

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
REGULAR TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 11, 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 April 11, 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: Walker Davidson, Steven R. Carow, Ken Evans, Jack Parks, Brian Carlton, Joshua Dye, Michael Elliott, Jim Spittle, Steve Hopper, Dana Milford, Ned Williams, Gerald Haymond, Bill Price, Jim Vivian, Barbara Harrison, Bob Rapp, Paisley Gordon, and Stephanie Belcher

Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry led the Council in prayer prior to the opening of the meeting.

Item No. 1. Call to Order. Mayor Nancy D. Anderson called the April 11, 2011 Regular Town Council Meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance. Mayor Anderson led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item No. 3. Determination of Quorum/Additions or Deletions to the Agenda. There was a quorum. Councilmember Werner Thomisser moved to approve the agenda as presented. 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. Public Hearings.

A. Public Hearing to Consider Rezoning of All B-1 and B-2 Parcels to B-1 (Conditional District) and B-2 (Conditional District). Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider rezoning of all B-1 and B-2 Parcels to B-1 and B-2 Conditional District. The Town Council received the following memo from Town Planner Jordan Cook:

The Town of Weddington requests a Rezoning of all properties currently zoned B-1 General Business District and B-2 Shopping Center District to B-1 General Business District (Conditional District) and B-2 Shopping Center District (Conditional District). All of the properties are located in the Northeast quadrant of Providence Road and Weddington Road.

Application Information

Date of Application: March 1, 2011
Applicant Name: Town of Weddington
Owner Name: See table below

Parcel ID Numbers: 06-150-050, 06-150-049, 06-150-059A, 06-150-054, 06-150-056, 06-150-057, 06-150-053, 06-150-053A, 06-150-055 and 06-150-050A

Property Location: Northeast quadrant of Providence Road and Weddington Road

Existing Land Use: Business

Proposed Land Use: Business

Existing Zoning: B-1 General Business District and B-2 Shopping Center District

Proposed Zoning: B-1 General Business District (CD) and B-2 Shopping Center District (CD)

Existing Use(s): Businesses, Government Facility, Shopping Center, Bank, Convenience Store, etc.

Proposed Use(s): Same as existing uses

Parcel Size: 25.16 Acres

General Information-Background

- The Town Council approved the B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) text amendment at their June 14, 2010 meeting.
- Adopting this new text essentially added new zoning districts within the Town of Weddington. These new zoning districts called B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) established another conditional zoning district within Weddington. The other conditional zoning district is MX or Mixed Use. Conditional Zoning districts utilize the legislative review process rather than the quasi-judicial review process and allow for more communication between the applicant and staff, Planning Board and Town Council as well as Public Involvement Meetings.
- The Planning Board recommended approval of the B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) text amendment at their April 26, 2010 meeting.

General Information-B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) Rezoning

- The rezoning proposal would include eight parcels comprising of 24.03 acres in the Northeast quadrant of Providence and Weddington Road. All currently B-1 and B-2 zoned properties are included in this rezoning. *Town Planner Cook revised this bullet during the meeting and stated, "At the Planning Board Meeting, the last two parcels shown below in the table were discussed that they may never have been zoned B-1 or B-2. I looked into that and could never find concrete evidence. Neither one of those are buildable parcels anyway. We just want to make sure we are not rezoning from Residential to a Business District."*
- These rezonings do not increase and/or change the amount of commercial buildings, uses or acres within the Town of Weddington. This is simply a mechanism to ensure that all existing commercial uses follow the legislative (conditional zoning) process rather than the quasi-judicial (conditional use permit) process from this point forward.
- Below is a detailed list of the parcels being rezoned (the last two parcels listed that are owned by NCDOT shall not be rezoned):

Parcel Number	Property/Use Description	Acres	Owner
06150057	Weddington Town Hall	2.14	Town of Weddington
06150053A	Dr. Pinsak's Office	0.67	George & Carol Pinsak
06150053	Weddington Associates Medical Building	0.84	Weddington Associates
06150056	Weddington Corners Shopping Center	10.00	Weddington Associates
06150054	Vet Clinic	0.17	Weddington Associates
06150055	Gas Station/Convenience Store	1.34	Jerry & Robbie Pressley
06150050A	Citizens South Bank	1.00	Citizens South Bank
06150059A	Treski Property	7.87	M Squared Holdings LLC
06150049	NCDOT parcel in front of Treski Property	0.92	NCDOT

06150050	NCDOT parcel in front of Citizens South Bank	0.21	NCDOT
----------	--	------	-------

Minimum Standards for Office and Retail Uses in the B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) Zoning Districts:

- All zoning district regulations and development standards are the same as the previous B-1 and B-2 zoning districts. This was done to ensure that all existing uses would remain in compliance with the new B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) Zoning District.
- However, any development or redevelopment occurring after August 1, 2010 shall comply with MX development standards.

Additional Information:

- Adjacent Property Uses are as follows:
 - North: Parcels containing single family houses (R-40 and RCD zoning districts)
 - South: Highway 84 (Weddington Road) and parcels containing single family houses (R-40 and RCD zoning districts)
 - East: Weddington-Matthews Road and parcels containing single family houses (RCD zoning district)
 - West: NC 16 (Providence Road) and parcels containing single family houses (R-40 and RCD zoning districts)

Public Involvement Meetings for this rezoning were held on Monday, March 28 from 3:00-7:00pm at Weddington Town Hall. Comments from the attendees were positive and most came just for clarification purposes.

The Planning Board voted unanimously to give this rezoning a favorable recommendation. The Planning Board also stated that if it was determined that the two NCDOT owned properties were never zoned B-1 or B-2 they should not be rezoned. Further research has not indicated whether these parcels were zoned business or residential and should not be rezoned at this time.

Staff has reviewed the application and submitted documents and finds the B-1(CD) and B-2(CD) Rezoning Application is in compliance with the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.

The Town Council also received the following:

- Zoning Map Change Application dated March 1, 2011
- Aerial Map
- Zoning Map

With there being no one wishing to speak for or against the proposed rezoning, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

B. Public Hearing - Review and Consideration of Pet Grooming Text Amendment. Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider the pet grooming text amendment. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

Sec. 58-57.1. B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district.

The B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district is established to provide an orderly arrangement of convenience and comparison shopping outlets, along with adequate off-street parking and other amenities in accordance with the intent described in subsection 58-5(3)c. Development in a B-2(CD)

shopping center conditional district may only occur in accordance with the requirements for conditional zoning as outlined in section 58-271. Rezoning to a B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district shall only be applicable to areas designated for future business in the town's land use plan. Any development or redevelopment occurring after August 1, 2010 shall comply with MX development standards.

(1) *Permitted uses.*

a. *Essential services, classes I, II, III and IV.*

b. *Retail trade and services.*

1. All uses permitted in the B-1(CD) district.
2. Appliance and appliance repair stores.
3. Automobile parts supply stores.
4. Bakeries, retail.
5. Bicycle stores.
6. Catalog stores.
7. Clothing stores.
8. Delicatessen.
9. Floor covering, wallpaper, paint and window covering stores.
10. Furniture stores.
11. Music stores.
12. Notion and fabric shops.
13. Pet shop.
14. Photographic studios and camera supply stores.
15. Restaurants, excluding drive-in and fast-food.
16. Supermarkets.
17. Toy and hobby shops.
18. Small animal veterinary outpatient clinics.

19. Pet Grooming (not to include overnight boarding)

c. *Other conditional uses.*

1. Shopping centers having two or more individual uses. Uses in shopping centers shall be limited to those commercial, retail or office uses which are permitted and/or conditional in the B-1(CD) or B-2(CD) districts.
2. Service stations and convenience stores, provided that all bulk fuels are stored underground. Petroleum pumps and canopies must be located a minimum of 80 feet behind any street right-of-way line.
3. Telecommunication towers.

Town Planner Cook reviewed the proposed text change with the Town Council. He stated, "A tenant at the Weddington Corners Shopping Center asked for a pet grooming use that is currently not a permitted use in the B-2 Shopping Center District. The Town Council asked that this be added so that they would not risk losing a potential tenant."

