

Salisbury, North Carolina
February 21, 2006

REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Mayor Susan W. Kluttz, Presiding; Councilmen William (Bill) Burgin; William (Pete) Kennedy; Mark N. Lewis; City Manager, David W. Treme; City Attorney, F. Rivers Lawther, Jr.; and City Clerk, Myra B. Heard.

ABSENT: Mayor Pro Tem Paul B. Woodson, Jr.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Kluttz at 4:00 p.m. The invocation was given by Councilman Kennedy.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Kluttz led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States flag.

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Mayor Kluttz recognized all visitors present.

CONSENT AGENDA

(a) Minutes

Approve Minutes of the regular meeting of February 7, 2006 and the special meeting of February 9-10, 2006.

(b) Group Development Site Plans

Approve the following group development site plans:

- G-03-06 - Hawkins Town Village, 602 Hawkinstown Road
- G-04-06 - Mercon Properties, 1302 Richard Street
- G-06-06 - Southern Equipment Services, 809 N. Long Street

Councilman Lewis indicated that he needed to be excused from G-03-06 due to a conflict of interest.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of G-03-06. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

Thereupon Mr. Burgin made a **motion** to excuse Councilman Lewis from G-03-06. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (3-0)

Thereupon Mr. Burgin made a **motion** to approve G-03-06. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (3-0)

HIGHLIGHTS AND GOALS

Hurley Park Advisory Board

Ms. Elaine China, Chairman of the Hurley Park Advisory Board, presented the Board's Highlights and Goals.

Highlights 2005-2006

- Held Spring Celebration with four hundred (400) in attendance
- Held Summer Lecture with fifty (50) in attendance
- Continued routine maintenance and hosted seventeen (17) weddings
- Received Blanche and Julian Robertson Family Foundation grant of \$7,850 to restore and stabilize stream bank
- Received funds from City budget that allowed for improvements in wooden structures
 - Deck
 - Trashcans
 - Picnic Tables

Level One Goals 2006-2007

- Continue Spring Celebration and Summer Lecture - \$1,600
- New Plantings - \$3,000
 - Replacement for dedicated trees
 - New plants for garden renovations
- Annex Renovations - \$20,000
 - Add a drinking fountain
 - Add electrical hookup
 - Add a path
 - Replace existing bridge with a Chippendale bridge

Level Two Goals 2006-2007

- Plan a garden field trip for Hurley Park board members and staff
- Further development of the Hurley Park website
- Create a “walking tour” brochure

Mayor Klutz thanked Ms. China for her passion for the park and for the Advisory Board’s work to make this a beautiful place in the City.

BUDGET ORDINANCE AMENDMENT - HURLEY PARK

Mr. Tony Cinquemani, Interim Public Services Director, informed Council that funds have been received from the Blanche and Julian Robertson Foundation for renovations to the stream bank at Hurley Park. The amount received is \$7,850 and Mr. Cinquemani requested Council adopt a budget Ordinance amendment to appropriate the funds.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to adopt an Ordinance to accept \$7,850 from the Robertson Foundation. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Klutz voted AYE. (4-0)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2005-2006 BUDGET ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, TO APPROPRIATE DONATIONS FOR HURLEY PARK.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Budget, at Page No. 14, and is know as Ordinance No. 2006-11.)

HIGHLIGHTS AND GOALS

Salisbury Tree Board

Mr. John Burke, Tree Board member, presented the Goals and Highlights for the Salisbury Tree Board for 2006-2007. He noted that the mission statement of the Tree Board is to preserve, protect and plant trees on City owned property and along public rights of way within the Salisbury City limits. Members of the Tree Board are Mr. Clay Smith, Chair; Ms. Mary Ellen Turner, Vice-Chair; Mr. John Burke, Ms. Carol Palmer, Ms. Johnnie Leach, Ms. Doris Roberts, and Ms. Susan Cloninger.

Highlights 2006

- Review and update the Salisbury Tree Ordinance
 - Status: Present to Council 2/21/06
- Provide funding for tree and landscaping on East Innes Street and South Main Street as part of the Downtown Salisbury Master Plan
 - Status: Landscaping of the bridge complete. Plan for South Main Street will be developed
- Continue to provide funding for Neighborhood Tree Planting Projects - \$5,000
 - Status: An inventory of trees are available for planting on a case by case basis
- Conducted Arbor Day Program at Livingstone College
 - Status: Complete
- Develop an Ordinance regulating the clear cutting of trees within the Salisbury planning jurisdiction
 - Status: New legislation has prohibited planning jurisdictions from regulating forestry practices

Goals 2006-2007

- Utilize City Green software to:

- Analyze tree canopy conditions
- Monitor land clearing activities
- Provide a “State of the Environment” report to City Council
- Conduct educational training for tree trimmers and the general public - \$4,200
 - Purchase classified advertising
 - Partner with the Catawba College Center for the Environment
 - Utilize Access Channel 16
- Provide funding for tree planting and landscaping on South Main Street as part of the Downtown Master Plan - \$5,000
- Continue to provide funding for Neighborhood Tree Planting projects - \$5,000
- Continue to seek grants and alternative funding for urban forestry programming
- Update the approved tree list
- Develop a plan for the Brown-Wiseman Boxwood property
- Assist the Jersey City Neighborhood with a tree planting program using CDBG funds
- Continue to participate in Arbor Day and Tree City, USA programs
- Support the Community Appearance Commission’s efforts to increase the number of benches and trash receptacles in the downtown
- Assist with tree planting plans associated with the proposed Centennial Park in Fulton Heights

Mayor Kluttz thanked Mr. Burke and the members of the Tree Board for their work throughout the year.

STAFF REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TREE ORDINANCE

Mr. Joe Morris, Planning and Community Development Manager, presented proposed revisions to the Salisbury Tree Ordinance. He explained that the revisions were developed by a Committee created by Council that consisted of members from the Salisbury Tree Board, Community Appearance Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, staff, and Duke Energy.

