

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
REGULAR TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2011 - 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 March 14, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. with Mayor Nancy D. Anderson presiding.

Present: Mayor Nancy D. Anderson, Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry, Councilmembers Werner Thomisser and Jerry McKee, Town Attorney Anthony Fox, Town Planner Jordan Cook, Finance Officer Leslie Gaylord and Town Administrator/Clerk Amy S. McCollum

Absent: Councilmember Robert Gilmartin

Visitors: Will Branch, Christine Branch, William Branch, Elizabeth Branch, Richard Propst, Elizabeth Propst, Paisley Gordon, Ron Turpak, John Houston, Barbara Harrison, Pat Harrison, Martha Allen, Kathy Bragg, Sheila Crunkleton, Bill Price, Gregg Wyant, Carol Wyant, Jan Taylor, George Eanes, Dennis Taylor, Todd Alexander, Jeff Perryman, Heather Perryman, Jan Smith, Walker Davidson, Suzette Gray, Jim Vivian, Rob Dow and L.A. Smith

Mayor Nancy D. Anderson led Council in prayer prior to the opening of the Town Council Meeting.

Item No. 1. Call to Order. Mayor Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. William Branch, student at New Town Elementary led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item No. 3. Determination of Quorum/Additions or Deletions to the Agenda. There was a quorum. Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry moved to approve the agenda with the following amendments:

- Remove Items 6C and 10C from the agenda
- Move 9E from the Consent Agenda to New Business 11B

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, McKee, Mayor Pro Tem Barry and
Mayor Anderson
NAYS: None

Item No. 4. Introduction of Deputy James “Chris” Walker. Mayor Anderson introduced the Town’s newest deputy Mr. Chris Walker who replaced Deputy Jason Griffin. Deputy Walker advised that he was a 10 year veteran of the Anson County Police Department as a Canine Handler and was Patrol Sergeant for five years. The Council welcomed Chris to the Town.

Item No. 5. Special Recognitions.

A. Martha Allen – American National Red Cross (Presidential Award for Excellence). The Town Council recognized Ms. Martha Allen, Town resident, for receiving the American National Red Cross Presidential Award for Excellence. Ms. Kathy Bragg, Director of the Union County Red Cross stated, “Martha Allen is a fantastic Red Cross Volunteer. She has been a member of the American Red Cross

Union County Chapter for many years. She became an active volunteer for the Union County Chapter in 2003 when she joined our Board of Directors. She has been a driving force for our Chapter's growth and success over the past eight years. Martha's passion over the last few years has been the Tiffany Circle of the American Red Cross. The Tiffany Circle recognizes women philanthropists in our community and in our nation who want to help their local American Red Cross Chapters provide financial stability so that we can help so many people. In Union County we were able to serve over 24,400 people last year. We were able to do this because of people like Martha. Martha joined the Tiffany Council in 2008 and was the sole member for the Union County Chapter. Since then, she has helped recruit eight other women leaders in Union County as Tiffany members. With her support and guidance, we went to the National Tiffany Circle Summit last year where our Tiffany Circle won National Tiffany Circle of the Year. Martha has done a lot of work over the past 8 years and all that work culminated in October of this past year. Martha Allen was chosen one of only six national award recipients this past October for the Presidential Award for Excellence. There are over 750 American Red Cross Chapters across the Country. Martha lives in Weddington and she is a devoted advocate of all the American Red Cross does. Her spirit is boundless and her compassion is genuine and whether she is at a blood drive giving out cookies or receiving a National Award in Washington, DC you will always find the same Martha Allen – a person that wants to help her neighbor, love her community and make this world a better place.”

Ms. Allen – I was always taught that charity begins at home. I would encourage you if you do not have a place to volunteer there are so many needs in the community. Thank you for this honor. The Red Cross is always there to serve and would love for anybody to come and help volunteer there.

Item No. 6. Public Hearings.

A. Public Hearing to Review and Consider Proposed Text Amendment to Add “Private Banquet, Reception and Conference Center” Uses as a Permitted Use in the MX Zoning District (Continued from the February 14, 2011 Regular Town Council Meeting). Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider the proposed text amendment to add “Private Banquet Reception and Conference Center” uses as a permitted use in the MX Zoning District. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

Sec. 58-4. Definitions.

Banquet and Reception Centers are uses and structures that are designed for groups of people to gather for social functions or events, including, but not limited to weddings and wedding receptions and other gatherings. This definition does not apply to churches.

Conference Centers are facilities designed to accommodate corporate meetings, training, retreats, exhibition space, and other uses of a similar nature.

Sec. 58-60. MX mixed-use conditional district.

(1) *Permitted uses.*

- o. Banquet and Reception Centers, and Conference Centers provided the lot is at least 5 acres. However, nothing shall prohibit one or more of these uses from being combined on a single 5 acre lot. These uses shall not produce levels of noise or electronically amplified sound that is audible at levels greater than 60 DB beyond the boundary of the property on which the facility is located. Further, no noise or electronically amplified sound shall be audible beyond the property boundary between the hours of 10 p.m. and 9 a.m.

Sec. 58-152. Signs permitted in all R residential districts.

(d) Signs on-premises of banquet, reception, and conference centers are regulated as follows:

(1)	Types of signs permitted:	Identification.
(2)	Permitted number of signs:	One per street front.
(3)	Maximum area of signs:	20 square feet.
(4)	Permitted location:	Behind required setback.

Items (d) and (e) become (e) and (f).

Sec. 58-175. Off-street parking.

Banquet, Reception, and Conference Center	1 per employee during the shift of greatest employment plus 1 space for every 2 guests based on the maximum number of guests the facility can accommodate. At a minimum, each use shall have parking to accommodate at least 30 vehicles.
---	---

Town Planner Jordan Cook – This was a citizen proposed text amendment to add Banquet and Reception Centers and Conference Centers to the MX Zoning District as a permitted use. This text only adds this use in the code. You are not actually approving a building, banquet center or conference center tonight. An applicant that wanted to have this use would still have to go through a Land Use Plan amendment and a CZ rezoning process to have the plan actually approved. It would have to go through all the steps, the Planning Board, Town Council, public hearing and consideration. The applicant and the Planning Board defined Banquet, Reception and Conference Centers and created development standards for that under the permitted uses. A section was also added dealing with signs, the parameters for signs and the parking requirements. As a reminder, the Town Council did agree that this use should be an MX rather than any type of residential zoning district and the Planning Board did give this a favorable recommendation.