With there being no one wishing to speak for or against the proposed text amendment, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

C. Public Hearing - Review and Consideration of R-40, R-40D, R-60, R-80, RCD, and RE Text Amendments. Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider text amendments to R-40, R-40D, R-60, R-80, R-CD and R-E. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

Current Text in R-80 and R-60:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with article III of this chapter. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in article III of this chapter:

Proposed Text in R-80 and R-60:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in Section 58-271:

Current Text in R-40:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with article III of this chapter:

Proposed Text in R-40:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in Section 58-271:

Current Text in R-CD:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted as conditional uses by the town council in accordance with article III of this chapter; provided, however, that no such uses shall be allowed within a conservation subdivision. The council shall address any additional review criteria for these land uses as may be contained in section 58-88:

o. Conservation subdivisions; provided, however, that conservation subdivisions that have a sketch plan approval as of the date of the adoption of the ordinance from which this section is derived will not be required to apply for a conditional use permit.

Proposed Text in R-CD:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271; provided, however, that no such uses shall be allowed within a conservation subdivision. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in Section 58-271. The council shall address any additional review criteria for these land uses as may be contained in section 58-88:

o. Conservation subdivisions.

Current Text in R-40D and RE:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with article III of this chapter:

Proposed Text in R-40D and RE:

(2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271:

Town Planner Cook reviewed the proposed text change with the Town Council. He stated, “At the Planning Retreat, the Town Council directed staff and the Planning Board to start the process of removing all conditional use permits in the residential zoning districts and replacing them with conditional zoning permits. This is the first step. We are going to have to comb through the ordinance and find every mention of conditional use permit.”

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - This is to use the legislative process on residential zoning. It does not change the Land Use Plan. It does not change the processes that we use to go through the modification of the Land Use Plan and then zoning?

Town Planner Cook advised that Mayor Pro Tem Barry was correct.

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

D. Public Hearing to Review and Consider Text Revisions to Town Land Use Plan. Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider text revisions to the Town Land Use Plan. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

III. GOALS AND POLICIES

Land Use Goals:

- Goal 1: To ensure that all new development takes place in a manner that conserves open space and scenic views.
- Goal 2: To limit development activities on environmentally sensitive lands.
- Goal 3: To preserve open space and scenic views, while providing opportunities for low-density development.
- Goal 4: To maintain the town’s strong single-family residential character.
- Goal 5: To retain a mix of land uses that reinforces Weddington’s unique small town character.
- Goal 6: To ensure that the type, location, and scale of existing and future commercial development in the Town provides essential goods and services for the residents of Weddington, and through the development process, preserves open space.
- Goal 7: Through the conditional **zoning** process, provide smaller lot sizes to accommodate a variety of age and income groups, and broader residential preferences, so that the community's population diversity may be enhanced.

Exhibit 1: Future Land Use Categories

Land Use	Description
Traditional Residential	This category applies to areas where most of the lots and parcels are less than six acres in area. Most of this area is platted and is, or will be zoned for 40,000 sq. ft. lots at a density of approximately 1 dwelling unit per acre, in accordance with the Town's current Residential (R) zoning regulations.
Conservation Residential	This category applies to the areas within the Town that are currently zoned R-40 and are six acres or greater in area. Most of this area has not been platted and the Town will allow for the creation of conventional or conservation subdivisions. Conventional subdivisions shall have minimum lot sizes of 40,000 square feet, plus be subject to a 10% open space requirement. Conservation subdivisions shall be subject to a conditional use permit zoning and allow for smaller lot sizes, yet retain a density of approximately one dwelling unit per 40,000 square feet.
Neighborhood Business	Existing commercially zoned parcels that lie in the vicinity of the "Town Center" or near the intersection of New Town Road and NC 16. This area is intended for neighborhood scale businesses that serve the needs of Weddington's residents.

Policy 13: Through the conditional **zoning** process, provide for alternative smaller lot sizes to accommodate a variety of age and income groups, which promotes community, residential, and population diversity.

Policy 14: Allowing alternative smaller lots to promote residential and population diversity in the community.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The following list of strategies should be reviewed and updated annually to reflect community accomplishments, new approaches to community issues, changing conditions, shifting priorities and new demands.

This list is not intended to be exhaustive or all inclusive -- the Town, County and other public and private entities will take numerous actions throughout the life of this plan to achieve the community's goals. This list of strategies is intended to identify those deemed to be of the highest priority that should be pursued by the Town over the next several years. The strategies shown are not listed in priority order as each, if implemented, will provide meaningful long-term benefit to the Town. Notwithstanding the

above, actual legislative decisions or implementation strategies made in the future in Weddington will be in the Town Council's discretion.

Strategy 1: Incorporate design standards into the zoning ordinance to ensure that non-residential developments are well designed and in harmony with neighboring land uses.

Strategy 2: Evaluate the creation of a new zoning classification to address the needs of areas of the Town where new residential development would not be appropriate.

Strategy 3: Amend the conditional use zoning review standards to require that the following be addressed on site development plans:

- a. Relationship of the proposed development to adjacent properties;
- b. Buffering, screening, and landscaping both within and around the development;
- c. Preservation of existing vegetation;
- d. Parking designs, landscaping and building layout;
- e. Access to and from the development and also within the development;
- f. The view from adjoining public roads;
- g. Architectural design;
- h. The impact of the additional traffic from the development on neighboring thoroughfares.

Strategy 4: Ensure that the Town's subdivision regulations require roads to be designed and constructed to meet North Carolina Department of Transportation (NC DOT) standards.

Strategy 5: Adopt access standards to preclude direct access from residential subdivision lots onto designated major or minor thoroughfares depicted on the Town's Thoroughfare Plan.

Strategy 6: Require subdivisions to provide individual lots access through internal subdivision roads.

Strategy 7: The Town should review its contract with the Union County Sheriff's Department on an annual basis to ensure that adequate police services continue to be provided.

Strategy 8: Allow conservation subdivision on large, unplatted parcels (i.e., subdivisions that retain R-40 housing yields but allow for smaller lot sizes), through the conditional ~~use~~ **zoning** process to preserve open space and scenic views.

Strategy 9: Require conditional **zoning** ~~use permits (CUP)~~ for all commercial development to ensure that it is compatible with the community character.

Strategy 10: Conduct an annual review of this Land Use Plan to monitor the Town's progress in achieving its goals.

Town Planner Cook reviewed the proposed text change with the Town Council. He stated, "This text change is related to the previous one. Since we started the process of taking out the conditional use permit language in our zoning code, we need to do the same thing in our Land use Plan."

With there being no one who wished to speak in favor or against the proposed text changes, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

E. Public Hearing – Review and Consideration of Proposed Text Amendments to Section 46-9 and 58-4 – LARTP. Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider proposed text amendments to Section 46-9 and 58-4. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

Section 46-9 Subdivisions

LARTP (Local Area Regional Transportation Plan) means the plan developed in collaboration with and adopted by the Village of Marvin, the Town of Waxhaw, the Town of Weddington, and the Village of Wesley Chapel. The provisions of the plan are intended to ensure: (a) an integrated system of roads that provides safe and efficient traffic circulation; (b) the efficient movement of through traffic by providing an interconnected system of roads; (c) uncomplicated road layouts so that emergency service personnel, public service personnel and visitors can find their way to and from destinations; and (d) controlled access to thoroughfares.

Section 46-9 Subdivisions

Thoroughfare, major, means a major thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time. The term "major thoroughfare" includes any other routes as designated by the town.

Thoroughfare, minor, means a minor thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time. The term "minor thoroughfare" includes any other routes as designated by the town.

Section 58-4 Zoning

LARTP (Local Area Regional Transportation Plan) means the plan developed in collaboration with and adopted by the Village of Marvin, the Town of Waxhaw, the Town of Weddington, and the Village of Wesley Chapel. The provisions of the plan are intended to ensure: (a) an integrated system of roads that provides safe and efficient traffic circulation; (b) the efficient movement of through traffic by providing an interconnected system of roads; (c) uncomplicated road layouts so that emergency service personnel, public service personnel and visitors can find their way to and from destinations; and (d) controlled access to thoroughfares.

Section 58-4 Zoning

Major thoroughfare means a thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time.

Minor thoroughfare means a thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time.

Town Planner Cook - This is a housekeeping item. The LARTP Plan has been adopted. This is adding the definition of LARTP to the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances and we also referenced the LARTP in our minor and major thoroughfare definitions. We needed to reference the definition in our code.

With there being no one wishing to speak in favor or against the proposed text change, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

F. Public Hearing - Review and Consideration of Town Monument Signs Text Amendment. Mayor Anderson opened the public hearing to consider the Town Monument signs text amendment. The Town Council received a copy of the following proposed text change:

Sec. 58-145. Signs permitted without permit.

