

City of High Point

*Municipal Office Building
211 South Hamilton Street
High Point, NC 27261*



Minutes

Tuesday, January 21, 2014

5:30 PM

Council Chambers

City Council

*Bernita Sims, Mayor
James C. Davis, Mayor Pro Tem
Foster L. Douglas, Jason P. Ewing,
Jeffrey J. Golden, Judith P. Mendenhall,
Britt W. Moore, Rebecca R. Smothers,
Jay W. Wagner*

ROLL CALL, PRAYER, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Upon call of the roll, the following Council Members were present. Council Member Golden offered the invocation; the Pledge of Allegiance followed.

Present 9 - Mayor Bernita Sims, Council Member Foster Douglas, Council Member Jason Ewing, Council Member Jeffrey Golden, Council Member Judy Mendenhall, Council Member Rebecca Smothers, Council Member Jay Wagner, Council Member Britt Moore, and Mayor Pro Tem James Davis

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Upon motion by Council Member Moore, second by Council Member Wagner, all matters on the Finance Committee Items on the Consent Agenda were unanimously approved, removed and/or adopted. The motion carried unanimously. [9-0 vote]

Note: Action will be reflected on the individual matters throughout these minutes as being made and seconded by the same persons.

FINANCE COMMITTEE - Council Member Moore, Chair
Members: Wagner, Davis and Sims**(all were present)****140015****Budget Ordinance Amendment - Regional Assessment of Fair Housing Project**

Adoption of an ordinance amending the 2013-2014 Budget Ordinance to appropriate funds in the amount of \$70,000.00 for a Regional Fair Housing Assessment project.

Attachments: [Budget Ordinance - Regional Assessment of Fair Housing](#)

Ordinance No. 1724/14-02

Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014

Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 56

Adopted Ordinance amending the 2013-2014 Budget Ordinance appropriating funds in the amount of \$70,000.00 for a Regional Fair Housing Assessment Project.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Wagner, that this Budget Ordinance Amendment be adopted. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

140016**Budget Ordinance Amendment - Triad Mobility Manager Project**

Adoption of an ordinance amending the 2013-2014 Budget Ordinance to appropriate funds in the amount of \$53,854.00 for the Triad Mobility Manager Project.

Attachments: [Budget Ordinance - Triad Mobility Manager Project](#)

Ordinance No. 1725/14-03

Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014

Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 57

Adopted Ordinance amending the 2013-2014 Budget Ordinance to appropriate funds in the amount of \$53,854.00 for the Triad Mobility Manage Project.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Wagner, that this Budget Ordinance Amendment be adopted. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

140017

Resolution - Section 5303 Planning Grant Agreement - NCDOT

Council is requested to adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to received reimbursement funds from the Section 5303 Planning Grant.

Attachments: [Section 5303 Planning Grant Agreement with NCDOT](#)
[Resolution - NCDOT - Transit Planning Manager - Signed](#)

Resolution No. 1363/14-03

Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014

Resolution Book, Volume XVIII, Page 86

Adopted resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to receive reimbursement funds from the Section 5303 Planning Grant.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Wagner, that this Resolution be adopted. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

140018

Sole Source Authorization - Road Machinery Services, Inc.

Council is requested to approve an exception to the bid laws under the "sole source qualification" for the purchase of Caterpillar equipment for the Public Services Department from Road Machinery Services; and, approve the acquisition of the Caterpillar compactor wheels in the amount of \$41,000.00.

Attachments: [Sole Source Bid - Road Machinery Services](#)

Approved an exception to the bid laws under the "sole source qualification" for the purchase of Caterpillar equipment for the Public Services Department from Road Machinery Services; and approved the acquisition of the Caterpillar compactor wheels in the amount of \$41,000.00.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Wagner, that this Contract be approved. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

140019

Contract - Bid No. 30 - Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) Upgrades

Council is requested to approve contract for the award of Bid No. 30 for the construction of the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) upgrades. Purchasing and the Public Services Department recommends that contract be awarded to Bar Construction

in the amount of \$3,960,000.00.

Attachments: [Bid # 30-120413 Material Recovery Facility - reject bids](#)
[Bid No. 30 - Materials Recovery Facility Upgrades](#)

Removed from the Agenda.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Wagner, that this matter be removed from the Agenda. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

REGULAR MEETING ITEMS

FINANCE COMMITTEE - Council Member Moore, Chair

140028

Sale of Surplus City Property - Side Loading Refuse Truck - City of Burlington

Council is requested to approve the sale of a 2007 American LaFrance side loading refuse truck to the City of Burlington in the amount of \$45,000.00. This price is based on the estimated revenue the City of High Point would have received thorough the online auction process.

Attachments: [Sale of Surplus Equipment - Side Loader Refuse Truck](#)

Chairman Moore explained this matter was discussed briefly during a Finance Committee meeting held at 5:00 p.m. prior to this meeting. He explained that due to a recent fire, the City of Burlington had ten of their garbage trucks that were damaged with three being a total loss. He explained that the 2007 American LaFrance side loading refuse truck was declared surplus by the City of High Point and the original plan was to sell the truck through an online auction, but staff felt it would be a good opportunity to help out a neighboring city and has agreed to sell the truck to the City of Burlington for the fair market price based on previous auction sales.

Approved the sale of a 2007 American LaFrance side loading refuse truck to the City of Burlington in the amount of \$45,000.00.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Ewing, that this matter be approved. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

Pending Items

130364

Contract- Bid No. 28- Demolition of Kilby Hotel, 625-627 Washington Street

Approval of contract awarding Bid No. 28 for the demolition of the Kilby Hotel located at 625-627 Washington Street. The low bidder for the demolition of the Kilby Hotel was A1 Salvage and Demolition Co., Inc. in the amount of \$58,500 and the Purchasing Department is recommending acceptance of the bid based on the company being properly licensed and capable of completing the scope of work for demolition of the building. At the December 16th, 2013 meeting, this item was deferred to the January 21st meeting.

Attachments: [Kilby Hotel Demolition Bid Tabulation](#)

Note: As a result of action taken on related matter **130365 Ordinance- Demolition- Kilby Hotel, 625-627 Washington Street**, to adopt the Ordinance to demolish with an effective date of May 26, 2014, this matter was removed from the Agenda because it was determined that the bid prices would no longer be effective and would have to be rebid, if necessary.

A motion was made by Council Member Ewing, seconded by Council Member Smothers, that this Contract be removed. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

130230

Review of Health Insurance Coverage for City Council Members

At the request of Council Member Mendenhall, Council is being asked to review the current council-established policy regarding health insurance coverage and costs associated with the same.

This matter has been on the pending list since August 19, 2013.

COMMUNITY HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - **Council Member Douglas, Chair** **Members: Mendenhall, Ewing and Golden** **(all were present)**

140020

Ordinance - Demolition of Dwelling - 1305 Kentucky Street

Adoption of an ordinance ordering the inspector to effectuate the demolition of a dwelling located at 1305 Kentucky Street belonging to Robert J and Monica Tyler.

Attachments: [Ordinance - Demolition - 1305 Kentucky Street](#)

Ordinance No. 1726/14-04

Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014

Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 58

Chairman Douglas asked if the property owner or anyone was present to speak regarding this matter. There being no one present to speak, he asked staff to provide an update.

Katherine Bossi, Local Codes Enforcement Supervisor, reported that the first inspection was done in July of 2013 in response to some neighbor complaints and that the house has been vacant for a few years. She then summarized the major violations associated with the structure: structural damage, settling foundation, brick work coming off all four exterior walls, leaking roof due to holes, etc... The first hearing was on August 12th and the property owner did not appear for that hearing, but did contact staff by phone and indicated their intent was to contact and hire a contractor. The property owner has not obtained any permits and has not made any repairs to this structure and since the estimated repairs (\$70,400) exceeds the tax value (\$86,200), staff is recommending demolition. Ms. Bossi reported that the compliance date was November 12th, and reiterated there have been no permits and no repairs made. She then shared some recent pictures of the structure.

