HIGH POINT CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING COUNCIL CHAMBERS – HIGH POINT MUNICIPAL BUILDING May 21, 2018 – 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mayor Wagner called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Upon call of the roll, the following Council Members were **Present:**

Mayor Jay W. Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Chris Williams (Ward 2); Council Member Britt Moore (At Large), Council Member Donald Scarborough (At Large), Council Member Jeffrey Golden (Ward 1), Council Member Monica Peters (Ward 3), Council Member Wesley Hudson (Ward 4), Council Member Victor Jones (Ward 5), and Council Member Jason Ewing (Ward 6)

Mayor Wagner called for a Moment of Silence. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

2018-178 VITA Recognitions

Members of the Community Development and Housing Department, will be present at the Council Meeting to present certificates to the volunteers who participated in the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program.

Mayor Wagner recognized Michelle McNair, Community Resource Manager.

Ms. McNair thanked the Mayor and City Council for allowing for them to serve the City through the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program. She gave an overview of the program and how the program has benefited the citizens of High Point. She introduced Alicia Doulen, Community Resource Specialist and Lead VITA Coordinator.

Ms. Doulen shared some statistics regarding the VITA program noting this is the second year in a row they have gone over a million dollars in refunds. She recognized volunteers and partners and introduced Lauren Atwell-Bass, Community Resource Specialist and Assistant Lead Coordinator.

Ms. Atwell-Bass read a letter to Mayor Wagner from Joyce L. Robbins, Acting Territory Manager Stakeholder Partnerships, Education & Communication Internal Revenue Service.

Mayor Wagner thanked everyone for their volunteer work for the City of High Point.

(Applause; followed by a photo op)

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

<u>FINANCE COMMITTEE - Council Member Moore, Chair Committee Members: Moore, Hudson, Ewing, and Jones</u>

Council Member Moore stated because of Council travel this week, the Finance Committee was not able to meet. Finance Items would be done by Committee of the Whole.

2018-163 Utility Relocation Agreement - NCDOT

City Council is requested to approve a Utility Relocation Agreement between the City of High Point and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) for the relocation of the electric utilities within the I-74 (US 311) and NC 68 (Eastchester Drive) interchange ramp replacement project.

Randy McCaslin, Deputy City Manager, gave the presentation on this item.

Mr. McCaslin stated there has been discussion regarding the pending NCDOT project that would improve the interchange at 311/1-74 and Eastchester Dr. He stated part of the project would require relocation of major utility lines. The cost of moving those lines is about 1.3 million. The City will do that work and then be reimbursed by NCDOT. The next item on the agenda is the Budget Amendment which allows the City to spend those funds and then be reimbursed by the NCDOT.

Council Member Ewing asked in regards to the year of the Budget Amendment, when will construction begin. Mr. McCaslin stated the project has already started. Eric Olmedo, Budget and Administrative Director, stated since it was a Capital project, those funds will automatically roll forward to next year.

Approved a Utility Relocation Agreement between the City of High Point and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) for the relocation of the electric utilities within the I-74 (US 311) and NC 68 (Eastchester Drive) interchange ramp replacement project.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Jones, that this agreement be approved. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-164 Ordinance - Budget Amendment - Utility Relocation at I-74 and NC Hwy 68 Interchange

City Council is requested to adopt a budget amendment amending the 2017-2018 Budget Ordinance in the amount of \$1,302,760.00 to recognize funds from NCDOT for the relocation of overhead and underground electric lines located at the intersection of I-74 & NC Hwy 68 interchange ramp replacement project.

Adopted an Ordinance amending the 2017-2018 Budget Ordinance in the amount of \$1,302,760.00.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Ewing, that this Budget Ordinance Amendment be adopted. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

Ordinance No. 7412/18-41 Ordinance Book, Volume XX, Page 41 Introduced 5/21/2018; Adopted 5/21/2018

2018-165 <u>Contract - Cleco Construction Corporation - Centennial Street Bridge Deck</u> Preservation

City Council is requested to approve the award of contract for Bid No. 48 in the amount of \$454,320.60 to Cleco Construction Corporation for the deck preservation repairs on the Centennial Street Bridge over Oak Hollow Lake.

Terry Houk, Public Service Director, gave the presentation on this item.

Mr. Houk stated this project was budgeted for repairs on the Centennial Street Bridge over Oak Hollow Lake. It was identified by NCDOT as having some structural issues. Mr. Houk shared pictures of the structural damage and stated the contract was for \$454,320.60 which was under budget. Once executed there is a 90-day construction time.

Council Member Moore asked if the construction would be lane by lane or the entire bridge. Mr. Houk responded it would be the entire bridge at one time, detours would be in place. Council Member Jones asked how long the work is anticipated to last. Mr. Houk answered 90 days.

Approved the contract with Cleco Construction Corporation in the amount of \$454,320.60 for the deck preservation repairs on the Centennial Street Bridge over Oak Hollow Lake.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Ewing, that this contract be approved. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-166 Ordinance - Budget Ordinance - Centennial Street Bridge Deck Preservation

City Council is requested to adopt a budget amendment amending the 2017 - 2018 Budget Ordinance in the amount of \$383,000 for the Centennial Street Bridge Decking Preservation Project.

Eric Olmedo gave the presentation on this item.

Mr. Olmedo stated the funds for the project were available and appropriated in the current year budget. This is simply a clean-up item to combine those into one fund which requires Councils approval. Council Member Ewing asked if all the figures were originally appropriated for that project or was the funds pulled from other areas. Mr. Olmedo stated the amount \$167,960 and the \$149,583 listed were for bridge projects within the city, and the additional \$233,417 from general fund body program was not budgeted specifically for this project, but those funds were available and appropriate to use for this project. Council Member Ewing asked if pulling those funds would affect the annual allocation for road resurfacing. Mr. Olmedo stated no, that is a different project.

Adopted an Ordinance amending the 2017-2018 Budget Ordinance in the amount of \$383,000.00 for the Centennial Street Bridge Decking Preservation Project.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Jones, that this Budget Ordinance Amendment be adopted. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

Ordinance No. 7413/18-42 Ordinance Book, Volume XX, page 42 Introduced 5/21/2018; Adopted 5/21/2018

2018-167 Change Order to Contract - Wharton-Smith, Inc. - Eastside WWTP

City Council is requested to approve a change order in the amount of \$107,721.67 to the Wharton-Smith, Inc. contract to provide for additional repairs and replacement of equipment needed for the Eastside Wastewater Treatment Plant Solids Handling Improvements.

Terry Houk gave the presentation on this item.

Mr. Houk stated we are in the process of upgrading the incinerator, during the course of the construction process additional repairs and equipment were needed. This Change Order is for \$107,721.67. Council Member Moore asked if the \$107,721.67 above something else. Mr. Houk stated yes, it is. Council Member Ewing stated we are over two years past completion, will this put us any closer. Mr. Houk responded the project plan is to have the incinerator fully operational by the end of this year.

Approved a change order in the amount of \$107,721.67 to the Wharton-Smith, Inc. contract to provide for additional repairs and replacement of equipment needed for the Eastside Wastewater Treatment Plant Solids Handling Improvements.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Hudson, to approve the change order to the Wharton-Smith contract. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-168 Change Order - Yates Construction Company - Southside Pedestrian Bridge

City Council is requested to approve a change order in the amount of \$75,000.00 to the Yates Construction Company contract for Southside Pedestrian Bridge project to construct a greenway between Vail Avenue and Grimes Avenue.

Keith Pugh, Engineering Services Director, gave a presentation on this item.

Mr. Pugh stated this Change Order is to add portion of the Southside Greenway to the existing construction contract. This will construct the greenway between Vail Avenue and Grimes Avenue. Council Member Moore asked can you speak to the neighborhood stabilization program. Mike McNair, Community Development Director, stated these were actually program income that were received from selling properties through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, these funds are being reinvested back into the community.

Approved a change order in the amount of \$75,000.00 to the Yates Construction Company contract for the Southside Pedestrian Bridge project to construct a greenway between Vail Avenue and Grimes Avenue.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Hudson, to approve the change order to the Yates Construction Company contract. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-169 Amendment to License Agreement - Cingular Wireless PSC, LLC (AT&T)

City Council is requested to approve an Amendment to the License Agreement with Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) which allows the location of communication equipment at the City's Ward Water Plant; and authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement.

Terry Houk gave the presentation on this item.