The following signs shall not require a permit:

- (1) Signs required to be posted by law, signs established by governmental agencies, "Warning" signs and "No Trespassing" signs, **Town monuments** and historical markers placed by a governmental agency or a recognized historical society. Historical markers shall not exceed six square feet in area, exclusive of the support structure. **Town monuments shall not exceed fourteen feet in height.** Private unofficial traffic signs indicating directions, entrances, or exits, also shall not require a permit.
- (2) One sign, including a professional name plate, per dwelling unit, denoting the name of the occupant, not to exceed 1 1/2 square feet in area.
- (3) All political signs; provided that such signs shall be placed no sooner than 60 days prior to the date of election being advertised and shall be removed by the candidates within ten days after the election.
- (4) One sign advertising real estate or incidental items "for sale," "for rent," or "for lease," not greater than six square feet in area, located upon property so advertised or property where such incidental items are being sold. Any such sign advertising property for sale shall be removed within seven days after the property has been sold (upon closing), rented or leased. Any signs erected pursuant to this provision must not violate section 58-146(6). Any signs advertising real estate subdivisions shall be limited to one sign no greater than six square feet in area located at the entrance of the subdivision.
- (5) A sign advertising the sale of produce on the premises where the produce is being sold and grown shall be no more than ten square feet per side.
- (6) Any sign in town, deemed by the zoning administrator to be in need of repair, shall be renovated within 30 days by the owner upon receipt of written notification.
- (7) Temporary signs erected by homeowners' associations or neighborhood associations which are not greater than six square feet in area and which are located upon property

owned by the homeowners' association at the entrance to the subdivision for a maximum of five days.

Town Planner Cook reviewed the proposed text change with the Town Council. He stated, "We wanted to add Town monuments to Signs Permitted without a Permit. We wanted to make sure that the Town monuments that the Town is going to erect actually comply with the code."

With there being no one wishing to speak in favor or against the proposed text change, Mayor Anderson closed the public hearing.

Item No. 5. Public Comment. Ms. Barbara Harrison presented pictures to the Town Council. She stated, "On April 12, 2010, under New Business there was discussion and presentation of a Residential Burning Ordinance. One year later and this is still not resolved. The Town Council needs to have an ordinance that deals with the consequences of not following already established ordinances and laws. This is not about neighbors who cannot get along or about 80% of the residents that burn in this Town. It is about 20% who carelessly and recklessly endanger themselves and others by burning all kinds of trash when it is windy and late at night. The picture before you is a good example. What the picture shows is a lounge chair on top of a trash bin. When I went back to get the mailbox number, what was left of the chair were springs. At 10:00 at night I have driven by and flames are shooting up and several weeks later I drove by and there was Providence VFD at the same place putting a fire out which had spread into the woods and out into the lawn. The Union County Deputies and the Fire Chiefs need to have the authority to be able to fine people who are careless and reckless. What is it going to take - a home destroyed or a life taken before we can resolve this? This item has come up in total five times last year and two times this year. I am asking that you either put it to bed or you come up with an ordinance that has consequences for burning items that are not supposed to be."

Mr. Paul Johnson gave a PowerPoint Presentation. He stated, "I am with Airborne Development at Lochaven. I am sure you remember that I have had issues with the dam at Lochaven. I wanted to take a quick moment to inform the Town Council of the continued degradation of the dam and its current condition as it relates to public safety. The new developments since 2009 are that the condition of the dam is much worse. I have tried to post the signs as the Board had recommended for the public but the neighbors are removing the signs. There is quite a bit of contention down there. I put up the signs - they take them down. The folks that are taking them down are aware of the public danger down there but unfortunately when they take them down and throw them in the lake the general public that come down that road do not really know. As of right now, they have begun to pave the portion of the road that is maintained by NCDOT. I am requesting that the Town take another look at that. I know that there is already a stance but I have done everything within my power to protect the public and I am not able to do so. I have a few pictures here - this is the first attempt to warn people. That is a yellow caution flag. They took that down. This is a plastic chain and a sign. That was taken down by a resident. One of the residents put on there that I do not have the authority to do that and that I needed to get authority from the Town. The perception down there is that the Town is the only one that can do anything about it. I posted a letter that I was given by the Natural Resources and Environmental which recommended that I do that. This is the sink hole that has developed in the center of the dam. There is evidence of honeycombing inside of the dam. Right now there is no warning there."

Item No. 6. Approval of Minutes.

A. March 28, 2011 Special Town Council Meeting. Councilmember McKee moved to approve the March 28, 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. 7. Consent Agenda.

A. Call for Public Hearing - Review and Consideration of Freestanding/Ground Text Amendment (Public Hearing to be held May 9, 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 the freestanding/ground text amendment. The public hearing is to be held May 9, 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

B. Consideration of Renewal of Bromley Construction Trailer. The Town Council received a copy of the following memo from Town Planner Cook, a copy of the Application for Temporary Placement of a Mobile Home, Construction Trailer or Temporary Building and a copy of the Plot Plan:

PDH, LLC requests an extension for a temporary construction trailer located on Lot 121 in the Bromley Subdivision. The address of Lot 121 is 6067 Hemby Road, Weddington, NC 28104.

The Town Council issued a one year renewal for the sales trailer in the Bromley Subdivision at the March 8, 2010 Town Council meeting.

General Information

- A renewal for the temporary sales office is required per *Section 58-13 (4) of the Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- The applicant is required to apply for a renewal every year (12 months).
- The first permit was approved by Town Staff in 2007 for a one year period. In 2008 Town Staff gave a one year extension.
- 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 Bromley Subdivision currently has 103 lots remaining, therefore complying with the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.

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 approve the renewal of the Bromley Construction Trailer. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

C. Consideration of Proclamation Proclaiming April as Child Abuse and Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve Proclamation P-2011-03:

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
PROCLAMATION PROCLAIMING APRIL AS
CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH AND**

**SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH
P-2011-03**

WHEREAS, preventing child abuse and neglect, and sexual violence is a community problem affecting both the current and future quality of life of a community;

WHEREAS, Union County Department of Social Services accepted 1,811 reports of child abuse representing over 4,101 children in 2010;

WHEREAS, Of the 1,000 victims and family members were served at United Family Services' through Victim and Clinical Services during 2010;

WHEREAS, 97% of the children served by the Tree House Children's Advocacy Center were sexually abused by a relative or other known person and 24% of the children served were sexually abused by other children in 2010;

WHEREAS, 73% of sexual assault victims were under the age of 18; 54% of children served were under the age of 13; 17% were under the age of 5.

WHEREAS, child abuse and neglect not only cause immediate harm to children, but are also proven to increase the likelihood of criminal behavior, substance abuse, health problems, and risky behavior thereby increasing the cost of community support services;

WHEREAS, all citizens should be protected from sexual and physical violence;

WHEREAS, United Family Services; Victim and Clinical Services programs succeed because of partnerships created among social service agencies, schools, faith communities, civic organizations, law enforcement agencies, and all members of Union County;

THEREFORE, I do hereby proclaim April as Child Abuse Prevention Month and Sexual Assault Awareness Month and call upon all citizens, community agencies, faith groups, medical facilities, elected leaders and businesses to increase their participation in efforts to support families, thereby preventing child abuse and sexual violence and strengthening the communities in which we live.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

Item No. 8. Consideration of Public Hearings.

A. Consideration of Rezoning of All B-1 and B-2 Parcels to B-1 (Conditional District) and B-2 (Conditional District). Councilmember McKee moved to rezone all B-1 and B-2 Parcels to B-2 CD and B-2 CD. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

B. Consideration of Ordinance Adopting Pet Grooming Text Amendment. Councilmember McKee moved to adopt Ordinance O-2011-04:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 58-57.1
OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
O-2011-04**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTION 58-57.1 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Sec. 58-57.1. B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district.

The B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district is established to provide an orderly arrangement of convenience and comparison shopping outlets, along with adequate off-street parking and other amenities in accordance with the intent described in subsection 58-5(3)c. Development in a B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district may only occur in accordance with the requirements for conditional zoning as outlined in section 58-271. Rezoning to a B-2(CD) shopping center conditional district shall only be applicable to areas designated for future business in the town's land use plan. Any development or redevelopment occurring after August 1, 2010 shall comply with MX development standards.