The areas of concern discussed by the Committee were the lack of communication with property owners, aggressive utility line clearance, and long-term tree and utility conflicts. The proposed revisions developed by the Committee are:

- Update and clarify language in the Code (i.e. change city horticulturist to landscape manager)
- Notification of City and Property Owners
 - Section 24-55 – Requires notification to the landscape manager
 - Section 24-56 Requires notification to property owners (Duke Energy Corporate policy)
- Penalties
 - Increase penalties from current fine of \$50 to a minimum of \$200 to \$500
- Bonding
 - Section 24-47 states the current requirement for a \$1000 continuation certificate bond
- Training
 - Section 24-47 requires training or nationally recognized certification

Mr. Morris asked Council for direction on establishing the penalties, noting that perhaps this can be given consideration during work on the budget.

Councilman Lewis asked Mr. Morris if a public hearing will be held regarding the proposed changes. Mr. Morris responded that while a public hearing is not required, staff recommends holding one in order to give the public an opportunity to provide input.

ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT - T-03-06 - AMEND ARTICLE VII - SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Establishing criteria for termination of a Special Use Permit

(a) Mr. Preston Mitchell, Senior Planner, indicated that this request is to amend zoning text to include criteria for which a Special Use Permit, or S-District Permit, can be terminated by City Council.

Mr. Mitchell noted that planning staff receives advice from the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and during a discussion with Mr. Richard Drucker it was noted that the City’s current language reads, “The City Council may...review its authorization and the conditions thereof and after such review may modify or change the conditions of the special use permit or may terminate the special use permit.” He pointed out that the current language provides no assurance to the businesses or landowners of continued operation once the Special Use or S-District permit has been issued.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the criteria for termination will provide assurance of continued operation to businesses or land users and will provide City Council with publicly known, clear reasons for possible termination. He pointed out that although the City rarely exercises Permit review and termination, staff feels the recent surge of S-District zoning requests will increase the usage of Special Use Permits.

Mr. Mitchell reviewed the proposed criteria to be included in the Ordinance:

- Non-compliance with adopted conditions
- Expressed diminution of value of surrounding properties that may only be expressed during the evidentiary hearing and made a part of the Findings of Fact

- Expressed negative impacts related to the general safety, health, and welfare of the surrounding properties, which may only be expressed during the evidentiary hearing and made a part of the Findings of Fact
- Recorded and repeated Code violations
- Any non-conformity created by amortization of the permitted use which would be established as a condition of the permit
- Any zoning map amendment that would create a non-conformity between the district and associated permit

Mr. Mitchell informed Council that the Planning Board voted unanimously 9-0 to recommend approval to Council.

Councilman Burgin asked Mr. Mitchell if staff sees the conditions as independent of each other or if all six (6) have to be met. Mr. Mitchell responded that they are independent and only one of the criteria must be met.

(b) Mayor Kluttz convened a public hearing, after due notice and advertisement thereof, to consider zoning text amendment T-03-06 establishing criteria for termination of a special use permit.

There being no one to speak to Council regarding the text amendment, Mayor Kluttz closed the public hearing.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Burgin made a **motion** to accept the zoning amendment and to clarify that it is applicable to any one (1) of the six (6) and not collectively of the six (6). Mr. Lewis seconded the motion and restated it with Mr. Burgin's permission. **Motion** to adopt an Ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances, Zoning Appendix, of the City of Salisbury by amending Article VII, Section 7.10 for the purposes of including criteria for which a special use permit may be terminated by City Council (any one of the six). Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, ZONING APPENDIX, OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, BY AMENDING ARTICLE VII (GENERAL PROVISIONS), SECTION 7.10 (SPECIAL USE PERMIT), FOR THE PURPOSES OF INCLUDING CRITERION FOR WHICH A SPECIAL USE PERMIT MAY BE TERMINATED BY CITY COUNCIL.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Zoning & Planning, at Page Nos. 15-16, and is known as Ordinance No. 2006-12.)

GROUP DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN G-05-06 - JULIAN PARK, 600 BLOCK OF JULIAN ROAD

(a) Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator, reviewed group development G-05-06, a proposed business park located in the 600 block of Julian Road. Mr. Phillips reviewed the proposed site plan, aerial photographs and ground photographs of the site and surrounding properties. He noted that this is a two-fold development because it is a group development since all of the proposed buildings are over ten thousand (10,000) square feet with more than fifty (50) parking spaces, and the development is also a subdivision. He indicated that there are five (5) different parcels that have improvements being shown, as well as two (2) outparcels that are not proposed for development at this time.

Mr. Phillips stated that in regards to zoning and parking there is a lot of cross-connection parking between the building sites. He noted that many of the parcel lines run down the parking lot and the staff review committee looked at the Alternate Methods of Compliance (AMC) for landscaping around the side property lines. Mr. Phillips commented that with this style of development, which attempts to keep the buildings closer to the road with parking to the side and rear, staff felt the AMC would be a good use in order to provide the cross-connection between the building sites. He stated that the developer will put additional plantings along the buildings to compensate for those normally planted on the property lines. He informed Council that the development meets requirements for parking and perimeter landscaping.

Mr. Phillips noted that the property is zoned M-1 Light Industrial and the developer has made application to rezone the property. If approved the proposed rezoning would be to B-1 and Mr. Phillips stated that the landscape and parking requirements will still be met in that zone. He noted that the developer will also install sidewalk along Julian Road and added that from a zoning standpoint the developer meets all of the requirements of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Patrick Ritchie, Staff Engineer, addressed the proposed development from a subdivision standpoint and noted that overall the site plan has many good benefits. He stated that staff had concerns with two (2) areas on the plan. One concern is that the Subdivision Ordinance states that a cul-de-sac cannot be in excess of six hundred (600) feet, but this site has a single cul-de-sac with a length of seven hundred seventy-one (771) feet. The developer is proposing a traffic circle near the entrance to serve as traffic calming, but, by the definition in the Subdivision Ordinance, the traffic circle is not considered for shortening the road's length.