Ms. Suzette Gray – I am a realtor with Coldwell Banker. We represent the Alexanders. In regards to this text change, we understand that you are not voting on a particular property but I would be remiss in not letting you know now that at some point we do hope to come before you and speak to you specifically about the Alexanders’ Property which is the T.W. Redwine House on New Town Road. It is just under eight acres. It was built in 1883 and we are hopeful that at some point we could invite you out to the property to take a look at it. We believe that it would be a very powerful thing to make Weddington a strong destination place. It could increase tax revenues, help businesses, retailers as well as preservation of history and also maintain an unspoiled green space for the community of Weddington as opposed to any further development.

Attorney Fox reminded the Council that the decision tonight was for only for the approval of the text and not for a specific piece of property.

With there being no further comments or questions, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

B. Public Hearing to Consider a Weddington Burning Ordinance. Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider a Weddington Burning Ordinance. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

ORDINANCE REGULATING THE OPEN BURNING OF YARD WASTE IN THE CORPORATE TOWN LIMITS

WHEREAS, the Town Council of the Town of Weddington deems it to be in the best interest to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Weddington from fire hazards, it is necessary to regulate open burning in the Town.

THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Weddington Town Council as follows:

Section 1. Definitions. The following words when used in this ordinance shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section:

- A. "Open burning" means the burning of yard waste in such a manner that the products of combustion resulting from the burning are emitted directly into the atmosphere without passing through a chimney, or a permitted air pollution control device.
- B. "Yard waste" means any grass, weeds, leaves, tree trimmings, plants, shrubbery pruning, and such other similar materials which are generated in the maintenance of yards and gardens.
- C. "Recreational burning" means camp fires and fires used solely for outdoor cooking and other recreational purposes, or for ceremonial occasions, or for human warmth and comfort and which do not create a nuisance and do not use synthetic materials or refuse or salvageable materials for fuel.

Section 2. Open Burning Regulations:

- A. A person shall not kindle or maintain or authorize to be kindled or maintained any open burning unless conducted in accordance with North Carolina General Statutes 113-60.21 through 113-60.31 and 15A NCAC 2D .1901.
- B. Open burning must be constantly attended by an adult (age 18 or older) until after the fire is extinguished.
- C. This adult must have on-site fire extinguishing equipment such as dirt, water barrel, garden hose or water truck that is available for immediate use.
- D. Fires that are intended to clear undergrowth by running along the ground are prohibited, except when conducted under a directive from a state or federal government agency, such as the Forestry Service.
- E. Open burning is prohibited on High Ozone days when levels are in the Orange, Red or Purple Zone according to the North Carolina Division of Air Quality.
- F. Open burning shall only be allowed at least 50 feet from any occupied dwelling.
- G. Recreational burning will have no time limit as long as the burning is not creating a nuisance or hazard.

Section 3. Exceptions

Training fires set for the purpose of instruction and training of firefighters in the methods of firefighting are exempt from this ordinance.

Section 4. Penalties and Remedies

- A. Civil penalties. Any law enforcement officer with territorial jurisdiction or code enforcement officer may issue a warning citation for a first offense of this ordinance. Any law enforcement officer with territorial jurisdiction or code enforcement officer may issue a civil citation for any subsequent violations of this ordinance, subjecting the violator to a civil penalty of \$50.00 for the second offense, \$100.00 for the third offense and \$150.00 for all subsequent offenses. If a

person/corporation fails to pay the citation within ten days of issuance, the Town may seek to recover the penalty by filing a civil action in the nature of a debt.

- B. The Town may seek to enforce this ordinance through any appropriate equitable action.
- C. Each day that a violation continues after the offender has been notified of the violation shall constitute a separate offense.
- D. The Town may seek to enforce this ordinance by using any one or a combination of the foregoing remedies.
- E. The issuance of a citation or the collection of penalties by the Town does not relieve any individual from liabilities that may result from a violation of this ordinance.

Section 5. Effective Date - This Ordinance shall be effective upon adoption.

The Town Council received a copy of the Notice of Violation of Town Ordinance for their review.

Town Planner Cook - What you have in front of you is the most recent version of the proposed Ordinance Regulating Open Burning in the Town of Weddington. These changes were made from the last Town Council Meeting in January when this was discussed. Our Planning Board Chairman made some changes based on your comments at that January meeting. The Union County Sheriff's Department has also looked over the ordinance and has provided the second page which is the Notice of Violation for the Town Ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - When I reviewed this document, I noticed that it specifically excludes large parcel owners. We wanted to add some language that excluded large parcels and I do not know how we should define that. I do not know if that is a material change. Everything else seems to be five acres or greater.

Attorney Fox – You would suggest that an exemption be added to exclude parcels that are five acres or greater in size.

Mr. Richard Propst questioned whether the Town was creating a situation that was different from the Union County process.

Mayor Anderson – The problem that we were having is if there was a violation for Union County or the State, we did not have a way to enforce that. This pretty much mirrors what the State says.

Mr. Jeff Perryman – I certainly do not think we need to add more ordinances for the Town unless we absolutely have to. I do understand that the problem has been enforcement. We need to mirror State Law as closely as possible. Keep it simple. You have addressed the enforcement part of it. I question the word nuisance in here. I would hate to see our deputies put in a position to have to arbitrate some disagreement between neighbors. If there are Homeowners Associations or neighborhoods that want to ban burning of any kind in their neighborhood they can already do that and it does not require action by the Council. They can do that on their own instead of writing a rule that is going to cover everyone in the Town when the situation is limited to a particular area or neighborhood of the Town.