Mr. Houk stated Cingular Wireless PCS. LLC (AT&T) has requested an amendment to the current license agreement with the City that allows them to use space at the Ward Water

plant for the installation of communication equipment. The amendment would result in extending the term of the License by 15 years, resulting in a termination date of October 19, 2042 and provide Cingular first right refusal. Public Service is recommending the City Council approve the Amendment to License Agreement with Cingular Wireless PSC, LLC and authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement. Revenue from this project and two other towers that are under the City's control is about \$227,000.

Council Member Moore asked if it is a 15-year fixed, or five-year renewal what does the contract require. Jo Anne Carlyle, City Attorney stated it was 15 years fixed. Jason Ewing stated wireless infrastructure was a hot topic in Washington in how municipalities can manage those on a Municipal level and not get taken advantage of. When does this have to be executed? Mr. Houk stated as soon as possible. Council Member Moore asked if the other towers are uniform in contract. Mr. Houk stated he believed so, we try to be legal and fair. The tower belongs to them, but it is on our site. Any modification to the water tanks needs approval by Council. Council Member Ewing asked why they want an extension on the current lease when they there is still 9 years on the current. Ms. Carlyle stated there was necessary clean up on the contract in general. The company has changed hands and changed names so there have been a few amendments. Council Member Jones asked if this locks the City in regarding the amount of revenue received. Ms. Carlyle stated yes, it is standard compared to other companies.

A discussion ensued regarding the extension of the contract and revenues received.

A motion was made by Council Member Ewing, seconded by Council Member Moore, to place this matter on the Pending List and remand it to the Finance Committee for further discussion. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-170 Public Hearing - 2018-2019 City of High Point Annual Budget

Monday, May 21, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. is the date and time established to receive public comments on the proposed 2018-2019 City of High Point Annual Budget.

Council Member Moore opened the Public Hearing for the 2018-2019 Budget.

Debbie Lumpkins, Executive Director of the High Point Arts Council, 121 S. Centennial Station, thanked the Mayor and the City Council for allowing her to speak to them collectively. She gave an overview and history of the Arts Council. She listed several entities that are in collaboration with the Arts Council noting there are 50,000 people impacted by their programs. She stated she feels they are the City's Art Department and respectfully requested that the Arts Council be a line item in the budget and be restored to the 2009 funding level. She invited the Mayor and City Council to the annual awards Banquet at Centennial Station Art Center scheduled for June 20, 2018.

Brian Gavigan, Business Owner and Chairman of the Advisory Board with Business High Point Chamber of Commerce, 1912 Eastchester Drive, stated the Budget is a fantastic peace of work, that increases services for several important things for City residents including blight removal, renovation for the Police Headquarters Building, 2nd year funding for the Family Justice Center, continuing neighborhood street resurfacing, utility assistance program, continuing work with development downtown which will provide growth and tax revenue for our City, continuing to reduce deferred maintenance in our parks, replacing transit buses, expanding transit offices, replacing and purchasing new equipment for large and light duty vehicles; and replacement of fire apparatus. You have done all that with no tax increase, no electric rate increase, no garbage collection fee increase, no stormwater fee increase, and no motor vehicle license fee increase. The only increase is a small increase in water and sewer that has been for debt reduction in water sewer infrastructure in our city. This is really great work and it takes a great team to put it together. On behalf of the Community, I want to thank you.

Ken Orms, 3525 Sainsbury Lane Greensboro (High Point city limits), suggested that the budget hearings be moved to the evenings so more people would be able to attend. He congratulated Council Member Ewing for his vote on the cell tower noting when negotiating with companies regarding cell towers in addition to revenues; safety should be considered as well, with possible cameras to monitor activities.

Council Member Moore **closed the Public Hearing** and acknowledge that the Public Hearing was held and asked the City Council if there is a need for a work study on Tuesday, May 30th.

Barring no objections from Council, Council Member Ewing moved to direct staff to prepare documents for adoption of the budget at the first Council meeting in June. Council Member Jones seconded the motion. Motion carried with a 9-0 unanimous vote as follows:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

PROSPERITY & LIVABILITY COMMITTEE - Council Member Ewing, Chair

Committee Members Ewing, Hudson, Peters, and Golden

2018-171 Special Events Policy

City Council is requested to approve a Special Events policy as recommended by the Prosperity & Livability Committee. This policy includes a definition of categories of events, a fee schedule and a listing of current events held in the city, with recommendations for which events are city sponsored and those that are not.

Council Member Ewing stated the Special Events Policy has been vetted through the Prosperity and Livability Committee and the recommendations from the committee are in the agenda packets. He stated this Special Events Policy was forwarded to Council by the Prosperity & Livability Committee with a unanimous favorable recommendation.

Approved the Special Events Policy as recommended by the Prosperity & Livability Committee.

A motion was made by Council Member Ewing, seconded by Council Member Golden, to approve the Special Events Policy as recommended by the Prosperity & Livability Committee. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

PENDING ITEMS

2018-100 High Point Area Arts Council Assistance Agreement

City Council is requested to approve an Agreement providing assistance from the City of High Point of up to \$181,324.00 over the next two fiscal years for the satisfaction of a \$362,648 mortgage associated with the High Point Area Arts Council purchase of property located at 121 S. Centennial Street.

Note: This matter was initially heard by Council on April 2, 2018, at which time it was tabled and sent to the Finance Committee for further discussion. It was discussed by the Finance Committee on May 3, 2018 and forwarded back to the City Council with no recommendation. It was again discussed at the May 7, 2018 City Council Meeting. At the May 7, 2018 a series of motions were made including denial of the Arts Council Agreement, which did not pass. The prevailing motion was to refer it to the Prosperity & Livability Committee for further discussion. The matter was again discussed by the Prosperity & Livability Committee on May 9, 2018 and after another lengthy discussion, no recommendation was made; however, they agreed to discuss it further at their June 6th meeting.

COMMUNITY HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE - Council Member Golden, Chair

Committee Members: Golden, Peters, Scarborough, and Williams

2018-172 Parades, Special Events and Picketing - Revised Ordinance

City Council is requested to repeal Title 10 - Transportation and Traffic, Chapter 1 - Traffic Regulations, Article 0 - Parades in its entirety and replace with the newly, revised Title 10 - Transportation and Traffic, Chapter 1 - Traffic Regulations, Article 0 - Parades Special Events and Picketing.

Council Member Golden request the City Attorney give a brief presentation regarding this item.

Ms. Carlyle stated the current ordinance does not address picketing. She stated the ordinance being proposed has been vetted by the Community Housing, Neighborhood Development and Public Safety Committee three times, the ACLU and the NAACP. She noted there is typo on page 11, and that it would be changed to City Manager or his designee.

Council Member Golden shared some comments that were brought to his attention. On page 11, Item F - it shall be unlawful for a group of fifteen or more persons to picket without filing a notice as required herein and then if you turn to page 12, Section 10-1-290 - Criminal penalty - speaks of a penalty of \$50.00 dollars or 30 days in jail. Are we going to be putting our citizens in a position where they could go to jail for picketing and protesting.

Ms. Carlyle explained the criminal penalty mentioned there is the wording from the State Statute.

Council Member Golden asked what method will be used for dispersement of people. Police Chief Kenneth Shultz responded constitutional methods and actions, and noted they follow the Constitution of the United States and the laws of North Carolina.

Council Member Golden pointed out that the proposed ordinance was heavily vetted. Council Member Peters stated the Committee worked very hard and noted the notice of intent to picket means if something makes you mad and you want to picket, you can email the City Manager from your phone, and go picket.

Ms. Carlyle reminded everyone that the ordinance would be effective upon adoption.

A motion was made by Council Member Golden, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Williams, to repeal the existing Title 10- Transportation and Traffic, Chapter 1- Traffic Regulations, Article O- Parades in its entirety and adopt the newly revised Ordinance Title 10-Transportation and Traffic, Chapter 1- Traffic Regulations, Article O- Parades, Special Events, and Picketing (to be effective upon adoption). The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

PENDING ITEMS

2018-144 Ordinance - Demolition of Structure - 1505 East Avenue

City Council is requested to adopt an ordinance ordering the housing inspector to effectuate the demolition of a structure located at 1505 East Avenue belonging to SHJ Capital, LLC.

Note: This matter was initially heard by the City Council on May 7, 2018. At that time, staff reported that the property was sold and action was taken to place this housing case on the Pending List for 30 days to allow staff an opportunity to meet with the new property owners.

<u>PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Mayor Pro Tem Williams, Chair Committee Members Williams, Jones, Moore, and Scarborough</u>

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2018-173 Faulk & Foster Special Use 18-01 (SU-18-01)

A request by Faulk & Foster, representing Verizon Communication, Inc, to permit a major Wireless Telecommunication Facility. The site is approximately 8.7 acres and lying along the south side of Skeet Club Road, approximately 800 feet east of Braddock Road (1520 Skeet Club Road).