Chairman Douglas asked if there were any questions/comments. There were none.

Adopted Ordinance ordering the inspector to effectuate the demolition of a dwelling located at 1305 Kentucky Street.

A motion was made by Council Member Douglas, seconded by Council Member Mendenhall, that this Ordinance to demolish the dwelling at 1305 Kentucky Street be adopted. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

Pending Items

130365

Ordinance- Demolition- Kilby Hotel. 625-627 Washington Street

Council is requested to adopt an ordinance ordering the inspector to effectuate the demolition of a structure located at 625-627 Washington Street belonging to Burnie McElrath and Myra Williams. At the December 16th, 2013 meeting, this item was deferred to the January 21st, 2014 meeting.

Ordinance No. 1730/14-08

Introduced December 16, 2013; Adopted January 21, 2014

Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 62

_____ Transcript _____

Chairman Douglas: Madam Mayor, **I want to make a motion to bring a matter out of pending.**

Council Member Smothers: **Second.**

Mayor Sims: I have a motion and a second to bring the one item in pending out of pending, which I'm assuming is the Kilby Hotel, is that correct?

Chairman Douglas: Yes.

Mayor Sims: Okay, comments or questions? [none] All in favor signify by saying Aye. Aye. Any opposed? [none] Motion PASSES. [9-0 vote]

Chairman Douglas: Okay, I think we have under consideration the ordinance to demolish the Kilby. JoAnne is there anything legally that we must do before we can proceed with this?

City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle: No, you've already voted to move it from pending, so that's it.

Chairman Douglas: Is there anyone in the audience that's willing to speak on behalf of the Kilby?

Mayor Sims: I gave you a list of individuals that signed up to speak.

Chairman Douglas: Mr. John Kennett. Mr. Freeman, are you two together?

Peter Freeman: Yes, we are. Honorable Mayor, Council, my name is Peter Freeman with firm of Freeman Kennett Architects, 1102 N. Main Street in High Point. I'm a resident at 1403 Emerywood Drive. Mr. Shannon, we have a couple of drawings that we want to show and my partner, John Kennett, is here with me and he's going to accompany me in this presentation. If you all will remember, we had discussed trying to have an opportunity to take a look at what could be done in order to stabilize the Kilby, both in the short term and the long term and then eventually as rehabilitation could occur to the project. What we are showing in this first drawing is the existing conditions as they are. We have had several meetings with not only the property owner, but preservation folks and other interested parties. What we've done is basically come up with some ideas in order to stabilize the hotel. What we're showing in this particular sketch is a steel frame that would be attached to the building with new foundations along Washington Street and along Hobson Street. Next slide please. Attached to that steel frame would be a protective mesh that would allow for anything that potentially would fall from the building to be caught and allow for the Washington Street to remain open. So you can see how on all sides of the building the framework is installed and is attached with cables across to give added lateral support and decreasing the opportunity for collapse of the hotel. It's a very simple and easy structure to actually provide and we've been in conversation with contractors to give us some estimates for that. Additionally, it gives us an opportunity in the longer period of time to be able to not only stabilize the structure, but in fact to be able to provide some marketing to raise money in the long run for the project. So it becomes a safe and stabilized structure in the short and mid-term allowing the owner and interested parties to be able to raise money to, in fact, to do a further rehabilitation and to look for additional developers.

We think it's a pretty clever and interesting proposal and as I mentioned, we've been in touch with contractors to get some pricing. Do we have a slide of that? Spruce Builders here in town gave us a price of \$136,000 to do this initial work, which would allow for that stabilization. That would include all the materials and labor and the footings required to do that stabilization.

John Kennett: That would also include the engineering design for the structure. It's included in here, an estimate for that. The thought process would be, once design was done and approval gained from the City, then construction would probably take somewhere between three and six weeks. The intent would be to stabilize the building immediately to protect Washington Street. Stabilize it in the mid-term as Peter said, to allow for demolition of parts that have already come down. Then also stabilization in the future as renovations of whatever kind would take place inside and around the building. There would be some resell value to the structure. The structure could be taken down and reused, or resold. So that was part of the things that we wanted to look at.

Mayor Sims: In case you all haven't noticed, we do have a time clock now, so we are limiting our speakers from the floor to three minutes. You'll hear that little sound which says your time is up. So we ask that we all be respectful of the clock so we can

level the playing field for those individuals who choose to speak from the floor. Having said that, we'll go ahead and proceed with the next speaker.

Chairman Douglas: Mr. Benjamin Briggs. Could you step up and give your name and address please?

Benjamin Briggs: Benjamin Briggs, 1753 Penny Road. I'm employed through Preservation Greensboro. I live here in High Point. The only reason I'm not working for Preservation High Point is because we don't have one yet. But if we develop one, I'd love to work here in my hometown. I'm here on behalf of Dr. Ben Speller from Durham. They're expecting snow. It might be snowing out there right now. He's not an elder, but he didn't feel comfortable driving up from Durham in the snow and driving back tonight late with his eyesight as it is. So I'm speaking on behalf of him. My involvement here is, ...to be brutally honest, I had sort of given up on this project until I got a call from the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington in October. I relayed my frustrations on this project to the public in a blog that I do and they picked up the blog and said is there something that we might be able to do in bringing in a third party, Dr. Speller, that might be able to mitigate this situation. I was frustrated because I see a situation that we have one of only sixteen local landmark properties in High Point and this is one of them, and this is the first one in the history of High Point, that we would destroy. This is the first local landmark of sixteen properties that we would destroy. I drove past this building in a school bus going to Griffin. My cat, Boneywall, came from the fish shop that was on the lower floor of the Kilby. I always admired this building and I wanted to do what I might be able to do to contribute to saving it. Other buildings that are already locally landmarked if the caliber of this building including Hailey House; Market Square; the Adams Inn; Fire Station #5 on N. Main Street; Three Musketeers; the old Guilford County Courthouse; Model Farm, which I'm also involved in saving. We might, knock on wood, have a closing on that next month. O. Arthur Kirkman House and the McCullough Gold Mill. I'm trying to give one last respectful try to give this property a chance. I was on the phone with a realtor, who plans on bringing in a.....had discussions with a developer this week. Our intention is to come by this property on Friday. The developer is meeting several deadlines for low income tax credits and he's been busy getting those tax credit applications into the state. So there are other opportunities. I think the Greensboro Community Foundation is interested in this project as well. So I'm just trying to get this local landmark a respectful last chance before it would be torn down. You know, if we can't do it in the days allotted by the Guilford County Preservation Commission-the 180 days-then that's fair enough, but I'm just trying to give it a last chance.

Chairman Douglas: Mr. Briggs, did you say that you were in discussions with the purchase of this property?

Benjamin Briggs: The owner?

Chairman Douglas: Yes.

Benjamin Briggs: Yes I am in discussions with the owner.

Mayor Smothers: Who is Dr. Speller?

Benjamin Briggs: Dr. Speller was a Dean at North Carolina Central University in Durham. Have any of you heard of the Hayti Cultural Center in Durham? He is the reason that the Hayti Center is there. It's a well-respected cultural center in Downtown Durham. He did that project, but now he's on the Board of Bellamy Mansion, Preservation North Carolina and several other projects. Windsor Plantation in the eastern part of the State. Very few people in the State of North Carolina have the background and the experience of Dr. Speller and we wanted his expertise here in High Point.

Council Member Moore: Benjamin, can you or anybody else for that matter.....the 180 days that has been....that clock is ticking.

Benjamin Briggs: That clock is ticking.

Council Member Moore: When is that deadline?

Benjamin Briggs: I believe that began in November, so it ends in May. So it just gives me a few more months to get the job done.

Council Member Smothers: I'm trying to connect your efforts with the ones of Freeman Kennett. I mean they've talked about stabilization at \$136,000 and that it can be done in three to six weeks. I just wondered have the dollars been lined up to do that?