Mr. Walker Davidson – I came before you last time in opposition of the Burning Ordinance. I like to burn yard waste in my yard to clean up the yard. I am not convinced that the majority of the citizens want a Burn Ordinance. This ordinance is confusing and I am not sure what behavior you are trying to prevent. It is better than it was last time. The Planning Board looked at this and said that they did not feel that an ordinance is needed at this time and that they would readdress the issue in the future if needed. When I look at what you have proposed here it says you deem it necessary to regulate open burning in the Town. What cases are you talking about that have become a problem? The three fire departments or local law

enforcement did not recommend this. Our joke has been that if you get in trouble and somebody shows up, you can default to that you are doing recreational burning. There has got to be that distinction between open burning versus recreational. Recreational you have as camp fires, outdoor cooking or for other recreational purposes. I do not know what that means. I do not know what ceremonial occasions include. My suspicion is that this has come up from some neighbors not getting along with each other and one calls the police on them and the Sheriff is going to have to define what is a nuisance and what is not a nuisance. I think you are not going to solve the problem with two neighbors. I wish you would go through this with us tonight to make sure we know what you are trying to prevent.

With there being no further comments or questions, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

C. Public Hearing to Consider Rezoning of All B-1 and B-2 Parcels to B-1 (Conditional District) and B-2 (Conditional District). This item was removed from the agenda.

Item No. 7. Public Comment. Mr. Greg Wyant - I have been in the community since 1987. I am here tonight to ask you to support the Rea Road Extension project. The economy is slow for the growth on this end of the County. therefore allowing our opportunity for infrastructure and road projects to catch up. An opportunity therefore to allow the infrastructure and road projects to support the population growth of the late 90s and early 2000s. The Rea Road Project would divert traffic from Highway 84 and Providence Road and help alleviate backups through the Town Center. The Rea Road project would allow Weddington to make a bypass away from the Town core. The Rea Road Project would help define the core of the Town for future generations. The Rea Road Project would run traffic away from Weddington United Methodist Church which has the largest preschool in the County. It would also divert traffic from Weddington Christian Academy. Common sense would dictate that the project would be completed as soon as possible. Do not miss an opportunity to lead for the next generation.

William Branch and Jan Smith – I am a teacher at New Town Elementary. I had asked the Mayor to come to our school. She did a public hearing for us. She went above and beyond because later she told me that we were very special in that she had a family emergency and came anyway. We want to say a very special thank you. She invited us to come this evening also. We have been teaching about governing and this is government in action.

Mr. Ron Turpak – I have been here for seven years. The greatest place in the world as far as I am concerned. It is like heaven. I feel the same way that Mr. Wyant does. Everything is going in our direction. It is something that we have been talking about for a long time – we ought to make it happen and if there is anybody that does not believe that it is the right thing to do I would like them to call me. We have too much going through here. Weddington is a great Town. We do not need to have New York City come through Weddington.

Mrs. Lib Propst – I had not planned to speak tonight. I am adamantly against Rea Road. It would destroy our family farm. We will have to move. My family has been here for five generations. I am sure you think it is great. If you were in my position you would be adamantly opposed to it. There are schools down the road. Traffic now backs up. This will only increase traffic and crime to this area. I moved back here in 1994 after teaching in Charlotte Mecklenburg for 31 years. I moved back because I retired and wanted to move back home. I have been harassed by this Town Council and other Town Councils ever since I moved back. I am fed up. You people that live on an acre lot have no idea what people who have farms put up with. I challenge you to buy a farm and then you will understand my feelings.

Mr. John Houston – I have been here about 11 years. The Rea Road Project has been an ongoing project. It is simply a traffic problem. We are faced with traffic. In my opinion the Rea Road Project is something that seriously needs to be looked at. About two years ago, there was an interest in finding out how the

Weddington citizens felt about this Rea Road project. We instigated a petition, circulated it through the Town and we had over 2,000 residents of Weddington who voted in favor of the Rea Road project. I am here tonight on behalf of those 2,000 residents who support the Rea Road Project and hope the Town Council will follow up and do the same thing.

Ms. L.A. Smith – I live in Weddington. I feel like we have been having this debate about Rea Road since the time I moved here 10 years ago. My first inclination would be to just make a decision and let’s move one way or the other. From my personal opinion, I would love to see you go forward with this project. If we had seized opportunities earlier, I do not think we would have this monstrosity that we have out here right now with all the asphalt and convoluted traffic patterns. We have a lot of traffic moving through here that does not belong here and it really damages our Town, our safety and the whole image that we want Weddington to project as being the small town atmosphere. You cannot have that much traffic moving through the main intersection and be a quaint little town like we all envision Weddington to be. I urge that you give it serious consideration in the positive sense.

Item No. 8. Approval of Minutes.

A. February 14, 2011 Regular Town Council Meeting Minutes. Councilmember McKee moved to approve the February 14, 2011 Regular Town Council Meeting minutes. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

B. March 7, 2011 Special Town Council Meeting Minutes. Councilmember McKee moved to approve the March 7, 2011 Special Town Council Meeting minutes. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

Item No. 9. Consent Agenda.

A. Consideration of Reducing Road Maintenance Bond for the Gardens on Providence Subdivision.
The Town Council received the following memo from Town Administrator/Clerk Amy McCollum:

When the Gardens on Providence Subdivision was developed, the Town required that the developer stub Blickling Drive to the adjacent property for future connectivity. NCDOT recently took over the maintenance of the roads in Gardens on Providence with the exception of Blickling Drive. NCDOT has advised the developer that they will not take over Blickling Drive for maintenance until it is continued through to the adjacent property which it could be several years before the adjacent property is developed.

The Town is currently holding \$15,413.00 for maintenance of all roads in this subdivision. USI conducted a field inspection of Blickling Drive in the Gardens on Providence Subdivision on February 12, 2011 to verify the satisfactory completion of construction activities for the purpose of establishing the developer’s maintenance bond for this street. Their inspection found that construction items were complete. Based upon 15% of the estimated amount of the roadway base and pavement, USI recommends that \$1,608.75 be set as the maintenance bond amount for this street.