Mr. Ritchie informed Council that staff's other concern was that the Vision 2020 Plan encourages inter-connectivity between parcels and noted that the parcels on either side of the lot are long and narrow and if they are developed they will most likely be developed with individual cul-de-sacs. He stated that staff felt this was a good site where there should be inter-connectivity between adjacent undeveloped parcels so that when the complete area is developed traffic can move from one parcel to the next without having to travel onto Julian Road to enter into a different cul-de-sac.

Mr. Ritchie indicated that with these two (2) concerns in mind staff recommended stub streets be added to adjoining parcels to provide inter-connectivity and by adding the stub streets it would create an intersection which would shorten the cul-de-sac to a length less than six hundred (600) feet, bringing it into compliance. Mr. Ritchie stated that the Planning Board discussed the recommendations at length and by a 5-4 vote recommended the site be approved as submitted with no restrictions placed upon it. He noted that if Council wishes to approve the plan without the conditions, Council will need to grant a relief from standards to allow the cul-de-sac to be longer than six hundred (600) feet.

(b) Mayor Kluttz opened the floor to receive public comment.

Mr. Jake Alexander, 8 Woodland Road, stated that he and his partner, Mr. Clay Lindsay, are the developers for this project and when completed it will represent a \$25 million development. He added that they have spent one (1) year of planning to reach this point. Mr. Alexander stated that regarding the intersection, he spoke with Mr. Joseph Dunlop, P.E. from the North Carolina Department of Transportation, who considers this traffic circle an intersection. He commented that he does not understand why he and his partner should be the ones to bring this to staff's attention, and why staff did not determine this on their own. Mr. Alexander stated that in regards to inter-connectivity, they agree that it is a laudable goal, but he does not feel staff did its homework on this issue. He noted that there is a forty-two (42) foot drop adjacent to the site. He commented that a road could probably be built if it was placed on the far right side with a grade increase of approximately twenty (20) feet, which means they could not develop the property. Mr. Alexander pointed out that the City's Code does not allow more than a five (5) percent grade increase in the first one hundred (100) feet from the street. He stated that he feels the suggestion for inter-connectivity was based on a one (1) dimensional site plan and not on a three (3) dimensional site plan.

Mr. Alexander stated that they are adding four hundred (400) feet of turn lanes on Julian Road which will improve access to properties in the area. They are extending water and sewer lines all the way to the end of the property and they have seamless parking from the traffic circle all the way around the property. He noted that they are using two (2) story buildings instead of one (1) story to remove the suburban characteristic that many people find objectionable in mixed retail development.

Mr. Alexander commented that at the Planning Board meeting they were given one hundred eighty (180) seconds to present their plan while staff had unlimited time to rebut their presentation and they were given no opportunity to subsequently answer those questions. He stated that they are trying to bring a significant asset to Salisbury and he feels this will have a significant impact on City and County property taxes. He added that he thought they might have received a more welcoming response than they did, but they are still committed to the plan.

There being no one else to speak to Council, Mayor Klutz closed the public comment session.

Councilman Lewis commented that all of the positive things he sees in the development indicate that the City will have a better development than what it typically sees and feels it integrates portions of the Vision 2020 Plan. He noted that there are many positive attributes to this development, which staff has recognized as well, but it boils down to a standard that deals with a six hundred (600) foot maximum street length for cul-de-sacs. He commented that he consistently states that Council cannot back away from its standards in order to be fair to everyone; however, the letter of the law can cause problems and the spirit of the law is what is trying to be accomplished.

Mr. Lewis stated that he recalls the reason the maximum length was put into the Ordinance for cul-de-sacs was to discourage their use in order to promote connectivity. He noted that in the past roundabouts have been used for traffic calming and the reason the maximum street length is eight hundred (800) feet is because people drive too fast when given long straight roads. He stated that in his opinion, the reason for the modification was for traffic calming and connectivity, which is the spirit of the rule that staff is requesting developers to adhere to. Mr. Lewis stated that in a two (2) dimensional world it would be reasonable to expect the developer to connect to the properties beside the site, but this is not a two (2) dimensional site. He asked Mr. Ritchie to verify that a road could not be built because of the slope on the side of the property. Mr. Ritchie responded that a road could be built and pointed out, that as shown in the photographs, earth can be moved. He added that the grade now present on the property was not present on the topographic maps used by staff to review the site. Mr. Lewis noted that there is a creek at the back of the property, a large drop on one side, and a large increase on the other and it seems to him that the spirit of what is trying to be accomplished will not be well served by required road connection between the parcels on either side. He stated that in order to try to mitigate the problem and come as close to Code as possible, the developer has proposed a traffic circle that by some definitions is an intersection. Mr. Lewis stated that given the slope and the grade of the property he feels this is acceptable and that they have done the best they can on this site. He added that he feels this plan meets the spirit of what Council is trying to accomplish.

Councilman Burgin asked Mr. Alexander if it would be possible to obtain a forty (40) foot private easement across the back left lot. Mr. Alexander indicated that there is a retaining wall that runs seventy (70) feet on the back left property line that holds up seventeen (17) feet of fill. He stated that he has looked and cannot find a forty (40) or fifty (50) foot right-of-way for a public street in any part of that area and still meet City guidelines on slope. Mr. Burgin commented that the person who owns the property may do something in the future that would allow for a right-of-way and if the private easement was in place then there would be the possibility of connectivity. He added that if this were at least on paper he feels it would solve the problem of the length of the cul-de-sac. He stated that if that were done he felt the development would be exactly what Council is looking for. Mr. Alexander reiterated that the back of the property drops off and for someone to have access they would have to build a thirty (30) to fifty (50) foot retaining wall on the back side of their property and then take down this development's retaining wall. Mr. Burgin stated that he feels the person who develops the property beside Mr. Alexander would want to bring the site down closer to Klumac Road level. He added that knowing the possibility is there with the private easement to connect the parking lots, even if it may never happen, he feels it will solve all of the other issues.