Benjamin Briggs: The dollars could come from a number of different resources. One resource would be, for example, if a fundraising was done through the aid of the Greensboro Community Foundation-just to pick a name-for fundraising efforts. That's one initiative that could be done. If they could identify people that were involved with the Civil Rights Museum in Downtown Greensboro, there might be a solution in that sense. Another way that the stabilization cage that we see that's supporting the shell could be done, would be through the sale of the property to a developer and this would all be put into the development costs that could be used for the tax credits. So this would simply be a first phase of the larger step that would then see the rehabilitation of the building and utilization of the 40% tax credits are available here.

Council Member Smothers: So the dollars have not been identified?

Benjamin Briggs: Dollars could be identified either through.....the streams have been identified, but there is not \$136,000 in the bank right now to start the project. No. But sale of the property to a developer can kick that off because they would be funded to do a project.

Mayor Sims: Once the stabilization happens, how long could that building stand like

that?

Benjamin Briggs: I would defer to the architects. The intention would be not to have it stand that way for a long time.

Mayor Sims: Understood, but you are in a fundraising mode or somebody will be.

Council Member Moore: Randy, are you seeing this for the first time as well?

Assistant City Manager Randy McCaslin: Yes.

Council Member Smothers: So is Ms. trying to work with whom?

Benjamin Briggs: She is working with me and I think she is working with a couple of other resources in the community that are looking at other opportunities through fundraising. But my goal is to try to find one or two good solutions that she can take and we can execute and get a different path for the building.

Council Member Smothers: Has she agreed to sell the building?

Benjamin Briggs: I would defer to her to answer that. I have had conversations with her, but it's hearsay for me to say it, but she's capable of making a statement if she'd like to.

Council Member Smothers: I didn't know if she was here.

Mayor Sims: She's here.

Council Member Smothers: I couldn't see her. She's behind the podium.

Chairman Douglas: Ms. McElrath, could you come forward please?

Burnie McElrath: Mayor Sims, Council, I would defer to Mr. Doug Harris, who is going to speak on my behalf.

Doug Harris: I'm Doug Harris at 1698 Natchez Trace in Greensboro, but I don't want you to think that I'm an interloper getting High Point business. I was born and raised in High Point on Biltmore Avenue and when I was 5 years old, I used to go out with the Cub Scouts, out to a building that you may be familiar with. It was worse than this building. It was three walls and a chimney. A lot of people said it was going to fall down. That building is a building you all know as Castle McCullough. It stood in approximately this condition of this building and worse for about 100 years, from the 1880s to the 1980s. So the first thing I want to say to you is not to be hasty on what you think may be happening to the building. This, like Castle McCullough, is solid masonry walls. It's not wood with brick on the outside. It's something like a foot thick masonry walls versus Castle McCullough that is about a foot and half thick masonry

walls. Speaking to your question, Ms. Smothers, as far as money, I happen to know something about how Castle McCullough was saved because my brother owns Castle McCullough. And the first thing that was done was my brother went to the North Carolina Historical Society and they pledged \$100,000 back then, back in 1980 for the preservation. So that's a good source and it's a real source. And the way it worked mechanically was at each stage of preservation, they were given some of the money. So when he cleared out all the debris and mess, they gave him like \$25,000. When he put up some structure to save it, they gave him more. When he put on a roof, they gave him some more. So that's the mechanical way that it can be done. I will suggest to you that it's important to be done, too. You've heard how historic it is. High Point's done a decent job of preserving some historical names like the Hailey House, and you certainly have a nice statute for John Coltrane. But I'd point out that this is the only building in town where John Coltrane, had he not been a native of High Point, could have stayed if he'd come to High Point. And this is historic. This is important.

I also am on the Board of Directors and I played an important role in the preservation of the Woolworth building in Greensboro and I'll tell you something about how we did that. We were able to get historic tax credits. It took us about a year and a half, so once again, it's not a 30-day type process. We brought \$16,000,000 into Greensboro with historic tax credits based upon it being historic and the fact that it was an underdeveloped area. This is exactly that same boat. So I urge you not to be hasty in tearing down something that's historic, something that matters to High Point. This could be something very good. And as you see, has a lot of people very interested in it, so I hope you'll give it a fair chance and not be overly convinced by the engineers that it's going to fall down at any minute. That's not the case. That's not the case of Castle McCullough. That's not the case for this building. I think my time is about up, but I'll answer any questions you may have.

Council Member Smothers: I would just like to assure you that I don't think there's been anything hasty about this process.

Doug Harris: Yes Ma'am. By using that term, what I mean is that engineers sometimes are prone to say well this brick's falling out of here and this brick's in here and it's going to happen any minute now. My father and brother is an engineer, and they have a tendency to exaggerate how fast things are going to happen. By way of example, Henry VIII took over all the monasteries in England. You've seen the pictures of those stone walls standing there with no roof, no windows, no nothing. It stood for 500 years. So we don't need to be rushing in the next 30 days to tear down a historic structure that's important to this community.

Council Member Mendenhall: I believe your time ran out and it didn't do what it was supposed to do.

Doug Harris: Yes it did and I'm only here to answer questions. I was watching the clock and I stopped talking when it said....

Council Member Moore: Just out of curiosity, you do sound very experienced with a lot of definite knowledge, but what do you do for a living?

Doug Harris: I'm an attorney. I'm a professional attorney in Greensboro and have been for 33 years and a disgrace to my engineering family.

Chairman Douglas: Are there any more questions?

Council Member Mendenhall: I don't believe Ms. Smothers' question was answered about would the McElraths be willing to sell the building.

Doug Harris: Yes. Her primary interest is preserving this building. As you know, her family built the building and in one way or another, she wants to save this building. Now, there are various ways it could be saved within her family and various ways it could be sold. And she's willing to go either way. So you've heard me describe some ways to raise some money to where it might be saved within her family, but if it comes right down to it, it's more important to save the building than it is to.....well, it's certainly not a money-making proposition for her.

Council Member Mendenhall: Thank you.

Chairman Douglas: So we'll hear from our next speaker. Mr. Earl Jones.

Earl Jones: I'm Earl Jones and I reside at 21 Loney Circle, Greensboro, North Carolina. I want to thank Madam Mayor and members of the Greensboro City Council to allow me to speak.

Mayor Sims: You're in High Point.

Earl Jones: High Point is a beautiful city as a matter of fact, I have a little bit of history here in High Point. When I first got out of law school, my first job was at Legal Aid over here on Main Street-a little small white building back in 1980. Of course, that building has been torn down and then I had a....I ran a community action program office over here for 16 years and we put people back to work. And of course, there's maybe one council member, perhaps two, but definitely one that served on the City Council when I worked with the City Council here and community leaders to establish the Martin Luther King holiday. That being said, you all have a public trust, and that public trust is to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens. So you should be concerned about a building that's in disrepair and you should be concerned about the safety and that's one of your major trusts. However, in this particular situation, we are coming into it late. Us meaning some of us members of the International Civil Rights Museum and Center and we are committed to working with the owner, working with the Council, working with the community, to preserve this building. We think it will be an asset to the City of High Point. You know the City of High Point is really an international city. You have the Furniture Market people coming to High Point from all

over the world. It's just like a little New York during that time. Having a property of this nature is an asset. You'd be surprised at the people that would come and visit. I know Councilman Davis at the last meeting indicated that to tear down the building costs \$58,000 and that would be a hit for the taxpayers. But if the building is renovated, it becomes an asset. You can get tax revenue from it, but more importantly, it preserves a part of High Point history that's important to you and important to all the citizens and residents in Guilford County. I did talk to Andy Ingram, who is head of the National Black Hotel Association and they provide guidance in preserving structures of this nature. Not only guidance, but also help to raise funds. So if you can allow this structure to at least stand for another 100 days. You know it stood for 100 years, so, you know 100 days can make a big difference as to preserving this property. But I do think it would be a great asset to the City of High Point. I think if you make a decision to work with all of us to try to preserve it, I'm sure one day you'll see the advantages for the citizens of High Point. Thank you very much.