The usual policy of the Town is not to make minor reductions with respect to letters of credit or bonds, but due to the fact that the Town requested that the road be stubbed and NCDOT is denying acceptance of Blickling Drive, I request that the Town Council reduce the maintenance bond for Gardens on Providence from \$15,413.00 to \$1,608.75

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to reduce the road maintenance bond for the Gardens on Providence Subdivision. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

B. Consideration of Recommended Policy for Releasing Escrows and Bonds Covering Maintenance and Operation Costs for Open Space Areas within Conservation Subdivisions. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Administrator/Clerk McCollum:

Section 58-58 (4) (i) (3) (iv) of the Town of Weddington's Code of Ordinances establishes the Standards for Developments located in a Conservation Subdivision. This ordinance states the following:

The property owner or other specified party as provided above, shall be required to escrow or bond sufficient funds for the maintenance and operation costs of the conservation lands for two years. The amount of such escrow or bond shall be equal to 1.5 times the biannual estimated maintenance and operational costs, and shall be in a form as provided in subsection 46-45(b).

Regrettably, the ordinance does not address when the Town may release that escrow back to the developer. It has been the policy of staff to release the escrow when the developer achieves the following:

- Demonstrates that the maintenance and operation of the conservation lands are secured by an established and functioning Homeowners Association (HOA) established by enforceable Restrictive Covenants and Declarations; and
- Shows that the Homeowners Association has funds equal to 1.5 times the biannual estimated maintenance and operational costs of the conservation lands for two years.

We believe that once the HOA is fully operational and accrues up to 1.5 times the 2 year annual operation costs of the conservation land, the need for the bond or letter of credit to be held by the Town is no longer needed. Therefore, we recommend that the Council approve this position as the official policy of the Town.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve the Policy for Releasing Escrows and Bonds Covering Maintenance and Operation Costs for Open Space Areas within Conservation Subdivisions. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

C. Consideration of Releasing the Conservation Bond for the Lake Forest Preserve Subdivision. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Administrator/Clerk McCollum and a copy of the Income Statement and Balance Sheet for Lake Forest Preserve:

The Town is currently holding \$45,000 for the maintenance of the conservation/common open space within the Lake Forest Preserve Subdivision. The bond/letter of credit mechanism insured that there was adequate funding for maintenance of the areas in the absence of a solvent homeowners association. Now, the Lake Forest Preserve Homeowners Association is fully operational and funded and the common open space/conservation land and amenity area have been deeded over to the association.

The Town has a copy of their Maintenance Plan and Maintenance Agreement for the subdivision. The annual maintenance budget for the Lake Forest Preserve Subdivision is \$15,000. The Lake Forest Preserve Homeowners Association's attached Income Statement and Balance Sheet shows that the association has the necessary funds for the maintenance of the conservation/common open space. Therefore, I am requesting that the Town Council release the conservation bond/ letter of credit for the Lake Forest Preserve Subdivision in the amount of \$45,000.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to release the conservation bond for the Lake Forest Preserve Subdivision. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

D. Call for a Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Text Amendments to Section 46-9 and 58-4 – LARTP (Public Hearing to be held on April 11, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall).

The Town Council received a copy of the proposed text change. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to call for a public hearing to consider proposed text amendments to Section 46-9 and 58-4 – LARTP. The public hearing is to be held on April 11, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

E. Call for a Public Hearing to Consider a Text Amendment to Establish a Livestock Management Plan (Public Hearing to be held on April 11, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall).

This item was removed from the Consent Agenda.

Item No. 10. Consideration of Public Hearings.

A. Consideration of Ordinance Adopting Text Amendments to Add “Private Banquet, Reception and Conference Center” Uses as a Permitted Use in the MX Zoning District. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to adopt Ordinance O-2011-02:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 58-4, 58-60, 58-152 AND 58-175
OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
O-2011-02**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTIONS 58-4, 58-60, 58-152 AND 58-175 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Sec. 58-4. Definitions.

Banquet and Reception Centers are uses and structures that are designed for groups of people to gather for social functions or events, including, but not limited to weddings and wedding receptions and other gatherings. This definition does not apply to churches.

Conference Centers are facilities designed to accommodate corporate meetings, training, retreats, exhibition space, and other uses of a similar nature.

Sec. 58-60. MX mixed-use conditional district.

(2) *Permitted uses.*

- p. Banquet and Reception Centers, and Conference Centers provided the lot is at least 5 acres. However, nothing shall prohibit one or more of these uses from being combined on a single 5 acre lot. These uses shall not produce levels of noise or electronically amplified sound that is audible at levels greater than 60 DB beyond the boundary of the property on which the facility is located. Further, no noise or electronically amplified sound shall be audible beyond the property boundary between the hours of 10 p.m. and 9 a.m.

Sec. 58-152. Signs permitted in all R residential districts.

(d) Signs on-premises of banquet, reception, and conference centers are regulated as follows:

(1)	Types of signs permitted:	Identification.
(2)	Permitted number of signs:	One per street front.
(3)	Maximum area of signs:	20 square feet.
(4)	Permitted location:	Behind required setback.

Items (d) and (e) become (e) and (f).

Sec. 58-175. Off-street parking.

Banquet, Reception, and Conference Center	1 per employee during the shift of greatest employment plus 1 space for every 2 guests based on the maximum number of guests the facility can accommodate. At a minimum, each use shall have parking to accommodate at least 30 vehicles.
---	---

Adopted this 14th day of March, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

B. Consideration of Adopting a Weddington Burning Ordinance. Councilmember Thomisser moved to approve the Weddington Burning Ordinance with the following amendments:

- Remove in Section 1 B the words - grass, weeds, leaves
- Add to Section 2 H – Burning of grass, weeds and leaves is prohibited.

Councilmember Thomisser - I am pleased to see Councilmember Barry was able to define to his comfort level the recreational burning section of the ordinance and with the help from the Mayor they were able to define air quality in the ordinance. I would like to say that most of this ordinance does follow the State Regulations. As far as an HOA enforcing it - that is possible to some extent; however, there are some HOA associations that simply are remiss in enforcing something like this. I see in the Enquirer-Journal

dated March 2 where we continue to have brush fires. We as a Council should encourage citizens to be careful. Mr. Jeff Rieves with the North Carolina Cooperative Service came and talked with members of the Town Council about composting and we should encourage that as opposed to polluting the air.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – Attorney Fox, would you address whether the changes recommended by Councilmember Thomisser are material?

Mayor Anderson – It is okay to burn your tree trimmings and the shrubbery in your yard but you do not want grass, weeds and leaves burned?