Chairman Williams stated Herb Shannon, Senior Planner, would give the presentation regarding this item.

Mr. Shannon stated anyone that would like to speak regarding this item would need to come forward to be sworn in.

Al	l participates	were swo	rn in by	the I	Deputy	City	Clerk,	Sandra .	Keeney.	

_____Transcript of Proceedings_____

Herb Shannon: Herb Shannon with the City of High Point Planning and Development Department. This is a Special Use to allow a Major Wireless Telecommunication Facility in a Residential Single Family- 3, R3 Zoning District. The sites laying along the southside of Skeet Club Road across from Deep River Park on 8.7-acre parcel that is currently developed for single family dwelling. The overhead projection... note the location of that site in the northern portion of the city. This is a blow up of the site. The area outlined in blue is the property where the special use permit is being requested and we have identified the proposed location of the telecommunication facility tower in the northern portion of the property. Wireless telecommunication facility up to sixty feet in height or a use permitted by a right of all residential zones in the city. However, if a facility or tower is over sixty feet in height in a residential zoning district, a special use permit approval is required. Included with application is a special use permit that outline the development conditions also a site plan and supplemental documentation that is provided by the applicant.

Just a quick summary of the proposal. The applicants are requesting approval to allow a 145-foot high monopole type tower on this parcel and 100 X 100 foot fenced in area. The location lies about 385 feet south of Skeet Club Road. Access would be from the existing residential drive way that serves existing residence on the property and the tower would be limited to four antennas. This is a survey of the property the compound area is outlined a northern portion of the site and also depicts how for continue maintenance that existing drive way that serves the home would be used. This is an elevation of the proposed 145' to tall structure with up to four antennas. I would note our Development Ordinance does require additional antennas so as to allow for co-location and eliminate future tower application if there is space on towers in this area. For a special use permit it requires analysis for its potential impact on the site and to surrounding property owners and the special use process allows the Planning Zoning Commission and the City Council to perform this analysis. The development ordinance requires certain findings be made for special use permit approval and within the staff report that has been provided to you those finding are outlined.

Key points to note are: first, that the request would not endanger public health and safety based upon the documents that have been provided staff finds that the request will not endanger public health and safety. All tower facilities require to meet all the requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Communication Commission in addition to any other State or Federal agency regulations. The applicant has approached the FAA and submitted a determination no hazard letter from the FAA and that is included in your package. Also, within the residential zoning district towers are permitted up to 200 feet in height this is well under that 200-foot limit. The applicant has also submitted a letter from the engineer stating the proposed structure would have a fall zone of 75 feet. The fall zone is a collapse area, the tower has been engineered such a way that in the event of failure it will collapse in a 75-foot area on the property. This is the portion of site where the tower is proposed to be located at, the fall zone or approximate fall zone area is highlighted in the area in red. The proposed tower structure is about 90 feet south of the north property line and approximately 75 feet from the eastern property line of the site and that letter from the engineer is included within your packet.

Another finding that we evaluate is that it will not substantially injure the value of the abutting properties or as a public necessity. Staff has not identified any evidence that the proposed wireless tower will substantially injure the value of abutting properties. The applicants goal was to try to place this facility as far away as possible from the abutting residential structures. It is about 500 feet from the nearest residential structure and over 300 feet from Skeet Club road. It abuts a 31,000-square foot of non-residential structure there is a church directly next to the site and the tower is proposed to be near the rear of this church structure and based upon that documentation provided staff has find that it will be in harmony with the surrounding area.

Also, in regards of harmony we look at evaluating the site in its location this tower is proposed to be on the northern portion of the site we did ask the applicant to evaluate other locations of the site where it could be located at. You have a situation where this property is in Tier 4 and Tier 3 of the Oak Hollow Lake Watershed critical area so with it being in that watershed critical area, there are higher environmental requirements and limitations on development. This blue line highlights the watershed critical area line. One of the reasons why it is at the northern portion of the site is to keep it out of that Tier 3 area which has more restrictive requirements.

Also, farther south from the site means more grading and more environmental impacts. Another issue that was considered was tower height. This is the highest point of the site as you go further south the grade drops about 15 to 20 feet a tower placed there would have to be higher to keep the same elevation. Also, as you can see there is a house to the west placement on the southern portion of the site would be closer to the house and you also you have that southern portion of the site encumbered by a stream buffer there is a perennial stream that runs through the southern portion of the site wherever there is a perennial stream there is a 200-foot buffer, 100 feet on both sides and the southern portion of this property is also impacted by an existing Bellsouth underground telephone line. All that was taken into consideration when the applicant looked at the location of the tower.

Finally, I would note based on staff evaluation, the proposed request does not conflict with adopted policy guidance documents. Based on the attached special use permit that is included in your packet, the preliminary findings and the back-up documentation, the Planning and Development Department is recommending approval of the accompanying Special Use Permit to allow a 140-foot tall wireless communication facility in the R3 district.

This item was reviewed the Planning Zoning Commission at their April 24th Public Hearing and the Commission recommended approval by a vote of 6-2. That is a brief summary of the application. Are there any questions for staff at this time?

Chairman Williams: This may be an off the wall question. I know in something in the past, we kind of did some screening like trees or whatever.

Herb Shannon: The landscape ordinance will require screening around the perimeter of tower compound there is 100×100 compound and the landscape ordinance would require screening around that perimeter area except for where the access drive is taken at for that little access area.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams: That's where, ok it would just that typically dirt road or whatever.

Herb Shannon: They are proposing using the existing gravel drive that comes in and they will just have a little turn off from that, that they would have to pave and as part of their development the stormwater run-off will accommodate the new paving that they're adding that comes off that gravel drive.

Council Member Ewing: In the past the last few towers we've dealt with there were images that showed what it would look like and how visible it would be from different surrounding neighborhoods. Do we have that for this specific proposal?

Herb Shannon: I do not believe the applicant has provided that information this time, the applicant can address that when they do their presentation.

Council Member Golden: Can we by chance document what the concerns were the two people that noted...

Herb Shannon: At the Planning and Zoning Commission those two members did not make a specific statement as to why they were voting against. You do have a summary of the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting second page 2 of your packet is a cover memo and it outlines in the staff presentation of those speaking in favor and those speaking in opposition their concerns, but in their vote, they did not make a specific statement for the record as to why those two voted in opposition.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams: Anymore questions?

Council Member Moore: Herb, the staff recommendation for approval.....what was presented that made you confident in the safety concerns that were brought up by the Chris and somebody else?

Herb Shannon: In evaluating a special use permit staff is bound by those specific findings. So, we look at each one of those findings and the supporting documents provided by the applicant. Those are the key things we look at. The applicant had the letter from their engineer. As far as the fall zone, of course, any type of structure developed in the city they would have to submit appropriate engineering plans that are reviewed by our building department and get permits. But we are bound just by those specific findings, so that is what we focus on.

Council Member Moore: Okay, was there discussion about that and I'm sure there was. Can you elaborate on this discussion about the soil concerns? Was there testing and that type of thing?

Herb Shannon: I will let the applicant elaborate on that. They did note that at the Planning and Zoning Commission. They affirmed they looked at that, but I'll let them get into that. I'll just note that for any development appropriate plans and engineering documents are required to be submitted and reviewed by our building department.

Council Member Moore: Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Alright any other questions for Mr. Shannon? Seeing none, I will move into the Public Hearing portion, open the Public Hearing, and I guess we will hear from the applicant first.

Paul Parker: Thank you for your time tonight my name is Paul Parker, I'm from Raleigh 2724 Lakeview Drive, Raleigh North Carolina. I have been in this business for 25 years and cited thousands of these sites and modified and negotiated leases, so you know we typically try to locate these towers in a place that is meets the requirements of the ordinance and typically if you meet the requirements of the ordinance you there's no reason to turn it down. But I do want to read this statement of justification here. So, I'm here with Faulk and Foster on behalf of Verizon Wireless for approval of a major special use application for the purpose of developing 145-foot monopole wireless communication facility 1520 Skeet Club road. In addition to Special Use application request the approval of the installation of the antenna's and related ground equipment for Verizon's facility. Faulk and Foster is acting on behalf of Verizon Wireless. Verizon Wireless is a service provider license by the FCC who is currently improving its networks in the High Point North Carolina area.