Mr. Clay Lindsay, Mr. Alexander's partner in the development, stated that in the back left corner the adjoining property will be lower than their site and the property owner would have to bring the property up. He added that they also have concerns because the adjoining property is zoned M-1 and they have no idea what the use will be in the future.

Mr. Alexander stated that requesting them to have the private easement would be asking them to encumber a piece of property that a prospective buyer will have no idea what the impact of the easement may be.

Mr. Lindsay indicated that when the surrounding properties are actually developed, depending on the conditions and use, they would be willing to consider the private easement but would not want to be encumbered with a promise now not knowing what they may have to promise in the future.

Mr. Lewis commented that this will be the issue any time stub-outs are required for connectivity and it is a philosophical issue that will have to be addressed.

Mr. Alexander stated that if there is future development they will consider the easement at that time but they cannot agree to burden the site with

an unknown commitment.

Councilman Kennedy stated that he has passed by this section many times and has wondered who would be willing to tackle this challenging terrain. He added that from what he has seen he is excited with the proposal because it will increase the tax base. He offered thanks to Mr. Alexander and Mr. Lindsay for their efforts.

Mayor Kluttz indicated that she agrees that Council has to be flexible and adjust requirements depending on the particular property in question. She added that she feels the City is fortunate to have two local people share their talents with the City. She added that she too is excited about a \$25 million development.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to approve group development site plan G-05-06 located in the 600 block of Julian Road. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

GROUP DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN G-01-75 - SALISBURY HIGH SCHOOL - 500 LINCOLNTON ROAD

Councilman Burgin indicated that he needed to be excused from G-01-75 Salisbury High School due to a conflict of interest.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to excuse Councilman Burgin. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Lewis, Kennedy, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (3-0)

(a) Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator, reviewed aerial photographs of the school campus including the proposed site for a parking lot on the corner of Lincolnton Road and Caldwell Street. He stated that the school has an approved site plan for a forty-three (43) space parking lot, adding that the new parking lot plan is for eighty-three (83) spaces. The parking area will have two entrances from Lincolnton Road and an exit onto Caldwell Street. He pointed out that the plan does meet City Code, however, upon staff review it was noted that the courtyard area was a contributing factor in the school being listed on the National Register as a historic site. He stated that this area is one of the few green areas left on campus, and noted that the current plan will alter it. He stated that staff and the Planning Board felt the sensitivity of the historic nature of the property was not taken into account in the parking lot development and feels there are other alternatives that can be explored. Mr. Phillips stated that the Planning Board voted 7-1 to recommend that Council deny the request. He pointed out that the applicant discovered that the previously approved plan for the forty-three (43) space parking lot would not work after all. They found that only thirty-two (32) spaces would be able to be added in order to meet all the requirements for field inspection.

Councilman Kennedy asked if the school was approved by the National Register. Mr. Phillips stated that the school is on the National Register as a historic place, adding that this plan could harm the status, possibly resulting in it being removed from the register.

(b) Mayor Kluttz opened the floor to receive public comment.

Mr. Pete Bogle, 318 W. Thomas Street and Dr. Windsor Eagle, 217 Windsor Drive addressed Council. Mr. Bogle stated that Salisbury High School has grown to over one thousand (1,000) students and one hundred (100) employees, with growth goals of one thousand one hundred and fifty (1,150) students. He stated that additional parking is needed because part of the staff parking area was eliminated in an addition to the school. He stated with the forty-three (43) space plan Dr. Eagle had a concern with one of the large oak trees. City Arborist Mark Martin inspected the trees and reported that both trees were near the end of their life expectancy and contained significant damage and could be recommended for removal. Mr. Bogle explained that the new eighty-three (83) space plan takes into account Mr. Martin's recommendation. He stated that he feels the Planning Board denial was based on preference and not on City codes or ordinances, adding that he has reviewed requirements and noted that the plan adheres to these requirements. Mr. Bogle informed Council that the Zoning Code requires high schools to have one (1) parking space per class room, one (1) space for each non-teacher employee, and one (1) space per five (5) students. This equates to two hundred ninety-two (292) spaces required for Salisbury High School this year, which leaves the school sixty (60) spaces short. He stated that with the proposed growth goal, City zoning will require over three hundred and twenty-five (325) parking spaces. He stated that the Historic Preservation Commission has no jurisdiction over the site, noting that it is on the National Register but is not within the historic district. Mr. Bogle summarized by saying that Salisbury High School needs additional parking, they are concerned with parking cars under large, damaged trees, and there are no codes that would prohibit the removal of these trees and installing the parking lot.

Dr. Windsor Eagle, Salisbury High School Principal, stated that the Salisbury High School building is on the National Register but not the grounds. He pointed out that the school does not have adequate facilities for parking and that they are currently forty (40) spaces short for staff members. He stated that if this plan is not approved today, parking will continue under the trees, noting that three (3) cars have been damaged from falling limbs this school year. Dr. Eagle stated that this is the only place available to place a parking lot. He concluded by stating that they are developing a nice campus with nice facilities and requested Council's assistance in approving the installation of the parking lot.

Mr. Clay Lindsay, 401 Richmond Road, stated that five (5) years ago Salisbury High School was facing a declining enrollment and the neighborhood needed help. He noted that in the last five (5) years there has been significant private investment in the neighborhood, lead through the efforts of Salisbury High School. Mr. Lindsay pointed out that in terms of the Historic Register, the worst that could happen would be for the building to be abandoned. He stated that he considers this to be an opportunity to work with the schools and make sure they have adequate parking.

