
June 11, 2012	2	Consideration of Approval of the May 14, 2012 Closed Session Meeting Minutes
June 11, 2012	3	Goodwin and Hinson Invoice
June 11, 2012	5	Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
June 11, 2012	6	Adjournment

Adopted this 14<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 20. Adjournment.** Councilwoman Harrison moved to adjourn the January 14, 2013 Regular Town Council Meeting. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

The meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

---

Walker F. Davidson, Mayor

---

Amy S. McCollum, Town Clerk