Site need and justification as noted above or previously said Verizon Wireless is determined that this area of High Point lacks sufficient coverage for their network system. The radio frequency engineers develop a search area and within that search area centers around the residential area south of Skeet Club Road and commercial areas. This area of town lacks any existing communications towers or other tall structures to sufficient height and specific locations necessary to meet the coverage objectives and provide connectivity to surrounding sites. In addition, wireless communications towers located well outside of the search area are to far away and are currently Verizon's currently operating on them. Special care is taken to ensure the proposal proposed tower and its location would have minimal visual impact of the surrounding residential areas in the immediate vicinity. The limited visibility of the proposed communication tower is due to the location, the height of the structure, and the lack of illuminations meaning It's not going to have a lighting on top of it and the rolling topography of the surrounding area. The configuration of the facilities site and access were carefully considered in effort to conceal the site and existing stand of trees in addition existing vegetation on the subject parcel would further screen this site from public view including landscaping buffer around the fenced compound.

The proposed site complies with the requirements of the City of High Points Unified Development Ordinance and specific regulations for wireless communication towers to be free standing. We have a letter form the RF Engineer Stephen McKenna, who is with Verizon and certifies there are no existing towers capable of meeting the coverage needs. The tower designed and requirement requirements both the proposed tower structure and fence compound are designed to accommodate at least three additional telecommunication carriers as shown on the attached site drawing we have available. Planted landscape buffer around the communication tower as shown on our construction drawings submitted in addition proposing a complete preservation of existing mature vegetation on the property except for the clearing of the 60 X 60 compound itself. We have a 100 X 100 lease area and within that 100 X 100 we will have a buffer between the 60 X 60 square if that makes sense.

So, in the previous meeting another gentleman that I work with Mr. Jim LaPann brought to the attention that the proposed facility is compliance with the City's Development Ordinance

and the location of the property was chosen to keep the tower away from adjacent residential dwellings and away from stream environmental constraints at the rear of the site. According to the Federal Communications Commission 70% of all 911 calls are placed from a cell phone. The request tower will fulfill a gap in Verizon's coverage area and will significantly benefit area residents with increase coverage and safety. As to concerns of the soil, we have had a soil testing by the engineering group SM&E and that was completed April 20, 2018 and they said the soil is acceptable for the design that we have. And we respectfully request approval so we can move forward with the building permit application and that review process.

Chairman Williams: Just a shot in the dark I'm going to assume like Council Member Golden requested you don't have like pictures of the proposal as to what it would look like in that area. We've had them before.

Paul Parker: I don't have a photo simulation right now, no Sir. I can certainly get one and turn it in with the you know if its approved for the building permit if that would suffice but I know there is some concern with it was brought to my attention today there is some concern that the tower fall zone radius based on the engineering design just kind of hits the property lines and in order to change that we are willing to move the tower to the west 10 feet is about all we can really do without basically starting the whole process over with the FCC and FAA and everything we have done. But we can move it to the west to make sure we're away from the church property.

Council Member Moore: Does the... obviously we're doing this through readings and correspondence that's in the packet here. Do you know Mr. Chris Coggins from the church?

Paul Parker: No, Sir I do not.

Council Member Moore: You do not. He is obviously the person the spokesperson for them and their concerns and just wondering in subsequent time prior to Planning and Zoning or after if there had been discussion and his questions and concerns had been answered. He had questions about the soil.

Mr. Parker: Yes.

Council Member Moore: Do you know if the church has responded.

Paul Parker: No Sir. I do know that Mr. LaPann has been corresponding with him directly and he was unable to make it tonight so that is why I'm here.

Council Member Moore: Mr. LaPann did not tell you anything, if that had been resolved?

Paul Parker: He did. He gave me all the letters that were written and the correspondence that went back and forth, and so I am aware that there was correspondence going back and forth and that there was concern about the soils.

Council Member Moore: And you feel like that has been answered? Or you don't know.

Paul Parker: I feel like it's been answered because the engineering firm that we hired has confirmed it is acceptable.

Council Member Moore: Okay.

Council Member Jones: With all that land, why is it not farther away from the church and the kid's playground and all that according to their letters they said the fall zone falls pretty close to that.

Paul Parker: We're trying to stay away from residential homes.

Chairman Williams: Anymore questions?

Council Member Golden: Yes, one question. You said you could move it 10 feet.

Paul Parker: Yes sir.

Council Member Golden: To accommodate the not touching the border, but I saw a note in here where the church had said that it being where it is now it would limit them you know expanding their parking lot or doing any construction on that side of the property. Am I reading that right? So, my question was the answer he gave was sort of well I didn't like it. I mean he basically said, well that's what it is and we are going to move forward. And then the other thing was they had a question on here about, let me see if I can find it, because I don't want to mess it up too bad. They requested a picture a couple of weeks ago and you guys you promised them a picture too and don't look like they got a picture of what it was going to look like from their property. Is that something you guys can't do or won't do.

Paul Parker: We can do it, it just takes more time than two weeks and we are already in this process we've been working on this for about seven months now, this has just kind of come to our attention. The main thing for us was the coverage objective and having it to where people have access to coverage in that area because right now we do not have Verizon does not have adequate coverage.

Council Member Golden: Literally you guys just have 10 feet of worth of wiggle room.

Paul Parker: Yes Sir. We want to stay out of that water shed area as well.

Council Member Jones: Well, I agree coverage is pretty bad. I live over there myself and when it comes to all the stuff we're working on from the Economic Development standpoint, that is one thing that people and companies look at, is what is the cell phone coverage is like, data wise. Everything else, I will be interested to hear from the other people about their thoughts and concerns about the church.

Council Member Golden: I'm looking forward to that myself. That's all I have for him.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions for the applicant?

City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle: If I may, it sounds like you guys have received some comments and I just want to remind you that this is a Quasi-Judicial hearing. You have to

consider what you hear tonight as sworn testimony and nothing that you have received outside of this hearing.

May 21, 2018

Council Member Ewing: From comments that I've heard, it sounds like everything we have in our packet.

City Attorney Carlyle: Thank you for putting your Attorney at ease.

Chairman Williams: Alright, Thank you Sir.

Paul Parker: Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Alright, I will call up the first person who wants to speak, Wayne Marshall.

Mayor Wagner: He is part of the applicant.

Herb Shannon: Mr. Williams, just one item for clarification. The applicant did mention the GEO Technical information that has not been submitted into evidence. I didn't know if the applicant had that available to submit into evidence this evening.

Paul Parker: I do not have it this evening.

Ray Gillen: Mayor and City Council, my name is Ray Gillen. I'm here to represent the Trustees of Covenant Church United Methodist. We do have some concerns on the cell tower. We have a thousand members at our church, plus 134 pre-school kids and 107 after school kids with a staff of 40 plus teachers in addition to clergy and staff. The proposed tower will be directly 124 feet from the playground and 130 feet from the class rooms.

Please understand that we support this new tower and we fully understand that it is needed in North High Point. With that being said, we would respectfully request you approve the tower with the stipulation that the tower location be moved to a site at 150 feet from our building. We've received one partial response from Faulk and Foster on December 19, 2017. We have no other response or evidence that our concerns were submitted to the High Point zoning staff by Faulk and Foster. We also include our comment, this also includes our comments from the Citizen information meeting on December 21, 2017. Our letters to Faulk and Fosters were not included in the planning and staff report. Minutes and citizens attendees from the Citizens information meeting were not included in the Planning and Zoning staff report.

Please note that our concerns about the tower's proximity to our kids were not included in the Planning and Zoning staff report. In fact, the relevant section states the site abuts an existing non-residential use church. However, the proposed monopole structure will be to the rear of this church structure near the gravel parking lot. No mentions of exposure of, no mention of the kids' exposure by saying non-residential total exposure time to our kids during school year is about 135,000 hours.

Also, our concerns about the soil. The soil in this specific area is classified ENB and ENC by the USDA Soil Conservation Service. This means that the soil does not drain easily and has

high shrink-swell characteristics. Covenant Church United Methodist has actual negative experience previously dealing with the soil issues. We spent thousands of dollars to remove the top 6 to 8 feet of soil to build our parking lot. Last year we spent \$18,600 dollars to stabilize the south wall of our classrooms. The current parking lot is gravel. When we pave it, the surface becomes impervious, then all of the water from the one lot will drain into the southwest corner directly to the base of the tower. In an average year this means there will be an additional one million, two hundred gallons of water or 27 additional gallons per inch of rainfall flowing to the base of the tower.