Chairman Douglas: Mr. Jones. You said that the Civil Rights Museum and the organization that you work with are committed to working with the owners to preserve and restore this building?

Earl Jones: Yes and as a matter of fact, Doug Harris, he's a member of our board. We've met with the owner of the building on several occasions. I just got involved in actually about three or four weeks ago and began to talk to the folks. But we feel that it would be an asset to the City of High Point. I worked in the City of High Point. My first job was in the City of High Point. I love the City of High Point. High Point has been good to me. They elected me to the State House and so we want High Point...when High Point and citizens are successful, Guilford County is successful, Greensboro is successful. Preserving this site, you know, Washington Street has a history during the time of segregation. It's also a symbol of what we've been through and now you all sitting up on the City Council there can all work together to try to preserve something that's part of High Point history. I think it's going to be important in the long run for the citizens of High Point, but more importantly, it will be a great asset so that when people come in from all across the country and all across the world and they go down Washington Street. It is an improvement and probably needs to be a place for more community development. You know, that's going to be a great asset to this city. The whole street is a historical site and that building is really a symbol of that, so I hope you all will consider working with us and with all the people who spoke. The folks at the Civil Rights Museum and some of us are working with the owner to try to preserve it.

Chairman Douglas: Any more questions or comments for Mr. Jones? [none] Thank you, Sir.

Earl Jones: Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Chairman Douglas: Madam Mayor, that's the end of the comments.

Council Member Mendenhall: Madam Mayor, I have a question for Randy. Randy, what is the date in May? Do you have a date?

Assistant City Manager McCaslin: The 19th of May.

Council Member Mendenhall: Thank you.

Chairman Douglas: The 19th of May would end that 180 days correct? Are there any more comments or questions?

Council Member Golden: Just listening to what Mr. Briggs said about this particular structure being one of sixteen and it actually being the only one that's located in an African-American community and it's been some significant progress made since the last time we heard anything on this. And also, I see that the family has went out and solicited support of several organizations that have a lot of credibility. I think for us to do anything prior to that 180 days that was asked of us months ago, I think we would be doing the community a disservice.

Chairman Douglas: Madam Mayor, I would like to piggyback on that as well. I think that we should extend this to the full 180 days. I know we agreed last month that we would give it 30 more days which was today's date if I'm not mistaken. But I concur with Mr. Golden that we need to give this an opportunity to work. I think that it will. I think it sounds like we have some heavy hitters on board now-a whole lot more so than we did the last time they came before us.

I would like to make a motion that we extend it to its full 180 days.

Council Member Golden: **Second.**

Mayor Sims: We have a motion and a second to....I assume we're putting this back into pending for the duration or up to the 180 days that was originally given to them by the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission. Any additional comments or questions concerning this?

Council Member Mendenhall: Madam Mayor, I will support that motion, but only with the understanding that by that date, it has to have been secured.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: I would like to hear from staff to see if there has been any change in the structure, the safety for our citizens. Is there anyone here from staff that has possibly checked up on that building recently?

Council Member Smothers: Since we put a fence up.

Ed Brown: Since the fence has been put up, there has been no other engineering done on behalf of the city-at the city's request, nor have we received anything from the

property owner at this time. The engineering reports that you already received—one that the city paid for and one that the property owner paid for, are the two that basically said the same thing. That stabilization was required and it is true that there is no date etched in stone when or if the building would fall down. But considering the situation of the roof, the third floor and the impact to the second floor of the internal collapse of the building, both engineers basically said we have to stabilize the building to buy the time. So that's the question that's on the forefront. Safety—you can talk all you want because we put up the 8-foot chain link fence which helps basically keep people away from it on a more permanent basis. But the question that's in front of everybody is the stabilization.

Mayor Sims: Has there been any additional movement of the building itself? Any bricks falling? Any glass falling? Any of those things that I guess initiated the original closing of the street?

Ed Brown: To my knowledge and to my staff's knowledge, no, there has not been any change. The day, I believe it was in October, when the Fire Department called me out to take a look, was based on what they had experienced and what they had witnessed and that's what led to the blocking off of the street at that particular time. The bet that we can tell, we can't tell on the inside of course, but to the best of our knowledge from looking at it from the exterior, there has been no significant change of the building since that time.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: What was the original date of the first repair order that was given to the property owners? I know it was several months ago and we keep sending them.

Ed Brown: The first contact we had was in excess of one year.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: More than a year?

Ed Brown: Yeah, I can get that to you. The first official notice was our correspondence that we had mailed to the property owner on August 28, 2012.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: When did the first engineer go out and look?

Ed Brown: The first engineer went out on behalf of the city on December 4, 2012.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: So it's been 13 months ago.

Ed Brown: Yes.

Mayor Sims: Any additional questions?

Council Member Moore: I just have one, but it goes to Peter. In your presentation, and I may have missed it, the securing that you're drawing there is the exterior. Is there also

with your work and the changes....is that to secure the inside as well?

Peter Freeman: Both sides.

Council Member Moore: Both from an internal fall and an external fall?

Peter Freeman: Yes, both sides.

Council Member Mendenhall: Mr. Douglas, your motion just simply delays any action. It doesn't say what will have transpired by that date, correct?

Chairman Douglas: Yes. It delays the action. I think what transpires depends on what happens within the time limit that was set originally by theI guess what happens according to Ms. McElrath, whether she sells the building and whether we get someone to actually do the remodeling on it or shore it up.

Council Member Smothers: Well, you're not suggesting that the city have a role in remodeling it are you?

Chairman Douglas: No.

Council Member Smothers: You're just talking about if there is movement to do that.

Chairman Douglas: Yes, if there is movement in the repairs or the shoring up of this building within those 180 days.

Council Member Mendenhall: So if there is no movement, is your idea then that we would adopt the ordinance to demolish?

Chairman Douglas: Well I think if there is no movement, then I think we would come back and reconsider the ordinance to demolish because there may be a reason for the non-movement.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: You know, I think we all appreciate the Kilby and we understand the importance to the community, but as a member of Council, it's my job to protect the public's safety and we continue extending deadline after deadline and we keep getting promises. Oh, this is working. This is working. Commissioner Davis came last time and we extended the deadline another 30 days based on that he had someone who was going to purchase this property. We continue hearing the same things, but we have no one here that has the funds or has set anything in motion to stabilize this building. I don't think that we're doing justice by extending it another three or four months. I feel for the owners and I'd love to save it because I'm in the building business and I think it's a beautiful building. But somebody's going to have to step up to the plate. You know, if that building were to fall, hurt or kill somebody, I'm not going to be able to sleep at night knowing I just keep extending the deadline based on empty promises. So, I don't agree to extend it to May 19th. I think that's just too

far. I think 13 months should have been an adequate time. I'm not opposed to another 30 days, but I think May 19th is just unrealistic.

Council Member Ewing: I have a question. A question for either Peter or Benjamin. The \$136,000 estimate to shore it up, how long has that been established?

Peter Freeman: Just about a week.

Council Member Ewing: You've only had that established for about a week?

Peter Freeman: Yes, we had to do a study to be able to come up with our recommendation and options.

Council Member Ewing: In searching for grants or possible funding sources, the information that Mr. Briggs had, was that done prior to having a dollar amount derived or was that afterwards?

Benjamin Briggs: What exactly was the question?

Council Member Ewing: The potential funding sources that you discussed, were those identified prior to identifying what the actual costs would be or was that presented to the potential funding sources?

Benjamin Briggs: I've been searching for alternative possibilities before, but now that we actually have a firm number and I'm able to give a firm price tag to someone-whether it be a developer to buy it to be aware of what the stabilization process is or whether it's an organization that might help us raise money.