There being no one else to speak to Council regarding the group development site plan, Mayor Kluttz closed the public comment session.

Mayor Kluttz stated that Council has helped create this problem by approaching the School Board with the request that Salisbury High School stay in the City and in the existing building. She added that the School Board was asked to expand enrollment to one thousand two hundred (1,200) students and this is one of the consequences of growing and changing. She noted that both requests were approved by the School Board. She stated

that this school is very important to the community and as it grows and the population expands, there has to be some place to park. She pointed out that a report from the Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommended removal of an elm tree on Caldwell Street, and the report concluded by stating that there was no potential for future growth without utilizing this portion of the site. Mayor Klutz added that as much as she appreciates historic preservation and trees, she sees no choice but to approve the plan for the parking lot. She expressed her interest in requiring larger trees than are ordinarily placed in a parking lot.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he thinks Mr. Bogle and Dr. Eagle were very persuasive with their presentation. He noted that he has seen numerous movements to eliminate Salisbury High School and that the City has fought to keep the school in place. He expressed his support for this group development and added that he hopes the school continues to grow.

Councilman Lewis stated that he is concerned with the TRC report that the proposed parking design is not sensitive to the historic nature of the school grounds, noting that there was no concern when the forth-three (43) space parking plan was approved. He stated that he cannot make a decision on this plan based on the statement that approval might affect the status with the National Register. He explained that the City demanded the school be expanded for the citizens and now the Council has an obligation to support this plan.

Mr. Phillips stated that the plan proposes ornamental trees of six (6) feet in height which meets requirements. Mr. Lewis asked if larger trees are wanted in a parking lot. Mr. Phillips responded that shade tree root systems would be detrimental to asphalt.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to approve Group Development Site Plan G-01-75 Salisbury High School, 500 Lincolnton Road. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Klutz voted AYE. (3-0)

STAFF REPORT - ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT T-01-06 - HOT-MIX ASPHALT PLANTS IN M-2 DISTRICT

Mr. Preston Mitchell, Senior Planner, reminded Council that this item was tabled at the February 7, 2006 Council meeting. He noted that this is not a request for Council to take action on the text amendment, but is an update on information requested by Council. He reviewed a map of the City displaying the M-2 Heavy Industrial Districts in the City, noting that the largest area is in the southwest corner. He stated that research found that every parcel of the M-2 area is already developed and the only undeveloped areas are three (3) parcels located at the end of the runway and owned by Rowan County. Mr. Mitchell explained that if the text amendment is approved, any proposals for a Hot-Mix Asphalt (HMA) facility would require a zone change.

Mr. Mitchell stated that a five hundred (500) foot buffer is proposed from the facility itself to any school or licensed daycare and explained that staff could not determine the location of the facility within the property so staff extended the buffer from the property lines. He reviewed slides denoting licensed daycare facilities and schools in the City. Mr. Mitchell stated that some principal concerns of several Council members relate to the odor issue and the desire to add distance requirements between HMA facilities. He added that Council could possibly visit an HMA facility in the Pineville area to see how it operates.

Councilman Burgin stated that he and Mayor Pro Tem Woodson have toured the existing plant and property on two (2) separate occasions, and that the size of the new plant is ten (10) times larger than the present facility. He stated that since odor is one of the criteria, he would like to visit a modern facility to understand how they deal with it. Mr. Burgin stated that he is concerned about how the neighbors will feel if the area is rezoned for the HMA plant. He noted that if a condition is created to require a certain distance between facilities, he feels odor will be the criteria where the plant will fail to perform as promised. He added that placing a distance requirement between facilities may enable Council to more easily identify which facility is causing the problem.

Mayor Klutz asked Mr. Burgin if he would like to tour an HMA facility before taking any action. Mr. Burgin stated that he would like to take the tour and develop conditions for the facility.

Councilman Lewis suggested that Mr. Burgin and Mr. Woodson serve on a Council Committee to study the proposal. Councilman Kennedy said he would like to be included on the visit to a neighboring HMA facility. City Manager David Treme requested that Mr. Richard Kelly, Risk Manager, be included on the site visit. It was agreed that all Council members will visit a facility.

*** Formal appointment of Committee – Page 17*

ADOPTION OF THREE (3) ANNEXATION REPORTS

Mr. Bill Duston, Centralina Council of Governments presented three (3) annexation reports for three (3) areas of consideration for annexation. The areas are Area 1 – Airport Road area; Area 2 – Cedar Springs Road area; and Area 3 – South Main Street area. He reviewed the estimated revenues and costs to provide services. The effective date of annexation is proposed to be June 30, 2006 with all construction to be completed by June 30, 2008.

Councilman Burgin asked for clarification that the City does not currently provide sewer in Area 2. Mr. Matt Bernhardt, Assistant City Manager for Utilities, indicated that the City does not. Mr. Burgin asked if \$182 per linear foot is what the City currently pays for sewer. Mr. Bernhardt responded that these numbers are based on current cost figures and estimates provided by staff and should be current to what the City has been paying.

City Manager David Treme indicated that the income to the general fund from the tax base increase and utilities will cover the cost of the ten (10) year bond payments for improvements to the water and sewer system.

Mr. Burgin noted that Area 3 has an annual deficit of \$17,912. Mr. Treme stated that staff is looking at these three (3) areas in total and the total income will pay for the ten (10) year revenue bond to pay for the construction required to serve the area. Mr. Burgin asked if there is an advantage for annexing this area. Mr. Treme responded that he feels there is potential for future development and it provides connection possibilities. He added that he feels there is a greater income generated with the combination of the three (3) areas together, rather than separately. Mr. Burgin asked if the City could annex this area later when the development occurs. Mr. Treme stated that it could be annexed later but it seems to be a natural fit to annex these three (3) areas at one time.