The tower is to be designed in an engineer fall zone of 75 feet. The tower height is 145 feet plus 4 feet of antenna's. This 75-foot engineer fall zone directly touches our property line next to our playground to the east and within 7 feet of our parking lot to the north. The January 3, 2018 letter submitted by Sabre Industries Towers and Poles professional engineer references a wind and ice failure only effects only engineer fall zone and does not reference soil conditions or additional water drainage to the tower base. Notice that the letter about the soil was 13 days after we shared soil data with Faulk and Foster. And yes, we are sensitive to the possible tornado effects as evidence in Greensboro recently and several years on Johnson Street. You, the City Council are the final decision makers. Our church, again, is respectfully requesting that you please stipulate that your approval requires moving the tower location a safe distance away from our church so if the tower falls it falls on trees and not our kids. Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Thank you, Sir. I guess I'll hear from Wayne Marshall.

Wayne Marshall: Thank you, I'm Wayne Marshall. I'm a member of Covenant Church I had grandkids that went to pre-school, not any more they are out. I was the trustee Chair when we had to redo the parking lot which is directly north of asterisk and there is a berm about where the blue line is there. That's the dirt. We literally had to move so that we could put a parking lot on it. The soil survey information from 1977 says it is not good for commercial building because of the shrink-swell. We know that because the soil underneath, it does not permit the water to go through easily. It just sort of sits. Now, the drainage from that parking lot is in the southwest corner which is directly to the base of the tower location. So, all that water will flow to that base. So that basically changes the amount of water that flows to 4 times what it is now because it's basically a one-acre lot that goes to that.

Mr. Parker mentioned that he can move it ten feet. I don't really understand that. You'll notice that there is a picture of the house which is he noted in his presentation as 500 feet away. There is... Mr. Gillen makes no mention, what Mr. LaPann and the people that presented that its true. It's just incomplete. It doesn't share the danger to the people. It does not address the soil issues. So, we are just asking... and the playground is directly east of the asterisk behind the building that is used every school day. The 135,000 hours of exposure per year does not include Sundays. It does not include Monday and Tuesday nights for Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and that's just additional time that something is exposed. I will be glad to answer any questions that you have about any part of any of this. We just simply think it's just plain illogical to purposely put a tower that close to people that are exposed.

Chairman Williams: Any questions? Thank you, Mr. Marshall. I don't have anyone else on this list. Is there anyone else that is here to speak? Give your name and address for the record.

Victor Jarvis: My name is Victor Jarvis, I live at 4014 Braddock, I'm the fourth house down Braddock Road from Skeet Club. I don't have any prepared information, but I wanted to say obviously the tower is where it's at because of statutory reasons to stay away from residential housing. So, to move it past ten feet it would be a statutory violation. That is what my speculation is. My biggest concern is, I'd like to have time to provide educational material to the board because there is other things that is taking place in the country that this Council may not be aware of. We are on the cusp of going from 4G to 5G, there is going to be lot of profit involved in that. They shorten up the millimeter waves, they are going to 2 1/2 giga hertz to 60 giga hertz which is the same speed as oxygen molecules—the oxygen that we breath. It's going to be very dangerous for the children at Covenant. In similar locations like in southern California, they've had cancer clusters. I don't ... like I said, I'm not prepared to give you all the details today, but what I would like to do is for this issue to be tabled so I can come in and bring you some scientific information. I have a technology background. It is a very dangerous process. It needs to ... the information that I can share will help this board on future decisions about all its towers. The technical information does not include future use, doesn't have future use information in it. The City is being paid based on current technology, but the technology is on the verge of changing. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Thank you Sir. Is there anyone else here to speak for or against this item? You have to be sworn in.

Sandra Keeney, Deputy City Clerk: Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Jim McGee: I do.

Chairman Williams: Please give your name and address for the record.

Jim McGee: My name is Jim McGee, I live at 1573 Skeet Club Road. I'm the original Chairman of the Administrative Board of this Church and I have a great deal of concern. I don't know what it means if you rezone something, can you build anything you want to if its rezoned? I'm not sure of the regulations there, but I'm just concerned not only with the children's playground, but the tower itself. It's stated that it is supposed to withstand a 90degree, a 90-mph wind. And we know, I can name four. Let's go back to the mid 30's. In 1936, there was a devastating tornado in Greensboro. You can go back to 1947. I personally made a commercial survey of the property on Rockford Road, and then in 2010 no, yes, 2010 a few people that live in High Point know that street was decimated with the tornado F4 I believe they called it. Those oaks that I saw there in 1947 had grown to tremendous beautiful trees that the landscapers and subdivisions had put there. All I'm saying is they were gone. Massive oak trees that was in 2010. In 2014 we had another coming our way just a little over a mile from where we are talking about where that proposed tower is. In the Blairwood Subdivision and if you know our city, it's right up between this side, the east side of Johnson Street Southside of Skeet Club. A subsequent path from the old tornado to this one, and I mentioned the one in 1936. You fellows are not old enough to remember that, but I do. It was devastating. But, what about the one just a month ago and that's just maybe 10 miles or little more than 10 miles from our church site. I'm just saying, if it's only good for 90-mph winds, it's going to fall. It's not if, it's when.

I don't like the idea of the tower at all, but if it's got to be, it's got 500 feet from his house. I propose it come another 100 feet to the southeast and get away from our buildings. We've already spent tens of thousands of dollars proposing and we have floor plan drawings already for a sanctuary that we intend to build on what you're calling the parking lo, if we can guarantee that the sub-soil will withstand the foundation for that type of building. That's my concern.

You also mentioned the fact of our other property involved on the other side. Well, it's no secret that we own the property on the west side of the line. Where the other house is sitting way back about 900 feet, right there, that house is on our property. We have put that up for sale and we have had a few interested people, but when they see this plan, and this tower that is going up, it either won't sell or it will be greatly diminished in value because who's going to build a house. There is plenty of room to build several houses on that lot, but nobody is going to build one there. The only way I would allow this to be approved was if this property had 300 feet so that it could be 150 feet from either side. That way if and when the tower falls, it is not going to damage or injure anybody or any buildings. Like I said, we've already spent tens of thousands of dollars for drawings and surveys to build on that what we are now calling our parking lot, which would be transferred. I think that is all I have to say.

Chairman Williams: Thank you. Alright is there anyone else? You have to also be sworn in sir.

Deputy City Clerk Keeney: Have you been sworn in?

Butch Johnson: No, I have not.

Deputy City Clerk Keeney: Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Chairman Williams: Please give your name and address for the record.

Butch Johnson: My name is Butch Johnson: 3929 Newport Court, also a church member. I had not planned on speaking but I just wanted to reinforce what Jim was just talking about. Prior to the down turn in 2008, I was the leader of a church building and study team to build a sanctuary. We do not currently have a sanctuary we have an all-purpose area we use. And like Jim was talking about the area that has been called the parking lot ended up being the only reasonable place to put the sanctuary. You know we have water issues with land on the westside, and on the front because of widening Skeet Club Road, we could not put it on the front like originally planned. So, the sanctuary that is anticipated at some point which is starting to be talked about a little bit this time, would be directly in front of that tower. So, I just ask you to imagine what that tower would look like sitting there with your house of worship. Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Anyone else? Seeing none, I'm going to close the Public Hearing and open this up for discussion, but before we start, I do have a question for Council. If memory serves me correct, is there a Federal Statute on our discretion when it comes to making decisions in these matters?

City Attorney Carlyle: Yes, you cannot consider health issues for example.

Council Member Moore: Can you speak a little louder?

City Attorney Carlyle: Yes, I'm sorry. I am on. You cannot consider health issues that you may have heard. Someone mentioned earlier tonight. You're not supposed to have to be very careful when talking about business decisions for example how many more parties would be served in the area as far as cell service being included. The real estate value there is some serious limitation as to what you can consider. But I really haven't heard a lot of information presented tonight that is outside of those other than maybe those two that I just mentioned.

Mayor Wagner: But to deny it, we would have to find that one of the required findings has not been met.

City Attorney Carlyle: Exactly, and I believe there are five findings that are set forth in the staff report and those really are your guidelines for how you adopt this.

Council Member Moore: And those have been met.

City Attorney Carlyle: According to your staff and staff recommendation.

Council Member Moore: According to staff.

Chairman Williams: Are there any other questions from Council?

Council Member Ewing: You know, looking at the and I believe, yeah, the findings, the one that I, at least to me, it appears it wouldn't be in compliance is the will it be in harmony with the area to which its located. The staff's discretion of its compliance might fall, but I think if you really look at that area, and one of the big triggers with me is we are in the midst of major changes to that thoroughfare on Skeet Club. We are widening it and we are creating sidewalks, a more walkable area, and I'm hesitant to put up a cell tower that really doesn't fit with what that is looking like or what it will look like. I think there have been some requests that weren't met by the applicant. Also, the visualization of what this tower will look like from surrounding areas. The soil composition, I believe that the applicant said that they have, but was not presented to staff as evidence. I just, I have a problem with meeting that specific.