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – That is what Councilmember Thomisser would like. The Burning Ordinance was to create a Weddington Ordinance that reiterated the State’s guidelines and best practices and make it enforceable by our Sheriff under our contract with the County and so that the Volunteer Fire Department has the right to put out fires. We are trying to create the liberty that is necessary to allow people to continue to do safe burning, limit unsafe behavior and deal with high ozone days and then give the Sheriff the right to enforce.

Attorney Fox – Materiality only relates to whether your notice is sufficient. It sounds to me like there is a disconnect on the content of the ordinance which may have changed in some members views that may be substantial or material. That really relates to whether or not the Council will support or not support the actual ordinance that is on the table.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – Jordan, do you remember in the first hearing on the subject whether grass, leaves and weeds were explicitly prohibited?

Town Planner Cook – No, they were not.

Attorney Fox – The other issue seems to be that is whether or not this Council is willing to adopt an ordinance that substantially parallels State law or diverts from State law or even creates more of a regulatory scheme than State law would provide.

Mayor Anderson – It was my understanding that we were trying to parallel State law by adding enforcement in there. I understand that there are certain Councilmembers that feel very strongly about burning leaves and grass.

Councilmember McKee – There was more than just that change because I believe State law is 100 feet from a dwelling and we have 50 feet. That is not mirroring State law. I think this is enhancing it. My concern is the safety aspect of it. We do not need people to set fires and then go to a kid’s ball game and come back 2 to 3 hours later. I am an advocate for composting. I do not see any reason to pile up leaves and burn them. Everyone has a piece of woods somewhere. They can put the leaves there.

Attorney Fox – You as a governing body can decide what is appropriate for the regulation of public health, safety and welfare.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – When I was asked to redraft this - I was unsupportive of the text in its current form. As amended tonight, I am still unsupportive of it because there is a conflict between what is construed as open burning and recreational burning. I believe that this is an issue between two adjoining property owners that we have been dragged into to try to resolve by amending our code sections.

Councilmember Thomisser – I disagree that it is an issue between two property owners. I know there is a situation in the Town where one of the property owners is vocal about it but at the last public hearing we had a nurse testify about the dangers of polluting air with the burning of leaves. It is about air quality as much as it is about safety. It is a situation that occurs in Weddington regardless of where you are. I was driving down Weddington-Matthews Road yesterday and a gentleman along the road was burning grass

when he could have cut it down at the ground and composted it. I picked up the smell in my car and I had to roll my windows down to get the smoke out of my car. People should not have to tolerate air quality pollution.

Mayor Anderson – One of the public comments was to let the HOA handle it. You are aware that to change the covenants in a Homeowners Association it would require 100% unanimous decision which almost always never happens. I know it does feel like that we have degenerated into a neighborhood squabble. Over the course of the last couple of years, I have had at least two other people in two other neighborhoods to call me and ask me about an open burning ordinance in Weddington. I gave them what was incorrect information that I received that we cannot have a burning ordinance if we do not pick up yard waste. That is not true. Ceremonial occasions could consist of a scouting event or a Native American ritual.

Mayor Anderson – I would ask for the following friendly amendment for Section 1 C:

C. “Recreational burning” means camp fires and fires used solely for outdoor cooking and other recreational purposes, or for ceremonial occasions, or for human warmth and comfort and ~~which do not create a nuisance and~~ do not use synthetic materials or refuse or salvageable materials for fuel.

Councilmember McKee – We are making substantial changes and I feel that we need to go back to the drawing board. I think we should take it off the agenda and rewrite.

Mayor Anderson – If we take this off of the agenda, I am going to respectively ask that we not bring it back up for another six months.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry made a substitute motion to defer discussion on a Weddington Open Burning Ordinance for six months. The vote on his motion is as follows:

AYES: Mayor Pro Tem Barry
NAYS: Councilmembers Thomisser and McKee

The motion failed.

Councilmember Thomisser accepted Mayor Anderson’s amendment.

Attorney Fox advised that Section 2 G may need to be amended also since it discusses creating a nuisance or hazard.

Councilmember McKee – I move that we table this until the next Council meeting and incorporate these changes and conduct another public hearing.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry and Councilmember Thomisser advised that they wanted to deal with the issue tonight.

The vote on Councilmember McKee’s motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmember McKee
NAYS: Councilmember Thomisser and Mayor Pro Tem Barry

The motion failed.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry called the question on the motion made by Councilmember Thomisser.

Mayor Anderson – You have a Councilmember who is trying to build consensus here.

Attorney Fox – The motion was to adopt the Burning Ordinance as amended by Councilmember Thomisser which included amendments to Section 1 B to strike grass, weeds and leaves and also to add under Section 2 – H. Burning of grass, weeds and leaves are prohibited. There was an offer to amend the motion to include a change to Section 1 C by Mayor Anderson to strike the nuisance language and that amendment was accepted. There was discussion of whether to remove that nuisance language in 2 G also. There was no resolution of that issue. Is the ordinance before you an ordinance that gave the public sufficient notice of the ultimate ordinance to be adopted? Removing grass, weeds and leaves is a change – it is probably what could be expected from someone coming to the meeting. It is for you to decide whether it is material. I think when you are looking at considering an Open Burning Ordinance with the provisions that you had in there that the public had sufficient knowledge and understanding of the type of ordinance that would be adopted.

The vote on Councilmember Thomisser’s motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmember Thomisser
NAYS: Councilmember McKee and Mayor Pro Tem Barry

The motion failed.

The Council took a brief recess at the request of Mayor Pro Tem Barry.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to prevent reconsideration of the Open Burning Ordinance for six months.

AYES: Mayor Pro Tem Barry
NAYS: Councilmembers Thomisser and McKee

The motion failed.

C. Consideration of Rezoning All B-1 and B-2 Parcels to B-1 (Conditional District) and B-2 (Conditional District). This item was removed from the agenda.

Item No. 11. Old Business.

A. Update and Discussion on 2011 Town Council Retreat – March 18 and 19, 2011. The Council received a copy of the proposed agenda for the Retreat. Mayor Anderson encouraged Council and residents to invite people to the Meet and Greet Reception to be held as part of the Retreat on March 18.