Mr. Bernhardt informed Council that Salisbury-Rowan Utilities (SRU) already provides services in part of this area and he feels the area will benefit from services being installed through the previous annexations. He noted that service is already being provided all around this area and adding it will fill in the area, noting that looking at the area as a whole it will be a positive income.

Mr. John Sofley, Management Services Director, noted that Area 3 is outside of the City's extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) and the City has no control on how the land develops. He stated that when staff reviewed the areas they looked at this as one (1) unit for annexation but the qualification process divided them into three (3) areas. Mr. Duston stated that when the City approached Centralina Council of Governments to look at this it was not the City's intention for it to be handled in three (3) different areas, but in order to qualify the entire area it was divided into three (3) separate areas and each qualified in a different way so that each could meet the General Statutes.

Mr. Sofley stated that the primary reason Area 3 has a general fund deficit is because the general fund will cover any water and sewer cost not recovered through a ten (10) year pay back so that the water and sewer fund does not reflect any additional cost to customers to extend the lines for annexation.

Mr. Burgin commented that the purpose for Council to annex is to increase the tax base but it seems that one of these areas does not do that and asked if it is meeting another objective. Mr. Treme reiterated that in looking at the area as a total it completely qualified and met the revenue requirements but in order to annex it had to be broken into three (3) parts with different methods to qualify.

Councilman Lewis commented that if an area is "dead-wood", could it not be taken out. Mr. Sofley stated that if this had been on the edge of the City and this piece was not adjacent to any other City limits, it might be possible to take it out, but this area sits between two current portions of the City and is on a major thoroughfare.

Mr. Treme indicated that looking at the areas collectively the total area meets the standards and it seems natural that this whole area would be included. He added that staff recommends including Area 3 but if Council feels it should be left out that could be done.

Mr. Burgin asked to clarify if water and sewer services are provided in Area 3. Mr. Sofley stated that there are areas that are served and areas that are not. Mr. Burgin stated that of the three (3) areas, Area 3 is the smallest yet has the most expensive start-up cost for sewer. Mr. Treme commented that the strategy is not necessarily to pick the top areas because all will eventually need service from the City and it makes sense to take in one that may not appear to pay as well with two (2) others that do in order to provide the service and still do reasonably well.

Mr. Sofley indicated that the City essentially serves this area now with fire and police yet the area does not pay for that privilege. He noted that the biggest cost is not water but sewer, because water is already there. Mr. Burgin noted that he would like to see a breakdown of cost for extending the sewer. Mr. Bernhardt noted that SRU will provide this information, pointing out that this area is where the lines come together for the entire area.

Mr. Duston informed Council that the only action required by Council today is to adopt the reports. He noted that a public information meeting is to be held March 24, 2006 and Council's public hearing will be held April 4, 2006. He stated that if Council wants to move forward with the annexation he strongly suggests adopting the annexation reports because February 22 is the last day to adopt the reports for the annexation calendar. Mr. Duston clarified that adopting the reports in no way obligates the City to do anything other than continue with the process.

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt the annexation report for Area 1 – Airport Road area with the addenda that includes the annexation land uses of the Subsection D areas as shown on the map, and also addenda that includes proposed water improvements and proposed sanitary sewer improvements. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

(THE ANNEXATION REPORT AND ADDENDA IS HEREIN INCORPORATED AND MADE A PART OF THESE MINUTES.)

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt the annexation report for Area 2 – Cedar Springs Road area with addenda that includes the annexation land uses of the Subsection D areas as shown on the map, and the addenda that includes proposed water improvements and proposed sanitary sewer improvements. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

(THE ANNEXATION REPORT AND ADDENDA IS HEREIN INCORPORATED AND MADE A PART OF THESE MINUTES.)

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt the annexation report for Area 3 – South Main Street area with addenda that includes the annexation land uses of the Subsection D areas as shown on the map, and the addenda that includes proposed water improvements and proposed sanitary sewer improvements. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

(THE ANNEXATION REPORT AND ADDENDA IS HEREIN INCORPORATED AND MADE A PART OF THESE MINUTES.)

COUNCIL COMMITTEE FOR HOT-MIX ASPHALT PLANTS

Mayor Kluttz noted that a formal Council Committee was not appointed during the discussion on this issue earlier in the meeting. Mayor Kluttz then appointed Mayor Pro Tem Woodson and Councilman Burgin to serve as a Council Committee to study Hot-Mix Asphalt plants in the M-2 Heavy Industrial District.

AGREEMENT WITH NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - FY2006 RURAL CAPITAL PROGRAM

Mr. Rodney Harrison, Transit Manager, presented Council with a Resolution authorizing the City of Salisbury to enter to an agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). NCDOT will assist in funding capital items through the Rural Capital Program. He noted that on November 4, 2005, NCDOT approved funding in the amount of \$43,400, of which the City is responsible for ten (10) percent.

Thereupon, Mr. Burgin made a **motion** to adopt a Resolution authorizing the City of Salisbury to enter into an agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF SALISBURY TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

(The above Resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book No. 12, at Page No. 16, and is known as Resolution No. 2006-06.)

RENOVATION/ADDITION TO POLICE FACILITIES AND RENOVATIONS TO CITY OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. Wade Furches, Finance Manager, noted that on July 19, 2005 Council approved a capital project Ordinance and awarded a contract to Summit Developers for the renovation and addition to the existing Police station. He added that certain small renovations to the City Office Building were also part of the capital project Ordinance.

Mr. Furches indicated that from the beginning of the project the intent was to finance it through installment financing, or lease purchase financing. He noted that staff is now ready to move forward. He pointed out that before Council today is a Resolution that provides the authority for staff to apply to the Local Government Commission for approval of the financing as required. The Resolution also names the Management Services Director as the City's representative in securing the authorization and directs the Director to solicit financial proposals on the lease purchase.