Council Member Moore: There are several things that come to mind. I'll do it in form of a question. You know right behind us is our commitment and charge is prosperity and safe and so this is a perfect example of where those two are collide, and I feel Mr. Parker that you know your presentation or communication from what we are getting certainly looks thorough and it met, but I feel like it could have been more complete and better responsive to the Church before it got to us. If I have questions for someone do they have to come back to the mic or can I just.

Mayor Wagner: Better at the mic.

Council Member Moore: Mr. Parker would you mind stepping to the mic. Thank you. How often is the tower inspected and who does that? Does Verizon do that?

Paul Parker: Yeah. They have a company that does that and they do it every six months and they have maintenance supervisors.

Council Member Moore: And their findings are reported back to their corporate to meet FCC requirements and that kind of thing?

Paul Parker: Well, the FCC, but they, yes, they have to inspect the foundation on a yearly basis—if not six months.

Council Member Moore: And how many sites in this area, and I can agree with Council Member Jones based on what Verizon is charging me, they should already have had the tower built. But ho many sites were considered in this area?

Paul Parker: Several. Multiple sites and this is the only one we could work with.

Council Member Moore: The only one that would qualify? Okay, and in your defense, you know based on the safety and the things that you know that have been met. You know if mother nature decides she's going to win a battle, she's going to win a battle with a cell tower or volcano in Hawaii, but trying to find a balance of what can be best and there are several issues, you know, that I'm struggling with, but I want to try to find and be part of a solution. I have no more questions for you, but I have one for somebody from the church.

Paul Parker: Could I just add one thing?

Council Member Moore: Sure.

Paul Parker: So, we have an area that is lacking in coverage and if a tornado does come through there, that tower would be, you know, that's going to be the catalyst to get emergency services there. And, we, with Verizon, will allow emergency services to locate their antennas on there as well. So, I understand both points of view, but there should be some consideration taken turning the safety issue the other way and looking at it as a positive for the neighborhood.

Council Member Moore: Thank you.

Council Member Ewing: Councilman, if you wouldn't mind, I have one quick question before he sits down.

Council Member Moore: Go ahead.

Council Member Ewing: You had brought up.....Councilman Moore asked about the inspection of the towner and you said they inspected it every six months, but then you said yearly—if not six months. Is there a statutory requirement that they inspect those towers or is that just a company policy?

Paul Parker: That is a company policy.

Council Member Ewing: Is there any statutory requirements?

Paul Parker: I do not know the answer to that.

Council Member Hudson: Can I ask a question as well before he sits down....and I may have missed this. Is there a reason why the tower cannot be moved southwest on that property?

Paul Parker: We want to stay away from the watershed and we would like to keep them where the landowner is willing to let us do it. It meets the requirements of the ordinance and it gives the property owner the ability to have a higher and best use remaining on part of this property, rather than having the tower in the middle of it. If you put the tower in the middle of it, you are not going to be able to do anything else on that property.

Council Member Hudson: Thank you.

Council Member Moore: It does slope going back so you would have to have a higher tower. Is there someone that would speak on behalf of the church? Thank you, Sir. The 10-foot that they had said will and can feasibly move that doesn't do enough for you? Is that correct? Because it says it falls to the line or does it fall right into the playground, or just to it, based on those numbers?

Ray Gillen: The 75-foot engineer fall zone which is for wind and ice as stated in the letter. It does not address failure from the soil.

Council Member Moore: The whole tower, okay.

Ray Gillen: That's a concern.

Council Member Moore: Alright.

Ray Gillen: the 75-foot directly touches our property line.

Council Member Moore: If you are able to go forward with your sanctuary, will that have an effect on your playground?

Ray Gillen: No, no.

Council Member Moore: It will not?

Ray Gillen: No, the sanctuary is in the portion that I'll call the parking lot.

Council Member Moore: Okay, is there land available for possible negotiation to move your playground?

Ray Gillen: No.

Council Member Moore: Thank you. Any other questions?

Ray Gillen: I have one more comment according to Mr. LaPann, the first choice of the tower location was the park across the street and according to his letter of December 19th, I'm sorry,

yeah, December 19th, which was the last communication with us, he said that the City of High Point refused to put it in the park. I don't know the reason or reasons.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams: Thank you. Is there any more questions from Council?

Council Member Ewing: I've got a question for Herb. A couple of questions actually. Going back to the findings, in reading that the staff findings of compliance, you know, some technology, some terms we all use differently and in harmony the way it is technically spelled out. How is that defined from a planner's perspective?

Herb Shannon: It can be somewhat subjective, but we are looking at it based upon the evidence provided. Looking at the character of the area, looking at the adopted Land Use Plan, the adopted Policy guidance documents provided to Council. Staff could find no evidence of conflict with these documents.

Council Member Ewing: And with....as far as evidence provided, it just came up a few minutes ago about the GEO study. Is that something you would find relevant for staff to look at?

Herb Shannon: That would be something that the Building Department would look at as part of an application. They are going to have to meet State Building Codes, period. If that means that the soils have to be adjusted or modified, foundation has to be modified in such a way, they have to meet State Building Codes, period. If the soils prevent that, then our Building Department will not sign off on the permit.

Council Member Ewing: And our ordinance, it has to be what you said, 500 feet from a residential structure?

Herb Shannon: There is no separation from residential structures. Staff measured that from the home to the northwest fronting along Skeet Club Road that was the closest structure. We did not look at the home on this. We did not measure from the structure on this site. We measured from the home to the northwest, but the ordinance does not have any separation requirement. We just noted the closest structure was 500 feet away from a residential structure.

Council Member Ewing: But there is no ordinance that would preclude a residential structure from being right next to it.

Herb Shannon: No Sir.

Council Member Ewing: Thank you. That's all I have.

Council Member Moore: Mr. Shannon, you referenced the State Building Code that they would have to follow. The soil test that has been talked about in our packet here, is that for presentation purposes to Council, and will the State be sending in their own people to test the soil and area prior to the building of the tower, if it is approved?

Herb Shannon: As I asked the applicant earlier if he had that information to submit as evidence, staff has not seen that. That is more of an issue at the point they submit for building

permits. They will submit that to the building official and staff would review it at that point to make sure that it meets State Building Code as far as any structure being developed on a property, but as of today, we have not seen that evidence.

Deputy City Manager Randy McCaslin: Britt, in all likelihood, the Building & Inspections Department will require them to provide an engineer-signed drawing that would talk to the footing requirements, etc..., which is based on soil requirements. So that's what the Building Inspector will require.

Council Member Moore: Okay, so there will be more testing of that soil if this is approved and that process goes forth?

Deputy City Manager Randy McCaslin: Whatever the engineer needs to provide, whatever the building inspection needs. Yes.

Chairman Williams: Can we address what he said about the City denying them putting it in the park? Can staff address that?

Herb Shannon: The only information that I'm aware of is Verizon was talking with the Parks & Rec Department about placement of a tower across the street in the park. It would be to the rear of the ballfields. It is my understanding that access to that tower was a key issue. You would either from some type of access through the park or access drive along the edge of the park that would cross another property owner's property, and that property owner did not agree to provide that access. That was a sticking point of what I was aware of as far as locating the tower across the street.

Chairman Williams: Only access was the issue?

Herb Shannon: Yeah, because the Parks and Rec Department had concerns about paving an access drive through the ballfields.

Assistant City Manager Randy Hemann: I was part of that conversation and that is my memory as well. It was access and removal of some trees and the Parks & Rec did not feel it was appropriate.

Chairman Williams: Thank you. Any other questions?

Jim McGee: Can I make one other statement?

Chairman Williams: Sure.

Jim McGee: I have walked that property many times before anything was built there back in 1989. There's some rather low, swampy areas on the westside of the questionable lot there, but if you go down Grindstaff Avenue.....just drive down there and look to the northeast. You will see almost not a cliff, but an extremely steep rise there. I don't have my topo maps with me, but you might want to look at those. I'm not challenging anybody else's comments, but there is a very high knoll in that area just about 300 feet above Grindstaff Avenue. Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Thank you.

Council Member Ewing: Mr. Chairman, if you would entertain a motion, I would like to move denial of the Special Use Permit and I don't feel it's within harmony of the area that it's to be located on a 145-foot pole in that specific location, and based on the applicant's data, it would host a minimum of four antennas, I think that's not a maximum, it's a minimum of four.

Council Member Golden: I second that motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor Wagner: Okay there is a motion and a second. I have a question for the attorney. In your opinion does the motion contain adequate findings of non-compliance through harmony?