B. Call for a Public Hearing to Consider a Text Amendment to Establish a Livestock Management Plan (Public Hearing to be held on April 11, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. at the Weddington Town Hall). The Town Council received a copy of the proposed text change.

Town Planner Cook - What you see on the first page applies to our R-80, R-60, R-40 and R-CD zoning districts. We added a sentence at the end that says all residents housing livestock in a residential subdivision must have an approved Livestock Management Plan approved by the Union County Extension Agent. The next page gives the combinations of how many horses and how many mini horses would be allowed. All the underlined language is new language. The language that is struck out is some of the language that the Planning Board recommended and you can see the combination that is struck out is based on the fact that two miniature horses shall be deemed equal to one horse. The newer language says that for purposes of this Section three miniature horses shall be deemed equal to one horse. You can see how that changes the combination on a 1 or 2 acre parcel. On the right side are the definitions. All we did was add miniature horses to the agricultural use definition. The second paragraph just reiterates what already exists in our code that a horse farm or academy needs a site of 5 or more acres where three or more horses are

housed, bred and boarded. The last is the actual definition of a miniature horse. Then there is the actual Livestock Management Plan Ordinance recommended to us by the Union County Extension Agent. He has provided some feedback on this. Some of this may be amended after I get all of his comments back. I do not think this is what the final plan will look at.

Mayor Anderson – Is this Livestock Management Plan an attachment or an ordinance?

Town Planner Cook – It will be an attachment. It is like our Lighting Plan. It is referred to in the ordinance but it would need to be approved by the Town Council as a separate document that would be available at Town Hall for the residents to pick up.

Councilmember McKee - My biggest thing is that I did not see the Livestock Management Plan and I cannot address this ordinance without having that before me and to read it to see how it is going to be implemented. Do we know who owns horses here in Weddington? Are we going to take the plan to them and have them sign off that they have received the plan? This is so vanilla. There is no way to have a public hearing. I have a concern about the compost management. It says in there that the Town Planner will be overseeing this. Does that mean that Jordan has to go out every month and go around to everyone that has horses to make sure that they are maintaining their property? Are we opening up a can of worms that we may not need to be looking at? I do not think we are paying him to go out and check horse manure. He has better things to do here at the Town. I think we need language ahead of time to study. I need more information than this. I do not care how good it is - I do not believe I would vote for it. The stink is the problem.

Mayor Anderson – I helped Jeff Rieves and Jordan Cook work on this. This was in response to what Mayor Pro Tem Barry said that every site is site specific. The North Carolina Cooperative Extension Agency is the subject matter experts and they can write a site specific plan for every parcel that has a horse on it. They are going to look at every single one.

Councilmember McKee – We do not know how many horse owners there are. How would we know?

Mayor Anderson – This ordinance would be enforced very similar to our other ordinances. When a problem exists, it is called to our attention by a resident or citizen of the Town.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - It goes back to the public hearing we had on horses and the miniatures and the challenge that we were having is that I can have a five acre parcel that allows me to have as many horses as I would like but if four of the acres are wetlands, I can still have as many horses as I want even though it is no good for pastureland and maybe only 1/3 of an acre is usable dry land and that is not effective livestock management. Then we have these homeowners fighting over horses and the smell and it came to less of a number issue and more of a smell issue. That is when I said let's just send Jordan over there once a month to verify that the manure is cleaned up. There is a better solution to the count per acre than the hard count rule even though that is the easiest to enforce.

Councilmember McKee – I understand that. It says here that the purpose of the plan is to protect the rights of property owners that own the livestock and the rights of the neighboring property owners but what is the plan?

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – Each specific parcel will have a specific plan based on the number of horses that they own or have housed, bred and boarded on that property given the topography of the parcel.

Councilmember McKee – Manure management would be the same if you had one horse or one and three.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - Not necessarily.

Councilmember McKee - You still have to manage the manure.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - Correct. So you want the specific rule on how we are going to manage manure?

Mayor Anderson - On further down it talks about using best management practices.

Councilmember McKee - What are they?

Mayor Anderson - The Department of Agriculture publishes those.

Councilmember McKee – I would like to see those.

Mayor Anderson - Those change periodically and we were thinking that our Agriculture Extension Agent could apply those best management practices. It is very site specific such as the depth of the bedrock, how far away are you from a stream, is there a well on the property. To try to craft an ordinance that would put every single criteria for every single possible scenario would look worse than our Lighting Ordinance so that is why we picked up on Mayor Pro Tem's suggestion that we find an expert to help us with that.

Councilmember Thomisser – This says that manure is composted in accordance with Best Management Practices for sustainable agriculture. What are the best management practices? Location of compost piles minimize nuisance to neighbors to comply with the minimum separation distance commonly recognized by the NC Extension Agent - but the whole thing is vague. It has to be more specific. What about the removal? We are assuming that all of this is going to decompose and compost. There is nothing here that requires anyone to remove it because the stuff just keeps coming. To me, it does not seem that it can decompose fast enough.

Mayor Anderson – You were at the meeting with Jeff and me. The answer is a cycle process. It does depend on the carbon to nitrogen ratio. The pile could start out at six feet and by the time it is composted it is down to three feet.

Councilmember Thomisser – If it goes from six feet to three – what are they going to do with it assuming that they do not garden? Is there a plan to remove it to someplace else or a plan for someone to come and pick it up to use in their garden? It is vague.

Mayor Anderson - It says manure management. Manure is composted and disposed of.

Councilmember Thomisser - How?

Mayor Anderson - People could use it for their yards, they could sell it, they could call the master gardeners, they could have a website to set up people picking it up. There were several scenarios that he put forth. If you want to say that it is removed once a month then put it in there.

Councilmember Thomisser - Regarding the number of horses - I believe that the Planning Board made an attempt to define how many miniature horses equals one horse.

Mayor Anderson - That was changed. I suggested the new language because that was the opinion of the North Carolina Extension Agent which quoted studies from NC State and Ohio State. I felt that he and those other institutions had a better working knowledge than our members of the Planning Board except

for a few people on that board. Their research and level of expertise was more professional and higher level than what is on our Planning Board. If you are not happy with that, that could be changed.