(1) *Permitted uses.*

a. *Essential services, classes I, II, III and IV.*

b. *Retail trade and services.*

1. All uses permitted in the B-1(CD) district.
2. Appliance and appliance repair stores.
3. Automobile parts supply stores.
4. Bakeries, retail.
5. Bicycle stores.
6. Catalog stores.
7. Clothing stores.
8. Delicatessen.
9. Floor covering, wallpaper, paint and window covering stores.
10. Furniture stores.
11. Music stores.
12. Notion and fabric shops.
13. Pet shop.
14. Photographic studios and camera supply stores.
15. Restaurants, excluding drive-in and fast-food.
16. Supermarkets.
17. Toy and hobby shops.
18. Small animal veterinary outpatient clinics.

19. Pet Grooming (not to include overnight boarding)

c. *Other conditional uses.*

1. Shopping centers having two or more individual uses. Uses in shopping centers shall be limited to those commercial, retail or office uses which are permitted and/or conditional in the B-1(CD) or B-2(CD) districts.
2. Service stations and convenience stores, provided that all bulk fuels are stored underground. Petroleum pumps and canopies must be located a minimum of 80 feet behind any street right-of-way line.
3. Telecommunication towers.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

C. Consideration of Ordinance Adopting Text Amendments to R-40, R-40D, R-60, R-80, RCD, and RE. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to adopt Ordinance O-2011-06:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 58-52, 58-53,
58-54, 58-55, 58-58 AND 58-59
OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
O-2011-06**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTIONS 58-52, 58-53, 58-54, 58-55, 58-58 AND 58-59 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Sections 58-52 and 58-53

Replace Text in R-80 and R-60:

- (3) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in Section 58-271:

Section 58-54

Replace Text in R-40:

- (2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in Section 58-271:

Section 58-58

Replace Text in R-CD:

- (2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271; provided, however, that no such uses shall be allowed within a conservation subdivision. The council shall address review criteria for each use which is contained in Section 58-271. The council shall address any additional review criteria for these land uses as may be contained in section 58-88:

o. Conservation subdivisions.

Sections 58-55 and 58-59

Replace Text in R-40D and RE:

- (2) *Conditional uses.* The following uses may be permitted by the town council in accordance with Section 58-271:

Adopted this 11th day of April, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

D. Consideration of Adopting Text Revisions to the Town Land Use Plan. Councilmember Thomisser moved to adopt Ordinance O-2011-08:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE
LAND USE PLAN
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
O-2011-08**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT THE LAND USE PLAN BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Land Use Goals:

- Goal 8: To ensure that all new development takes place in a manner that conserves open space and scenic views.
- Goal 9: To limit development activities on environmentally sensitive lands.
- Goal 10: To preserve open space and scenic views, while providing opportunities for low-density development.
- Goal 11: To maintain the town's strong single-family residential character.
- Goal 12: To retain a mix of land uses that reinforces Weddington's unique small town character.
- Goal 13: To ensure that the type, location, and scale of existing and future commercial development in the Town provides essential goods and services for the residents of Weddington, and through the development process, preserves open space.
- Goal 14: Through the conditional **zoning** process, provide smaller lot sizes to accommodate a variety of age and income groups, and broader residential preferences, so that the community's population diversity may be enhanced.

Exhibit 1: Future Land Use Categories

Land Use	Description
Traditional Residential	This category applies to areas where most of the lots and parcels are less than six acres in area. Most of this area is platted and is, or will be zoned for 40,000 sq. ft. lots at a density of approximately 1 dwelling unit per acre, in accordance with the Town's current Residential (R) zoning regulations.

Conservation Residential	This category applies to the areas within the Town that are currently zoned R-40 and are six acres or greater in area. Most of this area has not been platted and the Town will allow for the creation of conventional or conservation subdivisions. Conventional subdivisions shall have minimum lot sizes of 40,000 square feet, plus be subject to a 10% open space requirement. Conservation subdivisions shall be subject to a conditional use permit zoning and allow for smaller lot sizes, yet retain a density of approximately one dwelling unit per 40,000 square feet.
Neighborhood Business	Existing commercially zoned parcels that lie in the vicinity of the “Town Center” or near the intersection of New Town Road and NC 16. This area is intended for neighborhood scale businesses that serve the needs of Weddington’s residents.

Policy 13: Through the conditional **zoning** process, provide for alternative smaller lot sizes to accommodate a variety of age and income groups, which promotes community, residential, and population diversity.

Policy 14: Allowing alternative smaller lots to promote residential and population diversity in the community.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The following list of strategies should be reviewed and updated annually to reflect community accomplishments, new approaches to community issues, changing conditions, shifting priorities and new demands.

This list is not intended to be exhaustive or all inclusive -- the Town, County and other public and private entities will take numerous actions throughout the life of this plan to achieve the community’s goals. This list of strategies is intended to identify those deemed to be of the highest priority that should be pursued by the Town over the next several years. The strategies shown are not listed in priority order as each, if implemented, will provide meaningful long-term benefit to the Town. Notwithstanding the above, actual legislative decisions or implementation strategies made in the future in Weddington will be in the Town Council’s discretion.

Strategy 3: Incorporate design standards into the zoning ordinance to ensure that non-residential developments are well designed and in harmony with neighboring land uses.

Strategy 4: Evaluate the creation of a new zoning classification to address the needs of areas of the Town where new residential development would not be appropriate.

Strategy 3: Amend the conditional use zoning review standards to require that the following be addressed on site development plans:

- a. Relationship of the proposed development to adjacent properties;
- b. Buffering, screening, and landscaping both within and around the development;
- c. Preservation of existing vegetation;
- d. Parking designs, landscaping and building layout;
- e. Access to and from the development and also within the development;
- f. The view from adjoining public roads;
- g. Architectural design;
- h. The impact of the additional traffic from the development on neighboring thoroughfares.

Strategy 4: Ensure that the Town's subdivision regulations require roads to be designed and constructed to meet North Carolina Department of Transportation (NC DOT) standards.

Strategy 5: Adopt access standards to preclude direct access from residential subdivision lots onto designated major or minor thoroughfares depicted on the Town's Thoroughfare Plan.

Strategy 6: Require subdivisions to provide individual lots access through internal subdivision roads.

Strategy 7: The Town should review its contract with the Union County Sheriff's Department on an annual basis to ensure that adequate police services continue to be provided.

Strategy 8: Allow conservation subdivision on large, unplatted parcels (i.e., subdivisions that retain R-40 housing yields but allow for smaller lot sizes), through the conditional ~~use~~ **zoning** process to preserve open space and scenic views.

Strategy 9: Require conditional **zoning** ~~use permits (CUP)~~ for all commercial development to ensure that it is compatible with the community character.

Strategy 10: Conduct an annual review of this Land Use Plan to monitor the Town's progress in achieving its goals.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

E. Consideration of Ordinance Adopting Text Amendments to Section 46-9 and 58-4 – LARTP.
Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to adopt Ordinance O-2011-07:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 46-9 AND 58-4

**OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
O-2011-07**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTIONS 46-9 AND 58-4 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Section 46-9 Subdivisions

LARTP (Local Area Regional Transportation Plan) means the plan developed in collaboration with and adopted by the Village of Marvin, the Town of Waxhaw, the Town of Weddington, and the Village of Wesley Chapel. The provisions of the plan are intended to ensure: (a) an integrated system of roads that provides safe and efficient traffic circulation; (b) the efficient movement of through traffic by providing an interconnected system of roads; (c) uncomplicated road layouts so that emergency service personnel, public service personnel and visitors can find their way to and from destinations; and (d) controlled access to thoroughfares.

Section 46-9 Subdivisions

Thoroughfare, major, means a major thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time. The term "major thoroughfare" includes any other routes as designated by the town.

Thoroughfare, minor, means a minor thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time. The term "minor thoroughfare" includes any other routes as designated by the town.

Section 58-4 Zoning

LARTP (Local Area Regional Transportation Plan) means the plan developed in collaboration with and adopted by the Village of Marvin, the Town of Waxhaw, the Town of Weddington, and the Village of Wesley Chapel. The provisions of the plan are intended to ensure: (a) an integrated system of roads that provides safe and efficient traffic circulation; (b) the efficient movement of through traffic by providing an interconnected system of roads; (c) uncomplicated road layouts so that emergency service personnel, public service personnel and visitors can find their way to and from destinations; and (d) controlled access to thoroughfares.

Section 58-4 Zoning

Major thoroughfare means a thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time.