City Attorney Carlyle: It is simply referencing the finding of fact regarding harmony as discussed earlier and defined by staff and your comments earlier. I think that's all.

Mayor Wagner: I just didn't know how specific you wanted us to be in terms of a non-finding.

City Attorney Carlyle: I think that's all we have.

Mayor Wagner: There is a motion and a second to deny this permit. Is there any further discussion?

Council Member Moore: I have a discussion point or a question for staff or legal. The tower that was approved somewhat four or five years ago off of Johnson Street behind the Tabernacle Church, does anyone from staff know the height of that tower?

Herb Shannon: Off the top of my head, no. But, I believe it was around 160 in that general area, but I don't recall the exact height.

Council Member Moore: Okay.

Mayor Wagner: Any further questions or comments?

Council Member Jones: I guess the question would be if their study shows that we do need additional coverage and they need a tower in the area for additional coverage and we deny it, they are just going to have to look for a more suitable location.

Council Member Moore: That is correct, but if you know the area well, I don't know where that would be.

Council Member Jones: I don't either.

Council Member Moore: And trying to find the balance of harmony and prosperous and safe. I would like to try to find a way to put the two entities back together. And as I stated in my earlier comments, I think there could have been better communication on the part of Mr. Parker's firm. I may be wrong, but that is my guess in what I've heard. I'm not exactly sure what motion to do to accomplish that.

Council Member Ewing: I call the question.

Mayor Wagner: The question has been called. Everyone has been given an opportunity to speak. All those in favor of denial of the Special Use Permit, please signify by saying Aye. Could I see a show of hands?

Mayor Pro Tem Williams, Council Member Scarborough, Council Member Peters, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Ewing: Aye.

Mayor Wagner: Any opposed?

Mayor Wagner, Council Member Moore, and Council Member Hudson: No.

Mayor Wagner: The motion to deny the permit is approved.

[end of transcript]

A motion was made by Council Member Ewing, seconded by Council Member Golden, that this matter be denied. The motion carried by the following 6-3 vote:

Aye (6): Mayor Pro Tem Williams, and Council Members Golden, Peters, Scarborough, Jones, and Ewing

Nay (3): Mayor Wagner, At-Large Council Member Moore, and Council Member Hudson

2018-174 Ordinance - NSPC-Gallimore Dairy, LLC Zoning Map Amendment 18-03 (ZA-18-03)

A request by NSPC-Gallimore Dairy, LLC, to rezone approximately 40 acres from a Conditional Use Light Industrial (CU-LI) District to a Conditional Zoning Employment Center (CZ-EC) District. The site is lying along the north side of Gallimore Dairy Road, approximately 1,250 feet west of Pegg Road.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams announced that Herb Shannon, Senior Planner, would give the presentation on this item.

Mr. Shannon read the staff report and stated this is a request to rezone a 40-acre parcel located in the northern portion of the City's planning area off of Gallimore Diary Road. The applicant has requested rezoning from the Conditional Use Light Industrial (CU-LI) District to a Conditional Zoning Employment Center (CZ-EC) District. He stated Planning and Developmental Department recommends approval of the request to rezone this 40-acre parcel with changes outlined in the staff report. He noted the Planning and Zoning Commission did review this at their March Public Hearing and they recommended approval and the following statements were adopted:

Consistency Statement - The Commission stated that the request is consistent with adopted policy guidance, in that the land use policy for this area has not changed since the property was annexed in 2005.

Reasonableness Statement - The Commission stated that the request is reasonable the requested EC District, because it is similar and compatible with previous conditional zoning

approval granted this area. Further, development of residential uses are prohibited in Zone 1 of the Airport Overlay District. The vote to adopt these statements was 8-0 and the vote to approve this rezoning was 8-0.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams opened the Public Hearing and asked if there were anyone in the Council Chamber that wished to speak regarding this matter. He stated we would start with the applicant.

Johnathan Smith, 229 Plymouth Avenue, Winston - Salem, Manager of NSPC - Gallimore Dairy, LLC., stated they have owned this property for sometimes and have been working with the Economic Community in High Point, Guilford County and the State. He stated there was a need to open an Industrial Park and intend to develop product similar to the Piedmont Center and other high quality Industrial Parks in Northern High Point. He listed other properties with similar zoning and noted landscaping buffers would be high in quality.

Council Member Ewing pointed out this is a great Economic Development area that continues to grow and expand.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams asked if anyone else would like to speak for or against this item, seeing none he declared the Public Hearing closed.

Adopted an Ordinance approving Zoning Map Amendment 18-03 based on the findings as outlined in the staff report and consistency with the City's adopted plans, and that the action is reasonable and in the public interest.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams moved adoption of the Ordinance approving Zoning Map Amendment 18-03. Council Member Ewing made a second to the motion, which carried by a unanimous 9-0 vote as follows:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

Ordinance No. 7414/18-43 Ordinance Book, Volume XX, Page 42 Introduced 5/21/2018; Adopted 5/21/2018

2018-175 Ordinance - City of High Point Text Amendment 18-03 (TA-18-03)

A request by the Planning and Development Department to amend various sections of the City of High Point Development Ordinance regarding the following:

- a. Establishing quasi-judicial hearing procedures for the Historic Preservation Commission;
- b. Updating design standards in the Employment Center (EC) zoning district and the Gateway Corridor Overlay (GCO) district, and for Corner Retail and Large Retail development types;
- c. Amending dimensional tables in the Agricultural/Rural (AGR), Residential Single Family-3 (R-3), Residential Single Family-5 (R-5), Residential Single Family-7

- (R-7), Main Street (MS), Mixed-Use Washington Street (MX-W), and Mixed-Use Downtown (MX-D) zoning districts regarding perimeter setback;
- d. Adding the Assembly (major and minor) and Cultural Facility (major and minor) use types as permitted principal uses in the Light Industrial (LI) zoning district in the Core City;
- e. Adding or amending adaptive reuse provisions for certain use types in the Light Industrial (LI) zoning district in the Core City;
- f. Clarifying an off-street parking exemption for reuse of an historic structure;
- g. Correcting errors in Table 5.5.11.B, Perimeter Landscape Yard Types; and,
- h. Replacing "dimensional requirements" with "dimensional standards" in various ordinance sections.

Bob Robbins, Development Administrator, gave the staff report on this item.

Mr. Robbins stated several miscellaneous amendments have been made to the new development ordinance. These amendments include:

- Language changes that promote consistency;
- *Terms that are standardized in the ordinance;*
- Clarified regulations;
- Corrections to errors.

He noted there are parts of the ordinance that help encourage adaptive reuse Light Industrial properties in the core city area that need to be promoted. He also noted the changes to the Historic Preservation Commissions review process, from a Legislative one to a Quasi-Judicial process in response to advice given by the School of Government and some proposed legislation.

Council Member Ewing asked on page 8 under building standards number 7(c) building citing has been stricken pertaining to the Eastchester Corridor. Mr. Robbins responded there have been changes trying to make the gateway corridor regulations coincide more with the design regulations in other districts. The language is stricken but is replaced by the text that proceeds it.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in the Council Chamber that wished to speak for or against this matter. Seeing none, he closed the Public Hearing.

Adopted Ordinance approving Text Amendment 18-03 based on consistency with the city's adopted plans and that it is reasonable and in the public interest as outlined in the staff report.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams moved to approve TA 18-03. Council Member Peters seconded the motion. Motion carried with a 9-0 unanimous vote as follows:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

Ordinance No. 7415/18-44

Ordinance Book, Volume XX, Page 32 Introduced 5/21/2018; Adopted 5/21/2018

GENERAL BUSINESS AGENDA

2018-120 <u>Proposed Ordinance Amending Method of Election for City of High Point City</u> Council Members

The High Point City Council held public hearings on Monday, April 2, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. and continued the public hearing to Monday, May 7, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. (public hearing was closed at this meeting) on a proposed amendment to Article III, Section 3.1. Method of Election of the City Charter to implement four-year terms for the Members of City Council beginning with the 2019 municipal election.

Mayor Wagner opened the floor to Council Members for a discussion or a motion.

Council Member Ewing asked the City Attorney if the amendment needs to identify that this proposed change begins with the 2019 elections. Ms. Carlyle stated yes.

Council Member Ewing moved adoption of the proposed Ordinance Amendment with the change to reference "to begin with the 2019 election cycle". Council Member Jones seconded the motion.

[Statements are verbatim]

Council Member Hudson: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I would like to say with the amount of excitement of this last election created in the city, I fear of moving to a four-year term, is that we would have less excitement connectivity with the City. There will be fewer opportunities to be excited about what is going on. As you all know I will not be voting for four-year terms.