Thereupon, Mr. Burgin made a **motion** to adopt an installment contract Resolution for financing the renovations and additions to the City Police Facilities and renovations to the City Office Building. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

A RESOLUTION INSTALLMENT CONTRACT FOR FINANCING THE RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO CITY POLICE FACILITIES AND RENOVATIONS TO CITY OFFICE BUILDING.

(The above Resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book No. 12, at Page No. 17, and is known as Resolution No. 2006-07.)

Mr. Furches informed Council that since this is a construction contract a public hearing must be held regarding the lease purchase financing. He asked Council to set a public hearing for March 7, 2006 and noted that staff hopes to have bids from financial institutions in hand.

Thereupon, Mr. Burgin made a **motion** to set a public hearing for March 7 for the purpose of reviewing the final proposals for financing the \$3,565,680. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

BUDGET ORDINANCE AMENDMENT - HOME PROGRAM INCOME

Mr. Wade Furches, Finance Manager, explained that the HOME program is in the process of building new homes in low to moderate income neighborhoods and are for sale to first time homebuyers. He noted that once the homes are sold the income needs to be appropriated in order to use it to keep building new homes. He stated that staff anticipates the HOME program will sell four (4) homes before June 30, 2006 and the sales should generate approximately \$250,000. Mr. Furches indicated that there was \$91,000 of unspent program income from the prior fiscal year and staff would like to appropriate these funds as well.

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt an Ordinance amending the 2005-2006 budget Ordinance of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina to appropriate additional HOME program income. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2005-2006 BUDGET ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, TO APPROPRIATE ADDITIONAL HOME PROGRAM INCOME.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Budget, at Page No. 17, and is known as Ordinance No. 2006-13.)

STREET LIGHTING POLICY

Mr. Patrick Ritchie, Staff Engineer, presented Council with a proposed policy update for the City's Street Lighting Policy. He noted that the current Street Lighting budget is approximately \$350,000 per year, which includes several programs that have yet to be installed.

Mr. Ritchie explained that the City currently installs "NEMA" light fixtures, which were the standard fixture for Duke Power; however, Duke Power has changed their policy and these fixtures are no longer available effective July 1, 2005. The cost of the NEMA fixture is \$6.66 per month and requires a maximum spacing of three hundred (300) feet. The new fixtures used by Duke Power are the Cobra Drop-lens fixture which costs \$7.72 per month and has a maximum spacing of two hundred sixty (260) feet. Mr. Ritchie noted that in the historic districts Cobra cut-off fixtures are used and this style received a blanket approval from the Historic Preservation Commission for use in the historic districts. These fixtures cost \$7.72 per month and have a maximum spacing of one hundred ninety (190) feet.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the City has encouraged the use of pedestrian friendly lights and more developers are now using the lighting in neighborhood developments. The black traditional standard pole has an up-front cost of \$440 or a deferred cost of \$11.36 per month for a ten (10) year period. The deluxe traditional with fluted pole has an up-front cost of \$3,600 or \$37.95 per month. He noted that the cost for either of the poles is \$7.72 per month if the up-front fee is paid and the maximum spacing for the decorative fixtures is approximately one hundred thirty (130) feet.

Mr. Ritchie indicated that the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan encourages the use of decorative lighting and suggests that the developer should pay the cost for materials and installation of decorative lighting, but the City should pay for the operating cost for all fixtures.

He provided an example for the proposed policy. Using a standard Cobra Drop-lens it will take ten (10) fixtures at \$7.72 per light or \$77.20 per month. Using Black 100 watt HPS traditional fixtures Option A the up-front fee of \$12,806.46 is paid. To provide the same amount of light as the standard fixtures it will take twenty-nine (29) fixtures at \$7.72 or \$223.88 per month. Under the current policy the developer pays \$146.88, under the proposed policy the developer would pay nothing. Under Option B the up-front fee is not paid but the twenty-nine (29) fixtures would cost \$11.36 per fixture or \$329.44 per month. With the current policy the developer would pay \$252.24 and under the proposed policy the developer would pay \$105.56. He stated that currently the City has approximately two hundred (200) decorative lights installed under Option A that would have no monthly fee under the proposed policy. The City currently has approximately one hundred (100) decorative lights installed under Option B utilizing the decorative adder. These areas would see a reduced monthly fee under the proposed policy.

Mr. Ritchie stated if the Street Lighting Policy is revised to reflect what is recommended by Vision 2020 it would result in an increase of approximately \$14,400 a year from lighting no longer billed to neighborhoods. The policy change would also result in an estimated cost increase of \$3,000 per year to cover the additional cost of future decorative lighting. He noted that the FY2006-07 Budget should also include funding for installation of lighting along Brenner Avenue in the area along the Greenway. The yearly cost estimate for these lights is \$4,550.

Councilman Lewis asked if there is any value in not allowing the decorative adder because a developer could sign up for this option and then pass the cost to the homeowner's association. Mr. Ritchie responded that this is typically how it is done, adding that Option B has only been offered in the past two (2) to three (3) years. He noted that staff received many requests for this from developers so it was determined that if this helps get more decorative lights the City should not deny the developers this option. He stated that there are approximately one hundred (100) lights in place using this option.

Mr. Burgin commented that the bottom line is if you do not offer the financing the City will not have the decorative lights, adding that this is a way to encourage their use. City Manager David Treme commented that the lights have been used to promote the attractiveness of the community and what the City would like to promote under Vision 2020. He noted that this would mean adopting policies that would encourage the developers and homeowners to opt for the decorative fixtures. He added that for a relatively small amount of money the City would gain a very positive addition to the community.