Minor thoroughfare means a thoroughfare as designated by the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Thoroughfare Plan or Local Area Regional Transportation Plan (LARTP) and adopted by the town, as amended from time to time.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

F. Consideration of Ordinance Adopting the Town Monument Signs Text Amendment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve Ordinance O-2011-05:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 58-145
OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
O-2011-05**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTION 58-145 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Sec. 58-145. Signs permitted without permit.

The following signs shall not require a permit:

- (1) Signs required to be posted by law, signs established by governmental agencies, "Warning" signs and "No Trespassing" signs, **Town monuments** and historical markers placed by a governmental agency or a recognized historical society. Historical markers shall not exceed six square feet in area, exclusive of the support structure. **Town monuments shall not exceed fourteen feet in height.** Private unofficial traffic signs indicating directions, entrances, or exits, also shall not require a permit.
- (2) One sign, including a professional name plate, per dwelling unit, denoting the name of the occupant, not to exceed 1 1/2 square feet in area.
- (3) All political signs; provided that such signs shall be placed no sooner than 60 days prior to the date of election being advertised and shall be removed by the candidates within ten days after the election.
- (4) One sign advertising real estate or incidental items "for sale," "for rent," or "for lease," not greater than six square feet in area, located upon property so advertised or property where such incidental items are being sold. Any such sign advertising property for sale shall be removed within seven days after the property has been sold (upon closing), rented or leased. Any signs erected pursuant to this provision must not violate section 58-146(6). Any signs advertising real estate subdivisions shall be limited to one sign no greater than six square feet in area located at the entrance of the subdivision.
- (5) A sign advertising the sale of produce on the premises where the produce is being sold and grown shall be no more than ten square feet per side.
- (6) Any sign in town, deemed by the zoning administrator to be in need of repair, shall be renovated within 30 days by the owner upon receipt of written notification.
- (7) Temporary signs erected by homeowners' associations or neighborhood associations which are not greater than six square feet in area and which are located upon property

owned by the homeowners' association at the entrance to the subdivision for a maximum of five days.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 2011.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

Item No. 9. Old Business.

A. Review of Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. Finance Officer Gaylord reviewed the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 with the Town Council. She stated, “You have in your packet the most current version of the budget that we talked about at the retreat. The last page is the key page where I put in the items that you had agreed to put in the budget with amounts and you can see how they would play out. We just got a quote on the median maintenance today which is about \$24,000. We are still waiting on a quote for technology for Council. That would leave us in the negative \$375,000.”

Councilmember McKee discussed the medians maintenance quote prepared by Daryl’s Lawn Care and questioned whether the Council wanted to pursue.

Town Planner Cook advised the Council of an email he received from NCDOT on how they plan to maintain the plantings for one year to make sure that they are established.

Mayor Anderson – When NCDOT mows, it is only four times a year and it is with a bush hog. When we asked for as much grass as we could get, we knew we would have to do the mowing.

Councilmember Thomisser - We are spending a considerable amount of money on streetlights for the Downtown Area. It would not look good if we had tall grass. I think it is necessary to do this.

Council asked that staff contact NCDOT to see what they will reimburse the Town for mowing. Finance Officer Gaylord will send out an email to Council to schedule a date for the next Budget Work Session.

Councilmember McKee asked that Finance Officer Gaylord draft a policy on payments being made to vendors and regarding advance payments being made. He asked that the policy give the Town Council the ability to provide input before any advance payments were made.

Item No. 10. New Business.

A. Discussion and Consideration of Retaining Consultant to Identify and Evaluate Potential Sites for a Regional Library. The Town Council received a copy of a Proposal for Site Acquisition and Development Services from The Moser Group, Inc. dated April 11, 2011. Mr. Dennis Moser reviewed the proposal with the Town Council. He stated, “Task 1 involves identifying the potential parcels. After each task, we will come back to the Town Council and we will not move forward with the next task until we get your approval in writing to move to the next area. If we get to Task 1 and you decide this is as far as you want to go, then we are done. First, we meet with potential landowners to make the first cut on who is or is not interested in proceeding. We secure contracts that are going to survive this entire process. We are looking at 12 weeks for Task 1 – 12 weeks for Task 2 – 4 weeks for Task 3, 6 weeks for Task 4 and eight weeks for Task 5. We are going to look at this being part of a potentially larger site that would have the opportunity to share some infrastructure. You do not pay us until we complete the task to your satisfaction.”

Attorney Fox - If you get to Task 5 and you go through an RFP process, one component is that the selected developer under that process would have a commitment to reimburse the Town for the expenses that are incurred in going through this process.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - If you go out and survey the market place for parcels that would be willing to participate in this type of endeavor and the Council decides that none of the those parcels seem to fit in our grand scheme, then we could walk away at that point. What happens to those option contracts that you execute?

Mr. Moser – They go away.

The following items were discussed in the proposal:

- Town’s vision for a regional library and park.
- Town desires to define a group of properties that could be used as a regional library site and public park.
- Town’s desire to assess all reasonable property groupings that meet certain defined parameters; identify the best available property and create a conceptual site plan that is unique to the Town’s character and charm.

Tasks:

- Define and Secure Contracts for Potential Sites
- Technical Evaluation of Site Groupings
- Presentation of Findings and Recommendations
- Develop a Conceptual Site Plan for the Selected Property
- Assist the Town of Weddington with Preparation of an RFP Package for the Development

Number of Site Groupings	Fee
1 Site	\$58,500
2 Sites	\$67,000
3 Sites	\$75,500
4 Sites	\$84,000

The Town Council was also presented a letter from Mr. Gerald Haymond dated April 11, 2011 regarding a proposal for Site Acquisition and Development for a Proposed Town Park and Library. The letter advised that Haymond Properties is active in the real estate business and over the years has specialized in the sale and acquisition of small to large land parcels. Mr. Haymond stated, in the letter, “As a long time Weddington resident, I recognize and concur with the need for both a park and a library. I would like to offer my services to the Town of Weddington as follows:”

- Locate suitable tracts of land for this purpose
- Determine through professional review suitability of said parcels
- Present findings to the Mayor and Town Council to assess suitability
- Negotiate a Purchase Contract on behalf of the Town of Weddington. An effort will be made to secure property by way of donation to the Town.
- Upon obtaining an acceptable property, I will recommend three site engineers/developers to present final plans, building costs, acceptable to the Mayor and Town Council. All building and engineering costs will be paid by the Town of Weddington and/or Union County.

Total Haymond Fees – None

A “Thank You” to Gerald Haymond and/or Haymond Properties, LLC in the Town of Weddington monthly bulletin.

Councilmember McKee moved to proceed with the proposal from The Moser Group to identify and evaluate potential sites for a Regional Library.

Councilmember Thomisser - No one supports a library more than I do. We are supposed to meet with the Union County Board of Commissioners some time in May. They have a 14 million dollar deficit which they have to bring down to balance the budget. We are currently looking at another option for a library. The concern that I have is that we go out and get a vacant piece of land donated to the Town and then Union County does not have the capability of building a library. Then we are sitting there looking at a vacant piece of land for 10 years. I would feel much more comfortable if we had a meeting with the Commissioners for them to give us some indication what they can do for us. We have received a proposal from another organization. I do not have a problem with this but I would like the Council to consider deferring this for 90 days to give us more time to gather more information.

Mayor Anderson – I did talk with Councilmember Gilmartin. He is not here. He said that he would be available on Friday for a Special Meeting if we wanted to defer it but he also acknowledged that he is not here tonight.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - I think we have individually spoken with Mr. Moser on the project. The passion that this Council has shown towards trying to get a library built forced a conversation to the table that we were not prepared to have which is, “What kind of development could go along side a library that would facilitate the construction of a library sooner rather than later?” I think this facilitates the first part of that conversation without which we do not get to the second part of the conversation which is with the County and their willingness to continue funding the project. Their proposal gives us the ability to walk away.

Councilmember McKee – It has already been my impression with all of the conversations from members of this Council and the public that a large percentage of Weddington residents based on past surveys want a library - so to me this makes sense to move forward. If we want to have a library and a Town park which is part of this endeavor and we want the County to place the library in the Weddington area, we need to take them something that says this is what Weddington proposes. If we table this for 90 days and in May we come to the County Commissioners all we can say is, “We would like to have a library in Weddington – what are you going to do for us?” We are not the only ones that want a library. If we want to get a library in Weddington, we need to make the first step.