Councilmember Thomisser – Rob Dow made an attempt to define two miniature horses to one full size horse. That is what the Planning Board decided.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - We are painting with a very broad brush the number of horses you can have on a parcel that did not take into consideration what the parcel looked like, whether it had a heavy grade on it or whether it is flat or on a wetland. Whether you had two horses that were Clydesdale or five miniatures really did not matter. At the end of the day the issue was could you take care of them in a healthy fashion and did they create a nuisance and was there appropriate care being given to maintaining the site in a sanitary fashion to where it was not a nuisance to the neighbors.

Councilmember McKee moved to not call for a public hearing until Council has been provided with a detailed Livestock Management Plan and requested that staff determine how many residents of Weddington have horses that would fall under this ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - Miniature horses, goats? Jordan, how long will it take you to count horses? Are we going to grant a stay to the people that would be affected by this change or are we going to send them a letter?

Town Planner Cook - We gave them a six month period in the language which starts when the language is approved. They have six months to comply.

Councilmember McKee - I would like to take out identifying the livestock because that is probably impossible. I want to see Weddington’s Livestock Management Plan.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - It is by parcel and written individually for each property owner based on their facts and circumstances.

Councilmember McKee – I would like to see an example of a site specific plan and a copy of the best management practices.

All were in favor of the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

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

Item No. 12. New Business.

A. Discussion of Federal Census and Redistricting Requirements. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Attorney Anthony Fox:

Several council members have inquired about the need for Weddington to evaluate its voting districts in light of the recent federal census. In a previous memo, I referred to the language in GS 160A-23.1(a) which suggests that redistricting was required. It seems that despite the language of the statute, redistricting by Weddington will not be required. Bob Joyce of the Institute of Government has explained why redistricting by Weddington is not required. He states that:

“Jurisdictions that use regular electoral redistricts (as opposed to residency districts) must redraw their districts if the new census numbers show that the populations of their districts have become sufficiently imbalanced. The courts have been clear that when such districts

become sufficiently imbalanced, there is a one-person-one-vote equal protection constitutional violation. So GS 160A-23.1(a) says that those jurisdictions must evaluate their districts, looking at the imbalance, “to determine whether it would be lawful to hold the next election without revising districts to correct population imbalances.” If the imbalance is small enough, the answer is Yes, it would be lawful (because very small imbalances do not trigger a one-person-one-vote equal protection constitutional violation). In that case, the jurisdiction does not have to redistrict. If the imbalance is great enough, however, the answer is No, it would not be lawful (because of the one-person-one-vote equal protection constitutional violation), so they would have to redraw the lines

Jurisdictions that use residency districts, however, do not have to redraw their districts even if the new numbers show imbalance. That is because the US Supreme Court has made clear that even if residency districts become imbalanced, there is no one-person-one-vote equal protection violation. Now, GS 160A-23.1(a), in the very same way, says that residency district jurisdictions must also evaluate their districts, looking at the imbalance, “to determine whether it would be lawful to hold the next election without revising districts to correct population imbalances.” The answer to that question will always be Yes, it would be lawful (because the Supreme Court has said that imbalances in residency districts do not create a one-person-one-vote equal protection violation). Since the answer to that question is always Yes, jurisdictions that use residency districts can stop right there and are not required to redistrict.”

Mayor Pro Tem Barry asked that staff and the Town Attorney research the appeal process for the 2010 Census Data due to the discrepancy in the official numbers versus the estimates that the Town has received over the past several years.

B. Consideration of Weddington Easter Egg Hunt. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Administrator/Clerk McCollum:

At its meeting on February 28, 2011, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board expressed the desire to plan a Weddington Easter Egg Hunt/Celebration to be held on Saturday, April 9, 2011 at the Weddington Town Hall. The event would be held from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and the rain date would be Sunday, April 10, 2011. The Board requested a budget not to exceed \$500.00 for the event which would include the purchase of plastic eggs, candy, prizes, snacks and the rental of a bunny suit. The event would mostly occur in the back of the Town Hall and if the Town Council approves the request, the appropriate Press Release, Flyer and contact to the schools and local businesses will be made. Finance Officer Gaylord has advised that money is available in the Events and Publications Budget for this event.

Councilmember McKee moved to appropriate \$500.00 for the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board to hold the First Annual Weddington Easter Egg Hunt. The vote on the motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser and McKee
NAYS: Mayor Pro Tem Barry

C. Consideration of Proposal from Centralina Council of Governments (COG) for the Use of a Facilitator for the Town Retreat. The Town Council received a copy of a proposal from COG for Bill Duston to serve as the facilitator to the Town Council’s upcoming retreat on March 19, 2011. Services that Mr. Duston will provide include:

- Meeting with Town staff prior to the retreat to determine issues of importance to the Town and reviewing the retreat agenda;
- Developing and presenting a set of “ground rules” for the retreat; and,
- Facilitating the retreat and leading staff and Town Board members into discussion.

The cost of these services is \$679 plus the use of one (1) block of membership hours (3 hours) from the Town’s FY 2010-11 allocation.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve the proposal from Centralina Council of Governments for the use of a facilitator for the Town Retreat. All were in favor of the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

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

D. Consideration of Participating in the Shine For Blue Law Enforcement Memorial. Town Administrator/Clerk McCollum advised that the Town received information regarding the Shine for Blue Law Enforcement Memorial that will be dedicated during Police Week the end of May 2011. The Fraternal Order of Police are finalizing the ordering of the bricks to surround the Memorial and leading up to the Memorial. A brick can be purchased at \$50.00 each.