Council Member Smothers: I think, if I may. I understand, you know, the concern that Mr. Davis expressed and I think that's part of maybe all of our frustration of extending time periods without some set goals to accomplish within those time periods that leaves us with nothing but extension guidelines. The fact is, if we could have some idea of what might be accomplished in a period of time. Mr. Briggs has just indicated that now there's finally a number and that's a good thing that there's finally a number. But, I can't believe there's anybody in this room that wants to see the building torn down. We wouldn't have spent two and a half years talking about it and ten years before that trying to encourage its redevelopment and beyond that, if there weren't some sentiment attached by both the Whites and the African-Americans in this community. I would hope that, given the fact that, hopefully this Council will a little later in this meeting, establish some priorities for improvements to Washington Street-period-as part of the Core City. While you all are looking at Washington Street and the Kilby, you'll also look at First Baptist Church because that has a tremendous amount of value and sentiment in this community and a neighborhood cannot resurrect itself without buildings to do it. So there's no real desire just to clear it out, but I think we depend on y'all and Benjamin if you all had just given us some guidelines as to what would be accomplished within a period of time, it would have made this a lot easier. I'm not

trying to blame you. I'm just saying we're just left without a goal that's achievable within a period of time to measure progress.

Council Member Mendenhall: Madam Mayor, I think I stated the fact that I would be willing to extend it, but I feel in that amount of time, it should be secured. I don't think this is a hasty move because it has been an issue for quite a while. I agree with Ms. Smothers. I don't think anybody wants to tear the building down if we don't have to. I think we have heard tonight some possibilities for some funding that we have not heard in the past and certainly we didn't have a dollar figure to look at. But I also agree that at some point in time, some progress has to be made. In a situation like this one, we have a report that says this building is dangerous. Whether you agree with that or don't agree with that, that's what some engineers have said. We have a responsibility for public safety and I don't think we can just continue to extend and e

A motion was made by Council Member Ewing, seconded by Council Member Smothers, to adopt an Ordinance ordering the inspector to effectuate the demolition of a structure located at 625-627 Washington Street (Kilby Hotel) with an effective date of May 26, 2014. The motion carried by the following

8-1 vote:

Aye: 8 - Mayor Sims, Council Member Douglas, Council Member Ewing, Council Member Golden, Council Member Mendenhall, Council Member Smothers, Council Member Wagner, and Council Member Moore

Nay: 1 - Mayor Pro Tem Davis

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING COMMITTEE - Council Member Smothers, Chair

140029

Confirmation of Comprehensive Planning Committee Report

Council is requested to confirm the January 7, 2014 Comprehensive Planning Committee Report.

Attachments: [Comprehensive Planning Committee Report final](#)
[IGNITE High Point Report to City Council submitted by Councilman Wagner](#) ;
[Resolutions of Support for IGNITE High Point Master Plan](#)

Transcript

—
Chairwoman Smothers: The last item is a report from the Comprehensive Planning Committee who met on January 7th to discuss a number of recommendations and issues that have come before Council regarding the development within the Core City over the past year and a half and before that for that matter. At any rate, what you have before you this evening is not what was originally which was a draft on the....I guess it's probably on the website as well. Well at any rate, Council has the report. You also received it by email because I did sent it out and ask if there were corrections or additions. At any rate, there are five directives and these are somewhat general in nature because it does provide direction to the City staff to go about gathering additional information as well as prepare budget so that the Council might consider the

option of continuing to make investments in the Core City.

And the first one is the Library and that is that Council director staff to continue planning design of the Library parking lot for improvements with the instruction to minimize impact on current parking spaces. And Mr. Wagner had commented on that and it's the number, not just the current ones. It was not my intent to imply that it could not be moved around.

The second deals with the PIT and that was that Council direct staff to present a plan for the development of the PIT area with the goal of leasing the space to a private entity for programming and installing such improvements that will ensure public safety. It's hoped that the initial investment will not exceed \$50,000 and you will notice that is a hope.

Number 3. Washington Street. The city direct staff to design and prepare a budget for landscaping and decorative lighting along Washington Street. Such improvements in the right-of-way should include the addition of public transit shelters and such street furniture as appropriate for a commercial business area.

Number 4. The SoSi area. The city direct staff to develop a budget for a landscaping plan for the public right-of-way from Business-85 to GTCC.

Then 5. N. Main Street redevelopment initiative. This is somewhat general in nature. That the City Council will identify target areas in the N. Main corridor from Montlieu to Kivett that would be classified as redevelopment nodes. That would qualify for façade improvement grants and redevelopment incentives to be adopted by the City Council. Additionally, once such areas are identified, the city would consider funding such traffic studies that would be necessary to improve accessibility and marketability of the properties within the designated boundaries.

These are items that were discussed in Committee. Everyone was there except Mrs. Mendenhall and Mr. Douglas and they are recommended by a majority vote to the Council and **I so move.**

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: **Second.**

Mayor Sims: I have a motion and a second concerning the Comprehensive Planning Committee Report as read and outlined by Council Member Smothers.

Council Member Smothers: And all of this, obviously, is going to have to come back to Council for final adoption, implementation and funding.

Mayor Sims: Any comments or questions concerning the report?

Council Member Mendenhall: I'm assuming that at that particular point in time, Ms.

Smothers, there will be time for public comment. This is just to begin the process.

Chairwoman Smothers: Absolutely. This is just to establish some priorities so we know a direction.

Ewing: Madam Mayor, I'd like **to make a substitute motion if I may. I'd like to move that we put this back in Committee or possibly discuss it at our Retreat on Saturday and clarify some of these bulleted items.** I think they're....and I'll leave it at that since the last time I rambled on. I'll stop rambling on this.

Chairwoman Smothers: So you want to refer to Saturday?

Council Member Ewing: Yes, please.

Council Member Wagner: **I'll second that motion.**

Mayor Sims: I have a motion and a second to refer the report that was read by Council Member Smothers here tonight to Council's Saturday Retreat and that's this coming Saturday, January the 25th.

Council Member Mendenhall: May I ask a question please?

Mayor Sims: Yes Ma'am.

Council Member Mendenhall: Since these directives are to begin a process for getting additional information so that the Council can determine what it wants to do, I don't understand what further clarification you would want for these since we don't have the information at this point in time.

Council Member Ewing: Some of the items are here....we talked about a lot in that meeting. Some of the items that were on that original draft have been pulled off and consolidated. There has been a lot of discussion about the items that were and were not in the Duany presentation. One of my concerns is....at the bottom here that says no other priorities will be considered for funding. I think we just need to make sure that we are in line with exactly what we're focusing on and that everyone is in agreement with certain areas.

Chairwoman Smothers: I can understand the concern in that regard, but until you get some cost for implementation for these, it's kind of hard to say what you're going to do next. Because you may not be able to do all these.

Council Member Ewing: But would it be....would Council prefer to break these items out individually and go through them itemized?

Chairwoman Smothers: I thought we had already done that, but I guess we could do it Saturday. I think the thing-what it really does lack is some timelines on it, but I didn't

know what they were. I mean we know that Mr. Freeman is working with a committee to finalize the design on improvement in the Library parking lot. The PIT is....we've got different designs now that's being analyzed, but we don't have a cost. Washington Street and the SoSi area are pretty much internal directives for staff to come back after they've.....and they're going to have to work with some property owners. I mean this thing is not going to be just...you know it sounds good, let's do it type thing.

And then the last one is the one that obviously will take the most time processing because it's going to involve a number of property owners, associations, City Project people, you name it.

Council Member Ewing: Madam Mayor, may I amend my motion?

Mayor Sims: You can withdraw or start over.

Council Member Ewing: Okay, I'll withdraw.

Mayor Sims: Because I don't know what you're going to say, but I would think it might be difficult to say you want to send it to Committee, but you want to amend it. Another date or.....