Councilmember Thomisser – I totally agree with what you said. But why cannot we wait for 90 days to gather more information?

Mayor Anderson – They are going to gather the information for us.

Councilmember Thomisser – Nothing is for free. If we are successful in getting this land donated, we are going to have to give something up for that.

Mayor Anderson – We have tried this on our own before and we were not successful.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmember McKee and Mayor Pro Tem Barry

NAYS: Councilmember Thomisser

B. Discussion and Consideration of Funding for 2011 Weddstock. Mayor Anderson advised that she had put this item on the agenda. She stated, "If we wait until we get an approved budget, then it is too late for the committee to start working on the festival."

Ms. Stephanie Belcher – We are stuck in a bad timing situation. When they asked for money last year, it was after last year's budget. When we agreed that this was a good thing and that we should pursue it again, you had already approved this year's budget. We are caught in a bad cycle of timing. We need to think about 2012 as well as 2011.

Councilmember Thomisser – I attended every single one of the Weddstock events last year. I am sold on the event. One of my concerns that I brought up last year was the name of the event. I lived through the 1960's and 1970's and what went on in New York State and I am concerned about calling the event a name similar to Woodstock. Has anyone given any thought to renaming this event Weddington Festival instead of Weddstock?

Mayor Anderson – We can take that up with the Committee.

Attorney Fox – You can certainly bring up that the name be revisited as a part of your discussion. You can put it in your motion – you can put it as a point of discussion as a communication to the organizers that they consider that. It seems like that was raised before.

Councilmember McKee – I have had the same input as Councilmember Thomisser. I support the event. I would like it to be called Weddington Festival that way when it is advertised that the name Weddington is out there.

Ms. Belcher – I know that they were looking for something catchy.

Councilmember McKee – It caught the wrong impression.

Ms. Belcher – I am sure that the committee can come up with something equally catchy that is acceptable.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve \$20,000 for the 2011 Weddington Festival.

Finance Officer Gaylord - At the retreat it was not to exceed \$20,000 and only if they did not get the sponsorships to cover that much and the desire would be to give less.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - That is accurate. If it is less, we would reap the benefits before everyone else will.

Councilmember McKee – I would request a friendly amendment that the name to be changed to something other than Weddstock that has the name Weddington in it.

Attorney Fox – It is in your discretion. An outside agency seeking funding - you can establish reasonable conditions on that motion.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - I do not know that it has to say Weddington in it.

Ms. Belcher - It could say WeddFest.

Councilmember McKee – The name should be more appropriate for Weddington.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - That is fine.

Attorney Fox – The motion as I understand it is to approve funding for a festival to held in August which was formally known as Weddstock. The funding being conditioned upon a name that is more appropriate in keeping with the Weddington community and the funding is up to \$20,000 provided that if sponsorships come in at an amount greater than anticipated that Weddington would receive the benefit of those sponsors such that the amount would be less.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

C. Discussion and Consideration of Funding Providence VFD Maintenance and Repairs to Fire Station.

Mayor Anderson - We received a briefing at our retreat about improvements that need to be made at the Providence VFD Fire Station. We have two issues – the operation costs and the costs for the building improvements. The building was built in 1985 and at that time it was up to code. I have spoken with the Fire Marshall today. We changed the occupancy of the building when we asked our Fire Department to provide overnight fire service. When we asked for that change we changed the purpose of the building. Our Fire Department is violating the fire code. We are at risk of being cited because it is out in the public domain that we are against fire code.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – My understanding is that the renovation of the building to code only has to occur once you start renovating the building.

Mayor Anderson – That is not true. You may not do part of the code - you do not get to pick the part. It all has to be upgraded once you start. The violation started to occur when we wanted them to spend the night.

Councilmember Thomisser – We are looking at two different issues. We will be looking at funding for three firefighters 24 hours a day x 7 days a week. This year the Town subsidized to the tune of \$215,000. Because we now have to put a day time paid fire fighter to work at night, I would assume that the subsidy would probably increase from the \$215,000. That is one concern that I have. I think that we have to have that as part of providing good fire service for the Town. The second part of this equation is the \$450,000 for the station upgrade. If you add those two numbers together saying that \$300,000 for the firefighters and another \$450,000 we are looking at \$750,000 and our budget is \$1.5 million. I have some concerns about the total amount. I did have an opportunity to talk with someone who is in the commercial building business this afternoon. What we are looking at with the \$450,000 is to put the sprinkler system in the fire house, to put a fire wall and to rearrange the staircase in the event of a fire so we would not be putting our firefighters in harms way. I was told that every time you renovate an old building you run into things. There is a certain amount that you see but there is a whole lot more that you do not see. This fire station has two levels – once you start making changes the code says that you have to have handicap capability to come downstairs. We may have to put an elevator in that building. I am concerned about the hidden costs that we are not looking at. I would like to explore an alternative way to look at this so that our firefighters would not be in harms way and yet we would provide adequate sleeping facilities for them.

Mayor Anderson – As long as the offices where the public needs to get to are downstairs, clearly we are not going to have a firefighter that is in a wheelchair going to fight fires.

Councilmember Thomisser – I was told the code was the code.

Mayor Anderson – We will let the Building Inspector hammer that out.

Councilmember McKee – Can our funds be traced on their financial statements?

Finance Officer Gaylord – On their financial statements they have a line item for Weddington donations for salaries. Our money goes to salary and training and they have a section in their financial statements for salary and training.

Councilmember McKee – On the capital improvement portion, I would like to see the building be inspected by the Union County Fire Marshal with recommendations. If we are going to fund the renovations, I think the fire wall, staircase and sprinklers need to be bid out to at least three bidders and those bids be brought to the Town of Weddington to be approved for dispersing the funds for the repairs. I also want to see if it would be feasible to have sleeping arrangements outside of the building. Someone I know renovates doublewide trailers and we could probably get one completely renovated in the \$30,000 range. All you would have to do is upgrade it for a sprinkler. Let's look at this and explore all of the alternatives. I do not want people to get the impression that members of the Council do not want to fund the Providence VFD. That is far from the case. We are dispersing tax payer money and transparency is very critical when we do things like this. It is very important that we have as much information as we can and we do this as economically feasible as we can. It ties the Town's hand to do other things the citizens of Weddington would like to get done. I am not against the Providence VFD. I want other alternatives that we can come up with that are economically feasible.

Mayor Anderson – Councilmember McKee is speaking for the whole Council when he says that you have the support of the Council and the gratitude for what you do. You were talking about getting the work bid out. What they showed us at the retreat was a thumbnail sketch and they do not have architectural drawings. Do you want the Council to help pay for that?

Mr. Jack Parks – I am Vice President of the Board of Directors for the Providence VFD. The fire station was designed in the 1982/1983 time frame. There was some concern about how it was built even at that time. The thing that has changed dramatically from that time frame to present day is the intended use of the building. The building was never designed to have dormitories/accommodations for people sleeping in the facility and by today's standards it is not designed to have people occupying office space even without the fire wall separating the apparatus bay from the rest of the building. The Fire Marshal is aware of our situation. He came to our department. We had a budget meeting and we discussed what our budget needs were. We are currently in the process of getting a meeting with the County Manager to discuss what our financial needs are. We are trying to get as much money as we possibly can get. What we submitted to you in the form of those plans was a result of the feasibility study that you asked us to have done by an architect. They are the ones that pointed out some of the problems that we have. They gave us two proposals – one is alterations to the building to take care of the safety issues that we currently have and we need to address and the other is to prepare the station to serve for another 20 to 30 years which is the additions to the building. The idea of placing a modular building outside of the station has come up in the fire department. As you know we have a metal building in the back of the facility. There are plans to remove a fire truck that is being stored there. We actually have asked the architect to look at the possibility of moving that building forward. His initial reaction to that was that it would probably cost more money to tear it down, pour a new pad and move it than it would be to build a new building. I have also asked about the possibility of a modular building. If we had to sprinkle a modular building, sprinkling would cost far more than the building. We have gotten one estimate of sprinkling of the building - it was over \$80,000 to sprinkle our existing building of which \$30,000 of that was the underground portion to tap into the water main and bring that water main into the facility itself. That is

what you run into with those types of expenditures. That is money you could never recover once you decide to do something else.

Mayor Anderson – We may need to have a conversation with our Zoning Administrator to see if our code would allow you to put anything there.