Council Member Golden: I could see the value in both, but my experience has been this, we changed voting years from even to odd which gave us three years as opposed to two years, which also gave us the opportunity to complete projects. The previous Council I sat on we initiate projects, but we didn't complete them and then we had an election and we had a whole new board, so stuff fell by the way side and it is my fear that two years in a sense makes the City become stagnant. If we look at this catalyst project I do not believe we would be where we are now had we been on a two-year cycle while working on that project, that is just my two cents. But as far as two or four it doesn't matter to me one way or the other, I just see the value in four.

Council Member Peters: Well to me this has been one of the hardest decisions I have ever had to make, and I still have not made my decision until I guess it is time to actually vote. But I have talked to some other Municipalities and have heard pros about staggered four-year terms and I have listened to staff and talked to people in the community and I do believe that it does help create a stronger sense of local government but I'm worried about it too. So, it's just a real hard, and I know a lot of people kind of think that we are trying to make this decision for ourselves which that is very far from the truth because if I did vote for four years, I may not run because that is a big commitment. So, it's just been a very hard decision and I hope that people understand that it's taken a lot for us to really think about and consider and try to learn what is the best decision.

Council Member Ewing: Just to clarify something that she said. The ordinance is not a staggered four-year term. It is just four years straight, which would eliminate an election cycle every two years.

Council Member Scarborough: You know one of our jobs is to grow this City and to make this city a place for us to all live in and be happy with and have opportunities. As many of you know I've been involved in the past in significant planning and development of High Point University where as served in four different Vice-Presidential roles and to have come up with a plan to do a lot of things in two years would be almost impossible. The four-year term would give us an opportunity to make some positive decisions that we can carry through. At least get started if we don't get to finish them because four years is even a short period of time. But I am for the four-year extension. I know that this will not take effect until later, but you know it maybe that none of have elections, but to me it is important enough that I stand by it.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams: I would concur especially with Council Member Goldens statement especially when he was talking about the big on the voter participation on even years that we have had in the past. But never the less I agree the amount of work we are able to achieve in just three years across many different dimensions and what we are able to do across the city. I think is attributed to the three years we had, if were able to do that in three and be consistent there and after I spoken to citizens, emails and phone calls and so forth plus I taken the liberty of speaking to County Commissioners. I have talked to State Legislators and I see that you get your inconsistencies where you have two years terms as opposed to four, seem to have more work done in those four-year terms. Thank you.

Council Member Jones: I think another point that I haven't heard brought up except for that we have spoken about is what the savings to High Point is from a public-dollars standpoint. The cost of having the election every two years is significate. The public dollar stand point of what it cost to train a Council of nine people and then on top of that you got the private investment. I mean, people that believed in all of us had to come out of pocket to help us get the word out of who we are and what we stood for. So, I think there is going to be significant six figure savings every two years for the City of High Point.

Council Member Golden: I want to reiterate what Monica said. Four years is a huge commitment and I will argue that some of us will not run for four more years. For those that think this is a self-serving move, I would beg to differ. I'm just putting it out there. Four years is a long time to commit to this board.

Council Member Moore: I agree also. I guess I better say a couple of things, everybody else has. Definitely a case can be made for two. I have the privilege of serving a couple of terms and then I strategically didn't get into the three- year one and I did get to step away and it gives you.... kind of takes the blinders off so to speak. It gives you a chance to look and evaluate and see how that was. But I think one thing that citizens need to realize is it is crucially important on the efficiencies and effectiveness of Government is the relationship between the Council and the staff and that doesn't happen overnight. We are not here every day we are involved every day to some degree. So, I think that is important. I don't discount the fact of public involvement and a public vote we are a representative democracy we do elect people to represent us and hopefully we make good decisions and are overall pleased.

So, for me, it's about the best governess for the City. It's about what's best whether I'm sitting here or I'm not sitting here. So, there is a time for every season. I'm concerned about the timing, but I do believe in the effectiveness for the citizen of four-year terms.

Mayor Wagner: I just echo what Councilman Moore said. I think the real decision that we are faced here with is what is the best form of Government for the City. My experience you know has been in that, and I agree to Council Member Golden and his statements, I think we are at a point right now in our City where the things we have going on will be enhanced if we are able to think more long term. Having two-year terms means really a year and half term because by the time you get to July of the second year, you are running again. And the staff and the people sitting up here will tell you not a whole lot of stuff really gets done most of the time during that six months before an election. And then you're at least several months into getting everybody all the new folks up to speed. So, of the two-year terms, you miss almost a year of that dealing with either at the election or the aftermath of an election. I think with the catalyst project we've got with our commitments to cleaning up blight the strategic priorities that we have set for our City, it is important not only for our Council to be able to think long term but for staff to be able to think longer term as well, and be able to know what type of Council they've got to deal with and what they think they can accomplish in a longer visionary strategic plan. That is just easier to accomplish with a four-year term. I agree with what Mr. Golden said, it is a major commitment and I don't know that I'll sit here and be one of those people. There will be an election. We are not voting to extend our own term. There will be people out there who think we have done that. They will read the paper incorrectly or they will hear from their buddy and we are not allowed to do that by law and that's not what we are doing. The next Council that is elected may include some of the people sitting up here, it may not. They will be the beneficiary of that opportunity to foresee that vision.

With that, we have all had an opportunity to speak. I will go to the question then.

The motion to adopt the proposed Ordinance Amendment with the change to reference "to begin with the 2019 election cycle" carried by the following 6-3 vote:

- Aye (6)- Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams, Council Member Scarborough, Council Member Golden, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Ewing
- Nay (3) Council Member Moore, Council Member Hudson and Council Member Peters

Ordinance No. 7416/18-45 Ordinance Book, Volume XX, Page 32 Introduced 5/7/2018; Adopted 5/21/2018

2018-176 Appointment/Reappointment - CAC/P&Z Commission

Mayor Pro Tem Chris Williams is requesting that City Council confirm the appointment of Dorothy Jackson to the Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) as the Ward 2 appointment (effective 6/2/2018-6/1/2020)—and the reappointment of Angela McGill to the Planning & Zoning Commission (P & Z) as the Ward 2 appointment (effective 7/1/2018-7/1/2021).

Mayor Pro Tem Williams stated he would like to pull Dorothy Jackson's name from consideration as she has had some recent obligations to come up and will not be able to serve. He stated he did want to move forward with a motion for the reappointment of Angela McGill to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Approved the reappointment of Angela McGill to the Planning & Zoning Commission.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Williams, seconded by Council Member Ewing, that this reappointment be approved. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-179 Appointment- 2nd Alternate Commissioner - NCMPA1 Board of Commissioners

Council is requested to confirm the appointment of Garey Edwards, Electric Utility Director, as the 2nd Alternate Commissioner to the North Carolina Municipal Agency 1 Board of Commissioners.

Council Member Ewing made a motion to suspend the rules to consider the appointment to the North Carolina Municipal Agency 1 Board of Commissioners. Council Member Moore seconded the motion. Motion carried with a 9-0 unanimous vote.

Council Member Moore then made a motion to appoint Garey Edwards, Electric Utilities Director, as the 2nd Alternate Commissioner to the North Carolina Municipal Agency 1 Board of Commissioners. Mayor Pro Tem Williams seconded the motion. Motion carried with a 9-0 unanimous vote as follows:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden, Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

2018-177 Minutes to be Approved

- 1. Special meeting (Departmental Presentations) Wednesday, May 2nd @ 3:30 p.m.
- 2. Finance Committee Meeting; Thursday, May 3 @ 3:00 p.m.
- 3. Special Meeting of CC, Monday, May 7th @ 4:00 p.m.
- 4. Regular Meeting of Council, Monday, May 7th @ 5:30 p.m.
- 5. Community Housing, Neighborhood Development & Public Safety Committee Meeting, Tuesday, May 8th @ 10:00 a.m.
- 6. Special Meeting of CC (Library Department Tour); Tuesday, May 8th @ 3:00 p.m.
- 7. Prosperity & Livability Committee Meeting; Wednesday, May 9th @ 10:00 a.m.
- 8. City Council Review Session; Thursday, May 10th @ 9:00 a.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Williams made a motion to approve the preceding minutes as submitted. Council Member Golden seconded the motion. Motion carried with a 9-0 unanimous vote as follows:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Williams; and Council Members Moore, Scarborough, Golden,

Peters, Hudson, Jones, and Ewing

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m. upon motion duly made and seconded.

	Respectfully Submitted,
	Jay W. Wagner, Mayor
	Jay W. Wagner, Mayor
Attest:	
Sandra Keeney, Deputy	City Clerk