Council Member Ewing: Saturday's Retreat is good. So I move that we put it into Committee. I would like to reserve the Washington Street and SoSi area items to discuss at our Retreat. Those are two that probably need the least amount of conversation on and more or less just details from staff.

Mayor Sims: Well I don't know what details staff can give you since we haven't directed them to do anything. That's where I'm coming from with this. I mean, part of what's on here says we're directing staff to do some research and look at these particular areas, to come back to us with some clear ideas or thoughts around what this would look like. Now, in my opinion, either we move the whole thing to Saturday, or you pull off individual items and say we're going to do this as individual items and we will approach them that way this evening saying yes we direct staff to do....number one or no we don't want to do number two. However that works. But I don't know if it's appropriate to ask staff to come back with more information when we really haven't given the rule of direction that needs to happen.

Chairwoman Smothers: And I appreciate that because the whole thing is to try to give some clear direction as to what additional information that you want.

Mayor Sims: But, now, I will say this. I think this list is somewhat incomplete. I know that in the Comprehensive Planning Committee, we did discuss one other item which was the study for the dieting of N. Main Street and at that point we did have absent Council Members when we had that discussion and I really believe that this was the number one item on the priority list that came to us from IGNITE High Point. And I would hope that we could at least reconsider where we were with that particular item

because I believe that these other things and I so wish that the IGNITE High Point or at least the City Project had come back with perhaps putting some of these items together and not necessarily giving them to us as single items because it opened up the door for us to do this a la carte plan or picking and choosing which we would do over another. So, of course, everybody knows that I'm a real supporter of the road dieting and have been from day one-since it's concept. We have talked about that. So I would hope that that's something that we could add back to this list and, you know, perhaps expand the scope of what we're going to do to perhaps include some other areas of Main Street that have since been requested to be added in the study area.

Chairwoman Smothers: Madam Mayor, there was a vote taken at Committee. It is not reported here because I frankly don't believe in negative motions.

Council Member Mendenhall: May I make a comment? I think theif you look at number 5, the last sentence says, "Council will consider funding such traffic studies that would be necessary to improve the accessibility and marketability of the properties within the designated boundaries. This says Montlieu to Kivett, which I think in some discussions have been pointed out as perhaps being better suited to dieting because of the parallel streets further south. From my perspective, I think that it is important for us to get the economic impact study, for us to hear from the private movement that's out there for property owners adjacent to Main Street and what they would like to see done. And, in addition, I think to get as much information as we can and then make a really educated.....I don't want to say educated guess because that sounds like an oxymoron. An educated opinion maybe [informed decision].....about what we need to study in terms of the dieting. There have been a lot of discussions about the fact that to accomplish the urbanism that everybody wants, that dieting of a street or a portion of a street is necessary. But I think we need additional information. I am not going to sit here and say that I am opposed to dieting. I may not agree with the section that we're talking about necessarily, but not necessarily am I opposed to dieting. I just need more information. But I think to move forward because I do support some of these....not some, all of these initiatives which I think came out of either the Core City Plan or the Duany Study in terms of Washington Street, the SoSi area, the PIT, the Library. But I think we need to start....you know we have been accused-well some of us-of not being supportive of it. In my opinion, this shows the support to try to move forward and get some information so we can make some decisions because we don't have a lot of the information.

Mayor Sims: I understand that, but when I look at this, some of these recommendations were not in the Duany Study. They were recommendations that came out of other studies that have been done and we've, again, gone and put these in and you know I have no problem with anything that's on this list. I absolutely have no problem with it. I just think the list is absent the one thing that came out of the study that said we need to look at and do. Now, I'm not opposed to you know looking at an area from Kivett all the way to Lexington if that is what needs to happen. I'm not opposed to that. But I do believe that we owe this to the individuals who have spent their time doing this and to the business community, who we asked to step up to the plate and put the dollars into

this whole IGNITE High Point piece to do this. And if I look at who these people represent and what they represent in the area of tax dollars to our community, I don't know how we-and again I shouldn't say thumb our nose, but I do believe that we're looking at this and not necessarily looking at the full scope of what needs to happen and I do believe that this Council if we're going to adopt this, we also need to add back in here the dieting of Main Street.

Chairwoman Smothers: Madam Mayor, I made the report for Council. There was not the vote to do it then. So if you want to defer that conversation to Saturday, or somebody wants to make a motion right now, you can do whatever you want to. But I'm just saying that we have been listening to citizens like Dorothy Darr, and Charity Belton and others who have come and have talked about their parts of town as well as needing assistance.

Mayor Sims: I sat right here and told you that I support this entire list.

Chairwoman Smothers: Until we get some dollars, we don't know if we can do it all.

Mayor Sims: Well we don't know what we can do period.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: I'm going to put my two cents in and I'm going to be brief because I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion about dieting Main Street, but the Duany Study....I think everybody's missing it. The City was a partner in that study with 99 other partners. We were 12-13% of the cost of that study. But we're being asked as a city to fund everything on the list. I don't agree with that. You know we keep hearing there's money sitting on the table, sitting on the sidelines. Let's see it. You know, we're a partner and we'll step us as a city because we want to do some things. We'll be a partner, but we need to see some private investment and that's all I'm going to say about it.

Council Member Wagner: First of all, I think that we have had one meeting on this. And at the beginning of that meeting, the Chairman of the Committee walked in and basically said that she didn't believe that there's a majority support for the road dieting plan and that we were basically just not going to talk about it. So I have a statement to make here, which is.....and if you will bear with me.

"Perhaps those of you who were present last May to hear Andres' Duany at HPU will remember the standing room only auditorium filled with our citizens and their enthusiastic rounds of applause and their standing ovation that accompanied his presentation of the IGNITE High Point plan. Now if you were not there or have forgotten, I encourage you to watch it on YouTube. It's there. You can go to it and watch it. I know that you are also aware that nearly 100 donors including nearly 50 Uptowne business owners raised nearly \$400,000 to pay for that study. The city contributed \$50,000 of taxpayers money as well. This response, as well as thousands of volunteer man hours, constitutes a revitalization buy-in by the private sector that is unprecedented in our city's history. Since that time, the City Project, an organization

created by this Council, through its IGNITE High Point effort has procured resolutions of support from the following groups and private companies for the implementation of the IGNITE High Point plan with others to come.

This shows what the resolution is and the signatures of the various groups are attached. We didn't attach a resolution to each specific signature. Those groups are the City Project Board, the High Point Chamber of Commerce, International Market Centers, High Point Realtor's Association, High Point University, UNC-High Point Regional Health System, High Point Rotary Club, The Furnitureland Rotary Club, SmartChoice, Ed Price Realtors, Lyles Holding, Willard Stewart, Hayden-Harmon Foundation, BlueRidge Properties, St. Mary's Episcopal Church and the YWCA. These groups and a long list of individual citizens constitute nearly 6,000 of our citizens who expressed open support for this plan.

I also have this report that I'm handing out now showing responses to social media including comments from our citizens. These are your citizens speaking. I encourage you to read them. This morning I spoke with a citizen who lives in the historic section of Johnson Street, who informed me that her polling of her neighbors indicated that only three along the entire district opposed the IGNITE High Point plan. Given more time, this list will only continue to grow. If anyone on this Council can document opposition to the IGNITE High Point plan in numbers greater than this, please present it to us for review. This Council's discussion of priorities only began two weeks ago and only one meeting has been held. At this Committee's meeting on January 7th, Councilwoman Smothers prevented any serious public comment from being heard. In addition, no public comment period in a Council meeting has occurred to allow those in support of the IGNITE High Point plan to speak. It would appear that some on this Council are seeking to kill this initiative while shielding themselves from public comment. Approval of this report by this Council today is a statement that the vision, the hopes and the heart felt desires of our citizens are not worthy of this Council's time, respect or even its serious consideration. I hope that our citizens will take note and remember this in November.

The report of the Comprehensive Planning Committee is a sham. It's an old political trick that constitutes half measures purposefully designed to produce failure. It wreaks of leadership seeking to do just enough to appear they are in favor, only to be able to say that we tried it and it didn't work.