Mayor Anderson advised that two of the Town’s deputies would be retiring this year and that bricks could be purchased honoring them for their service to the Town instead of doing the usual gift of a plaque.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved that the Town not make the contribution to the Fraternal Order of Police Shine for Blue Law Enforcement from the Town but that the Council consider personally sharing the costs to purchase the bricks.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmember McKee and Mayor Pro Barry
 NAYS: Councilmember Thomisser

Item No. 13. Update from Town Planner. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Planner Cook:

- Open Houses for the Carolina Thread Trail were held a couple weeks ago throughout Union County. Comments from those open houses were used to determine proposed locations for the trails. The selected route does not pass through Weddington but does border the Town in Wesley Chapel and Waxhaw. For a map of the proposed trail locations please visit the following website: <http://www.carolinathreadtrail.org/index.php?id=152>
- NCDOT has completed the access road behind Town Hall and removed all of the berm along Weddington-Matthews Road. Landscaping for the access road has commenced and the applicant has agreed to the conditions of approval recommended by the Planning Board for the ground sign. The applicant has also agreed to install a light at the rear of the Shopping Center (behind the Vet Clinic) and one at the access road and Weddington-Matthews Road intersection. The sign should be installed the week of March 14th.
- NCDOT has acquired the right-of-way needed to install turn lanes and a traffic signal at the intersection of Hemby Road/Beulah Church Road and Weddington-Matthews Road. Installation of the traffic signals has begun. The turn lanes and signal should be completed in early 2011.

- The Planning Board began to review the proposed LARTP (Local Area Regional Transportation Plan) Text Amendments at their January 24th meeting. The LARTP should soon be added to the CTP (Comprehensive Transportation Plan). The Planning Board decided that some of the Text Amendments should be discussed at the March Planning Retreat.
- The Public Hearing for the proposed Livestock Management Plan Ordinance will be held at the Town Council meeting on April 11th.
- The Planning Board is currently working on text to combine ground signs and freestanding signs into one sign (Freestanding Ground Sign) due to the confusion over the similarities of each sign.

Town Planner Cook advised that he was contacted by the owners of the shopping center informing him that they have a Pet Groomer that wants to take over a vacant space at the shopping center. He stated, "Pet Grooming is not an allowed use in our B-2 Shopping Center. Do you want me to proceed with the process to add pet grooming as an allowed use in the shopping center?"

The Council instructed Town Planner Cook to proceed with the process.

Item No. 14. Update from Town Administrator/Clerk. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Administrator/Clerk McCollum:

Mr. Buzz Bizzell has met with all of the vendors relative to the Streetscape project for the Town and has reviewed the scope of work with them. Boswell Electric is locating the utility lines and will be on site within the next two weeks. Ornamental has begun fabrication of the aluminum poles, etc. Mr. Bizzell will be developing examples of banners for the Town to consider. We are still working with property owners on getting their permission to allow the construction of the Town markers on their property.

Please let me know by March 24 if you are interested in attending the NCLM Regional Legislative Update Meeting on Thursday, April 7 in Kannapolis. Discussions on key state and federal legislative matters such as the State Budget, Annexation, Water Resources, Infrastructure Needs, Transportation, Broadband, ABC Systems, and the Local Government Retirement System will occur. The meeting will be held from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Please let me know if you would like to attend Town Hall Day on May 4, 2011 in Raleigh from 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

The Weddington Town Council is holding a Meet and Greet Reception for Weddington Residents on March 18 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Firethorne Country Club, 1108 Firethorne Club Drive, Marvin, NC 28173. The Reception is being held in conjunction with the 2011 Weddington Town Council Retreat. The Town Council has invited as their guests Senator Tommy Tucker, NC House of Representative Craig Horn and the Union County Board of Commissioners.

Depending on Council action, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is sponsoring a Weddington Easter Egg Hunt on April 9 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. to be held at the Town Hall. The rain date will be April 10.

The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is also sponsoring a Litter Sweep for the Town on April 30. More details to follow.

Parks and Recreation is working on scheduling meetings with the local churches, schools, businesses and clubs to talk about the Board’s Goals and Objectives and to open the lines of communication for upcoming Town events.

Upcoming Dates

- March 18 and 19 – Town Council Retreat
- March 28 – Planning Board Meeting
- April 9 – Possible Weddington Easter Egg Hunt
- April 22 – Town Hall Closed for Good Friday
- April 30 – Litter Sweep
- May 4 – Town Hall Day

Item No. 15. Public Safety Report.

Providence VFD – February Report

Fire Calls – 21
 EMS Calls – 10
 86 Training Hours

The Town Council received the Income and Expense Budget Performance and Balance Sheet for the Providence VFD.

Weddington Deputies – 369 Calls

Wesley Chapel VFD – 81 Calls

Mayor Anderson asked that the Public Safety Advisory Committee study the following issues:

- Emergency access concerns for the Town’s gated communities
- Whether the Union County Animal Control Ordinance can be enforced in the Town limits

Item No. 16. Update from Finance Officer and Tax Collector.

A. Finance Officer’s Report. The Town Council received the Revenue and Expenditure Statement and Balance Sheet for 2/1/2011 to 2/28/2011.

B. Tax Collector’s Report. Monthly Report – February 2011

Transactions	
Overpayments	\$(333.60)
Pay Interest and Penalties	\$(64.08)
Refunds	\$368.22
Releases	\$(120.18)
Adjust Under \$5.00	\$(16.51)
Taxes Collected:	
2010	\$(3,088.30)
2009	\$(213.95)
As of February 28, 2011; the following taxes remain Outstanding:	

2002	\$82.07
2003	\$196.11
2004	\$159.59
2005	\$291.65
2006	\$184.18
2007	\$313.71
2008	\$4,362.25
2009	\$7,521.23
2010	\$50,529.19
Total Outstanding:	\$63,639.98

Councilmember McKee questioned whether there could be another staff person appointed that could also sign checks in the absence of the Finance Officer and whether one signature could be required instead of two for checks totaling less than a certain amount.

Finance Officer Gaylord and Attorney Fox will research the Statutes regarding this issue and report back to the Town Council.

Item No. 17. Transportation Report. Mayor Anderson advised that the next MUMPO Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday. She also discussed the Mecklenburg Street Car Project with the Town Council.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry gave a brief update on the status of the Rea Road Extension. Councilmember McKee thanked Mayor Pro Tem Barry and Mayor Anderson for their work on this project.

Item No. 18. Council Comments. There were no Council Comments.

Item No. 19. Adjournment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to adjourn the March 14, 2011 Regular Town Council Meeting. All were in favor of the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

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

The meeting ended at 9:41 p.m.

Nancy D. Anderson, Mayor

Amy S. McCollum, Town Clerk