Mr. Ritchie noted that no action was needed from Council today but staff wanted to submit the Policy to Council for budget consideration. He also pointed out that if a developer chooses Option B and changes their mind several years into the installment, there is no reduction in the upfront fee to change to Option A.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Dan Mikkelsen, Land Management and Development Director, about the policy for reviewing street lights when they are not operational. Mr. Mikkelsen stated since Duke Power owns the lights and the City pays the power bill, the City reports outages to Duke Power. Duke Power then attempts to repair ninety-five (95) percent of the lights within three (3) days of the report. He stated that Duke Power is now becoming more flexible and is making it easier for citizens to report directly to Duke Power.

Mr. Mikkelsen stated that periodically staff goes out at night to ride through the thoroughfares to find lights that are out. The last time this was done staff found one hundred fifty (150) lights that were not working. He commented that it has not been practical for the engineering staff to go out at night but as the City works to increase its customer service one option would be to find City employees who do work at night and train them to identify and report lights that are out.

Mr. Lewis stated that he would like a policy for specific people to go on a regular basis to look for lights that are out. Mr. Ritchie pointed out that there are approximately three thousand five hundred (3,500) lights in the City. Mr. Lewis commented that staff has indicated that they rely on citizens to report a light when one is out on their street. Mr. Mikkelsen stated that if citizens need to report lights that are out they should contact the City Engineering Department at 704-638-5200. Mr. Lewis stated that he would like to have this information on the City's website.

GIS STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Kathryn Clifton, GIS Coordinator, presented a summary of the GIS Strategic Plan to Council. Ms. Clifton began by providing an overview:

- Updates to the GIS Strategic Plan written in December 2004
- Participation was encouraged via use of online survey tools and through the regularly scheduled GIS Users Group

Guiding Values

- Provide excellent customer service
- Provide timely and cost effective services
- Actively participate in decision-making
- Partner when possible (synergy)
- Be both efficient and effective in operations
- Develop and maintain accurate data
- Be goal oriented – achieve quality results
- Maximize resources

Positive Steps with GIS: Strategic Plan

- Receiving input from all departments
- Defining the Strategic Plan
- Implementing identified priorities

Positive Steps with GIS: ArcSDE

- Centralized geographic database (ArcSDE)
- Faster delivery of information to staff

Positive Steps with GIS: Sewer Mapping

- Field-collected ninety-five (95) percent of sewer infrastructure
- Valuable in identifying properties served by sewer

Positive Steps with GIS: Training

- Both introductory and specialized GIS training provided to City staff at Salisbury Training Room
- Participation from across the state has offset cost to City of Salisbury

Positive Steps with GIS: Partnerships

- Interns from Appalachian State University and Catawba College
- Working to build the physical inventory of assets within GIS
 - Addresses
 - Stream discharge points (NPDES)
 - Fire hydrants
 - Water and sewer infrastructure
 - Hurley Park mapping

Analysis and Decision-making with GIS

- Fire Department planning service areas
- Determine 1.5 and 2.5 mile response zones
- Salisbury Landcover – divided into four groups: trees, open space, urban and water. From 1984 to 2003, the City of Salisbury has seen a 24.6% reduction of areas classified as trees

Additional Resources for GIS

- Use of GIS has grown throughout the City of Salisbury
- Additional staff and funding will be necessary to support current projects
- Centralized technician seen as most cost-effective solution to support multiple departments

Ms. Clifton noted that the entire GIS Strategic Plan is available at <http://gis.salisburync.gov>.

Mayor Klutz thanked Ms. Clifton for her report.

COMMENTS FROM THE CITY MANAGER

(a) Planning Board

Council received the Planning Board recommendations and comments from their February 14, 2006 meeting.

(b) Speed Limit Ordinance for Highway 70

Mr. Dan Mikkelson, Land Management and Development Director, explained that the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) has requested the City update its speed Ordinances on Highway 70 for a 45 mph zone from Robin Road to four hundred eighty (480) feet west of Ashbrook Road. He stated that the City and State have to have concurring ordinances when there is a State maintained road within the City limits. The old ordinance simply stated to the western City limit, but NCDOT is no longer allowed to use that description and must specify where the outer limit is located. Mr. Mikkelson noted that there has been an annexation since the old ordinance was adopted, as well as the current construction project on Highway 70, and NCDOT would like to update their ordinances. He pointed out that two forms will need to be used, one for NCDOT and one for the City.

Thereupon Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt an Ordinance amending Section 13-336, Article X, Chapter 13 of the Code of the City of Salisbury, relating to speed limits – generally. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Klutz voted AYE. (4-0)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 13-336, ARTICLE X, CHAPTER 13 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, RELATING TO SPEED LIMITS – GENERALLY.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Budget, at Page No. 18, and is known as Ordinance No. 2006-14.)

Thereupon Mr. Lewis made a **motion** for certification of municipal ordinance declaring speed limit modifications and request for concurring ordinance by Department of Transportation. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

(c) Meeting with China Grove

City Manager David Treme stated that he and Mayor Kluttz will meet with representatives from the Town of China Grove to discuss several issues and will report back on the results of the meeting.

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(a) Elizabeth Duncan Koontz Humanitarian Banquet

Mayor Kluttz announced that the Elizabeth Duncan Koontz Humanitarian Banquet will be held Thursday, February 23, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. at the Civic Center.

(b) Community Appearance Commission and Tree Board Awards

Mayor Kluttz announced that the Community Appearance Commission and the Tree Board awards luncheon will be held Thursday, February 23, 2006 at 12:00 Noon at the Heritage Room at Council Street Commons.

-
-
COUNCIL TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT

-
Mayor Kluttz opened the floor to receive public comment. There being no one to address Council, Mayor Kluttz closed the public comment session.

-
ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Burgin, seconded by Mr. Kennedy. All council members agreed unanimously to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Mayor

City Clerk