Councilmember Thomisser – Last week Councilmember McKee and I went down to talk with the Fire Commission about other subjects and at the end of that meeting we did speak with the Fire Marshal. We are thinking outside of the box and we ran it past him. He did not have any opposition to it. The only thing he said was we have to put a sprinkler system in the modular with some type of alarm.

Mr. Parks – Of the \$80,000 for the sprinkling of the building, \$30,000 of it was the underground portion for bringing the water line in and \$20,000 was for the alarm system. Because it is a commercial building, there are different requirements than for a residential building.

Councilmember Thomisser – Would you agree if it was \$100,000, it would be less than \$450,000?

Mr. Parks – Yes it would be but that does not solve the problem going forward. The architect has recommended that the building be added on for future needs. To add on to the building was \$1.5 million. If you were to put another building behind the current station we probably would not have septic capacity to take care of that because we would be adding onto it. We are at the maximum limit of that septic system right now.

Mayor Anderson – At one point there was Homeland Security money out there for upgrading fire stations. Has anyone looked at grant money?

They answered not at this time.

Councilmember Thomisser – There has been a lot of discussion about the fire station built at Wesley Chapel and whether it was necessary to spend that kind of money. The station built at New Town Road and Providence Road – it was built several years ago at a cost of approximately \$3 million. Feels like investing money on a 20 year old car. What is the next thing that is going to happen to it? I am thinking about the future and a new fire station rather than trying to putting a band aid on a 20+ year old building.

Mr. Parks – According to the architect based on evaluation of the building, I do not think we need a new station. At one time, that was the best fire department in the State when it was built. Time goes on and it is time to make some improvements and alterations. The apparatus area is fine. We have certain code requirements that we would like to meet for our life safety requirements and we do have some additional needs down the road. I do not think we need a new facility.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – I think that you have the support of the Town Council. You and I met with Walker Davidson and vetted through this. The challenge that we have is accessing where you are today and understanding that that is the right number. You could build a nice house for \$450,000 and you do not even have your overruns in here yet because you have not opened up the walls to see what the mess is.

Mr. Parks – We have asked the architect and an engineering firm to come back to us with a proposal to do the engineering and architectural work that would allow us to obtain bids through engineered drawings, bid specifications and bid documents. We have asked for a proposal. We have not agreed to pay anything. It does not cost anything to get the proposal. They are providing professional services. I expect that proposal by next week. When we get the proposal, we will report back to you on what they have told us.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – I think we are discussing bad news versus horrible news. The horror is if in several days someone dies in the building. None of us likes the issue that you have come to us with. We understand we have to get the fire department fixed. We are looking at how we get you to where you need to go. You have to help us have confidence that the bid process that you are going to use is going to be transparent enough that we are driving the costs down and as efficient with the costs as we can possibly be if it were your own house. The Providence VFD is in the perfect location. Whatever the future of the Providence VFD is, there is still going to be a building providing fire service to Western Union County at that location. What do you need from us to help you get started?

Mr. Parks – We do not have the \$450,000. We could pay the architect to do the design work. You are well aware of our funding issues.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – I would be happy to reimburse you the architect fees once you get that bill. We are not going to write a check to the fire department for \$450,000 and you tell us when the open house is. I would like you to come to us with what your processes are going to be and architect and engineer estimates are going to be.

Mr. Parks – The architect has told us to expect approximately \$450,000 to complete the renovations. We have asked him to provide us with a proposal which I am expecting within the next 10 days. When I get that I can bring that to you to let you know what the professional services are going to be to provide the drawings, specifications and bid drawings to go forward with this project.

Councilmember McKee – We need to see where the merger is going and what the steps are because I do not think Providence can survive standing alone like they are with their shrinking coverage area and the expenses that they are incurring for such a small area. I think we need to invite the parties that are doing the negotiating to give us an update. There are rumors that the merger is off.

Mayor Anderson – I have been invited to the next Steering Committee Meeting along with County Commissioner Jonathan Thomas. That will be a pivotal meeting. After that meeting, then we can have them come back to us.

Councilmember McKee – I do not think we need to have a motion allocating funds until we have the direction on the merger.

Councilmember Thomisser – Regardless of how the merger goes, people are still going to be sleeping in that fire house or behind that fire house. I would like to have a comparison to what it would cost to do the renovations to the fire house versus what it would cost for a three bedroom double wide behind the station.

Mayor Anderson – understand that this is in violation of our current Zoning Ordinance. Would we be allowed to get a variance?

Town Planner Cook – We specifically say one principal building per lot. Can you get a variance on something that is not allowed?

Attorney Fox – The variance process is not designed to rewrite your Zoning Ordinance - it is designed to allow flexibility when there is hardship demonstrated. The option may be for them to seek a revision of the Zoning Ordinance to have a potential application for a text amendment.

Mayor Anderson – That would apply Town wide.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – I made the comment that you sell the property to the Town. We acquire it for some price and that replenishes your cash reserve without depleting the Town’s financial statements. Is there a deed restriction on that lot that prevents the Town from buying it?

Mayor Anderson advised that she has read the deed. She stated, “It is a 1.25 acre plat. On the deed it has the metes and bound description. It talks about the right-of-way for utilities and for DOT. A CUP was obtained for the building. There is not a recorded right of reversal.”

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – We are protecting the right to maintain a fire house on that parcel. There is concern and reservation by the Town Council that we are going to throw good money after bad money and because there has not been a lot of forward progress on the operational cash flow needs that we are going to spend \$450,000 and get two years down the road and we are still going to have the same problem. If we acquire some of the infrastructure, then we are protecting the Town’s interest in that location, then we own it if they fail.

Attorney Fox – The assumption is that what you acquire in the dirt is equal failure to what your contribution is.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – We would buy the lot for one price and then we would still be investing in the renovations at another price if they forfeited their rights then we would take control of the building.

Attorney Fox – The ultimate issue here is whether or not the amount that has been estimated to bring the property into compliance is the correct number and whether or not there are ways to get to compliance at a lesser number through either alternative structures or through value engineering. What you are presenting the Council with is one estimate based on one engineer’s assessment of the issue and the Council is struggling with whether or not that is sufficient in which to pledge the resources of the Town. I think what you hear is for a greater scrutiny of that approach and number.

Mr. Parks – I appreciate that and we have already asked some of those questions. We instructed the architect to advise us if we could just sprinkle the building and put in the stairwell and asked if we have to do the firewalls? The answer back from code enforcement from Union County was you have to do it all. We have already tried to piecemeal as much as we possibly could in order to provide the life safety that we wanted to do.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – I think the issue is this is a lot of money.

Mayor Anderson – It is a lot of money. I appreciate your scrutiny of this but I also appreciate your strong support of public safety. It has always been an important priority for us.

Mr. Parks – We will advise you with every step of the process.

Councilmember McKee – I think we all need to think outside of the box and see if there is a way other than \$450,000.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – What I understand from Jack and Walker is that your architect and engineer are preparing a quote for you for what it is going to cost to prepare the actual engineering and architectural documents and it will be itemized. You are going to get a quote sometime this week to spend in the amount of approximately \$45,000.

Mr. Parks – That is just a number – we do not know.

Mayor Anderson – They are going to come back to us within 10 days with a proposal to do the bid specifications.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – I was going to make a motion to go ahead and set up a fund to pay for the engineering work.

Councilmember McKee – Let’s wait to hear what their proposal is instead of funding what we do not know yet. They are going to get a detailed proposal of what they are going to do for their 10% of the costs. I think we should know that first.

Councilmember Thomisser – I agree with that.

Council discussed that we will schedule a budget meeting in the next few weeks and could add this item to the agenda.

Attorney Fox – One thing that I have not heard in the estimate that they are going to receive is whether or not the estimate is going to be limited to their path of looking at alternative approaches. When they engage the architect to look at the options that they are pursuing, there may be an incremental cost associated with that engagement if they were to look at other options to get to compliance that may result in value engineering.

Councilmember McKee moved to meet with the Steering Committee that is working on the merger to get an update and proceed with funding this in our budget at a later time. He stated, “I want an update from the people regarding the merger.”

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – We have two separate issues - one is an operational issue and one is a capital issue. I do not disagree with the operational request and we should schedule that meeting.

Councilmember Thomisser – The problem is if there is not going to be a merger, we are going to make all these improvement to a fire station that is answering half the calls that they did a year and a half ago. That does not make sense to me.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – If the merger does not take place – is it your desire to have a fire company located on Hemby Road?