The Library item proposal...I'm not going to speak on that because you clarified that. The PIT portion of the report is likely doomed to failure because it is extremely doubtful that the entirety of that site can be made safe and ADA compliant with only \$50,000. Once again, staff is being directed to do the work when the \$50,000 proposal came as an idea from a private group. Let the private group present their plan and let's discuss it and decide if it will work. The Washington Drive Plan is a reasonable proposal considering the fact that a prior Council approved the Washington Drive District Plan, which is right here. The Washington Drive District Plan in December of 2008, that our city has taken no action to improve its physical condition of that street

over five years. I say it's reasonable, but likely doomed to failure because it doesn't go far enough. Given the deteriorated street and the sidewalks, the installation of landscaping, decorative lighting, bus shelters and street furniture are a poor substitute for the beautiful streetscape plan that was originally proposed and approved by a prior Council. If you want Washington Street to have a fair shot at reaching its potential, we should move immediately to implement the full streetscape plan. The SoSi idea is another landscaping plan. While I agree that the look of S. Main Street, South GTCC is deplorable, in reality it is a little worse than the entirety of Main Street outside the Market District, which is dominated by a street that is designed solely to move cars, is hostile to pedestrians and provides little to nothing to attract their interests. Placing potted trees and other landscaping might green up the look of the area for people driving through, but it will not make the area safer for those who want to walk and it will have little to no economic development impact on the area. This proposal is lipstick on a pig and it will cost money better spent where it can have the most impact.

The last item involved asking staff to redo work that has already been done. The Core City Plan, which was approved unanimously by this Council in 2008, has already identified the areas of the Core that are right for redevelopment. I encourage those on Council to go back and look at this plan. Additionally, the IGNITE High Point plan studied this area and does not recommend beginning redevelopment here. A quote from Rick Hall, who is an engineer with the DPZ team, states...the section south of Montlieu noted in the Agenda has far less potential for economic revitalization. The economic boost was the only reason for initiating the road diet to the north with a ready supply of future patrons and adjacent homes ready to visit new shops, offices and restaurants while walking, cycling, or driving. The area south of Montlieu lacks all of these elements and the design of nearly all the buildings lacks pedestrian scale that would make an urban redevelopment plausible. In addition, a plan for revitalizing downtown, including a portion of the area, covered by this item was proposed by staff over four years ago, but this Council, including some sitting here tonight, voted against it. Also, redevelopment incentives for the Core were proposed to Council two years ago, but Council voted against them. I'm willing to consider revisiting and enacting either of these plans. There's no sense wasting time reinventing the wheel. Also, the area mentioned already qualifies and is eligible for façade improvement grants. This work has already been done and it's evidence that the proposal is a result of a rush to action and shows a lack of understanding and appreciation to the work already done by so many on our behalf. It also shows that those supporting it lack the knowledge and understanding of how successful redevelopments have occurred in other cities in our region and our nation. Much of what is recommended in the IGNITE plan has been done successfully in other cities we compete against for jobs and creative talent. For some reason, High Point seems to exist in an alternative universe where things that have worked everywhere else can't seem to work here and shouldn't even be attempted. My fear is that rather than be a "can do" city, we are becoming a "can't do" city or even a "don't even try" city.

Finally, I have my research that shows which items will produce economic fruit. If we're going to do this, I want to see your research. I have mine. I want to see yours.

Burying power lines was discussed also, although I think that maybe was taken off, but I'm going to speak on it anyway. Burying power lines was in our discussion from Westwood to Parkway. In my opinion, it's a waste of taxpayer's money and shows an astounding ignorance of why power lines should be buried. Just because the burial was planned long ago doesn't make it a good idea today. For the millions that it would cost, the city will receive little to no economic boost unless it is coupled with the creation of a complete street with trees and wider sidewalks through an area with buildings designed to a pedestrian scale and containing businesses that will interest people enough to actually come and walk there. This area contains none of that. The area also lacks neighborhoods within walking distance. Our last Council borrowed money to bury lines through Uptowne. If we're going to bury lines just for the sake of burying lines, we should do it there where it has a chance of stimulating real business growth. I happen to know, firsthand, that there is money waiting to be invested in Uptowne and those folks will choose not to invest in High Point if this initiative fails. They are basically waiting for us to commit.

Tonight, I have mentioned three plans that the city has either paid for or helped pay for. Those plans have cost us nearly two-thirds of a million dollars-us and our taxpayers who donated the money to go for it as well. What good does it do for us to have plans if we're going to disregard them in favor of making it up as we go along? But if this Council does see fit to do that, at least have the courtesy to tell all the donors, all the volunteers, and all the taxpayers what your plan is. Since apparently some on this Council feel they are more qualified than world-renowned experts. I think they owe it to us all to produce their plan for the revitalization of High Point and subject it to public scrutiny and comment. The decisions that we will make on this issue will affect High Point and the lives of its citizens for decades to come-doing nothing of significance and will only put us farther behind our competitor cities and we're already decades behind. It is too important of a decision to make without input from the public. We should vote to reschedule action on this matter until public comment has been heard and until a coherent plan supported by research and careful consideration can occur.

And so with that, **I'll make a substitute motion that we delay action on this plan until our second February meeting which would allow for public comment to be heard and considered.**

Chairwoman Smothers: Isn't there a substitute motion on the floor?

Council Member Wagner: It didn't get a second.

Council Member Moore: I thought it did.

Chairwoman Smothers: Yeah, I seconded it.

Council Member Moore: Yes, there was a motion and a second on the floor.

Council Member Wagner: Okay, let's vote on his and I'll make mine again.

Chairwoman Smothers: Okay.

Mayor Sims: His substitute motion was to place it in Committee for additional comment for Saturday's meeting. Is that correct?

Council Member Ewing: The first one was to place it for Saturday.

Mayor Sims: Okay, and you withdrew that one.

Council Member Ewing: Yes, I withdrew that and then said put it in Committee because Saturday's not a Committee meeting. But put it in Committee for future review.

Mayor Sims: Okay, so would you like to offer Mr. Wagner a friendly amendment to his substitute? Can that happen?

Council Member Ewing: Absolutely.

Mayor Sims: With the rest of whatever it is you had to say.

Council Member Wagner: **I just said to continue it to our second February meeting to allow for public comment and consideration.**

Mayor Sims: Is that appropriate, Ms. Carlyle?

City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle: He can make an amendment to the substitute motion.

Mayor Sims: Does everyone understand what it is?

Council Member Mendenhall: No.

Mayor Sims: Well, the first motion was to place it into Committee for further discussion. The friendly amendment says to place it in Committee and that we would have a public hearing on it by the February 17th meeting.

Council Member Wagner: No, not a public hearing. Just that it would be open to public comment to allow us to receive and consider public comment on it.

Mayor Sims: Up to the February 17th meeting?

Council Member Wagner: Correct.

Council Member Mendenhall: Public comment on this report? Is that what we're asking for public comment on?

Council Member Wagner: Public comment in general on this topic including this report and whatever else. I mean between now and the 17th, there's going to be a public comment period. Okay. We began considering this two weeks ago. There's been no public comment period and there's lots of people that want to be heard on this. That's basically it.

Chairwoman Smothers: The only thing that I would suggest is there's nothing substantive to comment on in terms of what the committee has asked for at this point. Now if we want to go back and let everybody come up and talk about the Core City Plan again and talk about the Washington Street Improvement plan again, I guess we can do that. Do you not want something more substantive to say this is a plan?

Council Member Wagner: I think that a lot of what is proposed in here is just simply not a good idea and I think we need to revisit it after receiving public comment.