Councilmember Thomisser – Yes.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – First of all we have to decide what to do with the physical structure of the fire house on Hemby Road. There is an operational funding issue with the fire department. We all want to keep the fire house open on Hemby Road. If we are going to keep the fire house open on Hemby Road we have to get it fixed. They are going to have to spend \$45,000 to get engineering work done to find out exactly what it is cost to get the location fixed. I know that I want a fire station on Hemby Road. If we are going to keep the fire house open on Hemby Road we are going to need to spend some money. We are not going to know how much money we are going to have to spend until we get these estimates. They need \$45,000.

Councilmember McKee withdrew his motion.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to give Providence VFD not to exceed \$45,000 to pay the architects and engineers for their estimate.

Mr. Parks – When we first addressed the merger with you, we discussed that it would be probably a 12 to 18 month process in order to accomplish what we wanted to accomplish. We are not 90 days into it yet. At this point, the Steering Committees have met and discussed items and basically are just gathering information. The actual fire members from both Providence and Wesley Chapel have had a meeting. That information has been filtered back to us and some of it filtered to you at the retreat. Nothing has happened that is not expected. We are on both sides questioning how this merger is going to work. Some things need to be worked out. Our next meeting on the 18th we are going to lay some concerns on the table. We only want to do what is best for this community regardless of what is best for Providence or Wesley Chapel. We want to make sure we are giving the best EMT and Fire service we possibly can if we merge. Please let us give everyone working on this enough time in order to make this work and something that everyone can be proud of. I do not have any reservations at all to think that this merger cannot work.

Councilmember McKee – When you came to the retreat, part of your written statement you said the merger is unlikely.

Mr. Parks – What we told you was that there were members on the Board of Directors from each department and members that are not sold on the merger idea. We are still working through that process in order to put it together for people to agree on what it needs to be. We at no time said that the merger was off.

Councilmember McKee – I had the feeling that everyone came away with the same feeling that I had. Why can we not wait to see what the architect is going to charge?

Mr. Walker Davidson – After hearing everyone talk, do the \$45,000 and that is all you need to do tonight and see how it progresses. One thing that is interesting is if the merger goes through, I would assume that they are going to create a district for the whole thing. You would get a tax district for the whole area and perhaps the Town of Weddington does not have to pick up the remainder as we move forward. It is similar to the Library – \$45,000 gets you moving. You may not have to commit to \$450,000 if the merger goes through because they will create the tax district, they will go back and ask for a loan of \$1.5 million from Union County and do it right once. Right now all you have to commit to is the \$45,000 to get them moving forward and you are not committed to \$450,000. Why should the Town commit \$450,000 if the merger is going through?

The vote on Mayor Pro Tem Barry’s motion is as follows:

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

D. Update on Landscaping Plan – Councilmember Jerry McKee. Councilmember McKee reported that he has met with a Landscape Architect to design a plan for the back part of the Town Hall property to possibly include a small park, garden, fountain and covered space. The plan will be reviewed by the Downtown Committee and Parks and Recreation Advisory Board for their input before bringing to the Town Council.

Item No. 11. Update from Town Planner. The Town Council received the following update from Town Planner Cook:

- Routes for the Carolina Thread Trail have been selected and the Final Plan is currently being reviewed. 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/local-connections/union-county-nc/>

- The landscaping and sign along the access road behind Town Hall has been completed. Steve McLeod has asked to use the Town's water to irrigate the new landscaping during the first few months the plants are in the ground. He stated that it was imperative to water the plants now and has hooked up to the Town's water hose in the back yard. Staff told Steve McLeod that any extended water usage would require the Town Council's input.
- 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. NCDOT will soon have the asphalt for the road work and will then need about two weeks to complete the grading and pavement work.
- NCDOT has completed the installation of the new stop signs at the intersection of Antioch Church Road and Beulah Church Road.
- Landscaping on Providence Road and Weddington Road has been completed.
- The Town Council will hold a public hearing on Freestanding/Ground Signs at the May 9th meeting.
- The DrumSTRONG 2011 Temporary Use Permit will be on the April 25th Planning Board agenda. The event is scheduled to take place on May 21-22.
- The Planning Board is currently working on text to add Orientation Signs to the Towns Ordinance. These signs would be allowed only on church, educational, institutional sites.
- The Town Council discussed the proposed LARTP Text Amendment regarding right-of-way reservation versus dedication at the Planning Retreat last weekend. The Planning Board determined that this item was a policy decision that needed to be discussed at the Retreat. At the Retreat the Council voted to keep the Ordinance the way it currently is and only require the reservation of right-of-way.

Item No. 12. Update from Town Administrator/Clerk. The Town Council received the following update from Town Administrator/Clerk McCollum:

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 Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is also sponsoring a Litter Sweep for the Town on April 30.

I am currently researching changing our legal notices from the Enquirer Journal to the Union Observer section of the Charlotte Observer. We are not able to advertise legal notices in the Union County Weekly newspaper because they do not have paid subscribers.

A Public Safety Advisory Committee Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 12.

Mr. Buzz Bizzell reports that the light posts and gateway signs are in production. He met with Boswell and NCDOT engineers on site and Boswell plans to bore all connections underground. There will be no

ditches to replant, etc. and the conduit will also be continuous with no joints. Paperwork was completed this week with Union Power for the street lights.

We are reviewing the process for a Census Appeal. Challenges to the census data can begin no earlier than June 1, 2011.

The Historic Preservation Commission is sponsoring a Tea in May with long time residents of Weddington to start the process of gathering pictures, articles and memorabilia to help preserve Weddington's past.

I spoke with County Manager Cindy Coto regarding the joint meeting between the Town Council and Board of County Commissioners. She advised that they will be resuming the schedule for those meetings in June after their budget is adopted and will call us at that time.

If the Town Council would like to plan an event for the National Day of Prayer, please let me know.

Upcoming Dates

- April 9 - Weddington Easter Egg Hunt
- April 11 - Town Council Meeting
- April 12 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Meeting
- April 22 - Town Hall Closed for Good Friday
- April 25 - Planning Board Meeting
- April 25 - Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
- April 30 - Litter Sweep

Item No. 13. Public Safety Report.

Weddington Deputies – 432 Calls

Wesley Chapel VFD – 131 Calls

Providence VFD

Fire Calls	-	26
EMS Calls	-	6
Total	-	32

No Mecklenburg County Calls.

Training hours for the month: 128

The Town Council received the Income and Expense Budget Performance and Balance Sheet for Providence VFD for March 2011.

Item No. 14. 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 3/1/2011 to 3/31/2011.

B. Tax Collector's Report.

Monthly Report – March 2011

Transactions	
Pay Interest and Penalties	\$(534.13)
Refunds	\$284.38
Interest Charges	\$535.13
Adjust Under \$5.00	\$(30.06)
Overpayments	\$(294.93)
Taxes Collected:	
2010	\$(19,078.91)
2009	\$(819.54)
2008	\$(130.19)
As of April 2, 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	\$4,214.37
2009	\$6,614.91
2010	\$31,515.14
Total Outstanding:	\$43,571.73

Item No. 15. Transportation Report. Mayor Anderson stated, “The draft TIP is out and we are having discussions on that at a Special MUMPO Meeting to be held April 27. Barry Moose has gotten the extra money to complete the engineering work and construction of the traffic circle and the Weddington Church Road Realignment. There was trouble with the permits for Weddington Church Road but there is movement on that.”

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - The Rea Road Extension Realignment of Highway 84 was fully funded and is in the TIP. The MUMPO Board meets on April 27 to vote on the TIP.

Item No. 16. Council Comments. Councilmember Thomisser thanked Mr. and Mrs. Harrison, Sharon Sanders and Stephanie Belcher for their work to make the Easter Egg Hunt successful on Saturday.

Item No. 17. Closed Session Pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a) (3) to Consult with the Attorney in order to Preserve the Attorney-Client Privilege and (6) To Consider the Qualifications, Competence, Performance, Character, Fitness, Conditions of Appointments, or Conditions of Initial Employment of an Individual. Councilmember McKee moved to go into Closed Session pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a)(3). All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

Item No. 18. Action from Closed Session. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to allocate to staff a 3% COLA increase and a 2% Merit Increase to be included in the budget. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

Item No. 19. Adjournment. Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to adjourn the April 11, 2011 Regular Town Council Meeting. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

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

The meeting ended at 10:10 p.m.

Nancy D. Anderson, Mayor

Amy S. McCollum, Town Clerk