Mayor Sims: Well, first of all, there are a couple of things floating around. One is the priority list that was developed by the IGNITE High Point, or City Project group out of the IGNITE High Point study. That's one list that was there, that we asked them to provide to us as a Council. Council met and determined that out of that list of items that were mentioned, along with some other things that were decided that would be added, came this Comprehensive Planning Committee report. I still believe that you have to have something concrete that says this is what we're asking for public comment on-whether it's the original list that was supplied by the City Project group or whether it's this report that has come out of City Council with whatever amendments we want to make to this, but I don't think you can open it up and say we just want public comment in general because we'll be all over the place. It has to be more focused than that.

Council Member Wagner: Okay. It would be public comment on this list and the original IGNITE High Point list.

Mayor Sims: Yes sir?

David Couch: Can I say something?

Mayor Sims: Can you come to the podium?

David Couch: Will there be another opportunity to comment?

Council Member Wagner: That's what my motion is about.

Chairwoman Smothers: Of course, I think Ms. Mendenhall pointed out earlier, once the reports come back from staff and what other various compilations we get regarding these items, they would then be on the table for public comment. So, I don't know. I guess we just listen to some more comment on the City Project.

Council Member Mendenhall: Well, I'm going to make a statement and it's probably

not relative to the motion, so that probably makes me out of order. Mr. Wagner, I have a deep sense that you feel that some of us are not supportive of the City Project, nor the Duany Study simply because we have raised questions about dieting Lexington to Parkway and I, for one, resent that. I have spent a lot of time talking with people. I support the City Project. I support the Duany Study. I have serious questions about dieting those particular blocks, but that does not mean that I am not supportive. And I resent your implication that because we don't agree with that particular part of dieting, we are not supportive of what has happened. And I really do....I just think that is totally unfair to the other members of this Council, who have attended the charrettes, participated in them, listened, have read. We have got to be able to disagree about things without being accused of being non-supportive. Now, whether or not we do a study from Lexington to High Street or whether we do a study of Lexington to Parkway or whether we do a study of Montlieu to the railroad tracks, I think it's still to be determined. But I do not believe it is appropriate for you to accuse this Council because we disagree with one of your points, of being non-supportive of the City Project.

Council Member Wagner: Well my response to that would be that, in our committee meeting...and you weren't there.

Council Member Mendenhall: Right.

Council Member Wagner: Umm, this Committee refused to even consider the study of the top priority that came out of the plan and we don't know if it will work or not, but we won't know until we study it. And for us to dismiss this idea is simply not fair to the people who have donated the money, done the volunteer work, who have spent-some of them I happen to know going on nine years now-and to get this far and to have.....there's a perception in the public that this list is essentially eliminating things out of that plan and also that this list includes things that have already been studied and rejected long ago and that we're reinventing the wheel on this. And because of that...I mean look at all the debate we're having. I mean is now the time to decide this tonight? Because there's a whole lot of debate going on and I think we need some more time.

Mayor Pro Tem Davis: Jay, may I ask you a question since you're on City Project and we're a partner in this. Would the other 99 partners step up to the plate and help fund this \$115,000 study at the same level of giving that they did for the Duany Study? Because I don't think it's fair for the city to be asked to fund everything on the list. I'm looking at 27265, If you take out the people who live in your ward in that zip code, I guarantee there's not very many people on that list from Ward 5. I didn't recognize any name in Ward 5 on there, but one. So that's what I'm coming from.

Council Member Wagner: Well I have no idea. Let me say this...first of all....

Chairwoman Smothers: There was a vote taken the other day....

Council Member Wagner: I got asked a question, can I not answer the question?

Chairwoman Smothers: I'm going to clarify what happened the other day. You said it wasn't discussed. It was and there was.....I h

A motion was made by Council Member Wagner, seconded by Council Member Ewing, to continue this matter to the second meeting in February (February 17th) to allow time for public comment. The motion carried by the following 8-1 vote:

Aye: 8 - Mayor Sims, Council Member Douglas, Council Member Ewing, Council Member Golden, Council Member Mendenhall, Council Member Wagner, Council Member Moore, and Mayor Pro Tem Davis

Nay: 1 - Council Member Smothers

PUBLIC HEARINGS - 6:15 P.M.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING COMMITTEE - Council Member Smothers, **Chair**

[140021](#)

Ordinance - Rezoning Case 13-10 - Willie Harrell

A request by Willie Harrell to rezone approximately 0.93 acres from the Residential Single Family-5 (RS-5) District to a Residential Multifamily-8 (RM-8) District. The site is lying at the southeast corner of W. Willis Avenue and Fairview Street.

Attachments: [Rezoning Case Z13-10 - Willie Harrell](#)

The public hearing for this matter was held on Tuesday, January 21, 2014 at 6:15 p.m.

Herb Shannon of Planning and Development provided an overview of the staff report which is hereby attached in Legistar as a permanent part of these proceedings. He reported that the Planning and Development Department recommends approval of the RM-8 District provided that the remaining RS-5 parcels in this block be included. Therefore, staff is further recommending the City Council amend the application to include the remaining single family zoned lots to this request and that case be remanded back to the Planning & Zoning Commission for reconsideration since that would be an expansion of the application. The Planning & Zoning Commission reviewed this application at their December public hearing and also recommended approval as suggested by staff for the City Council to initiate the application to include the remaining single family zoned parcels with this application.

Council Member Wagner questioned staff on the justification for adding the remaining lots. Mr. Shannon explained that it is of staff's opinion that it would help as far as compatibility if all the block is multi-family and it would be consistent with the Land Use Plan if the entire block has a RM-8 zoning classification. He clarified that this would not make any of the existing uses within that block non-conforming, but it would make the zoning pattern more consistent with the Land Use Plan. Council Member Mendenhall asked if there has been any communication with the property owners of those remaining parcels as to how they feel about including these parcels in the application to

be rezoned. Mr. Shannon explained that the applicant spent about three or four months trying to get these property owners to sign on, but because of the time it was taking, he decided to move forward with the property owners he had. He noted that the applicant can provide more details.

At this time, Chairwoman Smothers opened the floor for comments in support of or in opposition of this request.

John Anderson, an architect and planning consultant in High Point, 413 Cascade Drive, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He explained this request came about because Mr. Harrell, the principal petitioner, began construction on a triplex residential unit while it was originally zoned RM-8 and the project was permitted by the city. He pointed out the foundation and masonry steps he constructed were also inspected and approved by the city, but he had to suspend work on it for personal reasons and was never able to finish it. Mr. Anderson explained that two years later, the property owner revisited the city in hopes of finishing the construction, but his permit had expired so the plans had to be revised with code changes. He then put the project on hold until 2012 and in the process of checking for parking requirements for the triplex, he was informed that the zoning had been reversed to RS-5 in the interim and the present zoning does not allow for a duplex or triplex. After meeting with the Planning Department, it was suggested that he get all the owners of the current RS-5 property to petition for rezoning the property back to RM-8. Mr. Anderson noted they contacted seven of the property owners and were able to obtain signatures from four of them, which included Mr. Harrell, and he personally met with two others who were in agreement, but since there were multiple owners involved, he was unable to get signatures from one or two of them.

He noted all property owners they talked to were in favor if it with the exception of the abutting property owner. Since he was not able to get all the required signatures, he was told by the Planning Department that the block could not be rezoned in its entirety based on the petition submitted; however, it was suggested that since they had three contiguous lots with signatures that abutted the RM-8 zone, they should make their petition solely for them. He pointed out he was trying to get back to his project so he could complete it, but did not have another two months to wait for the hearings involving the added properties. On behalf of the applicant, Mr. Anderson asked for Council's consideration in acting on the original petition to allow him to move forward immediately.

Council Member Golden asked for an explanation of the required 20-foot Type C planting yard. Mr. Shannon explained the ordinance requires this type of planting yard for a buffer in areas having multi-family that abuts single family use and in this case would consist of trees and shrubs. Chairwoman Smothers asked if Council could proceed and take action on this request by rezoning it, then direct staff to initiate the rest of the property to be rezoned at a later date

pointing out the applicant was held up for a considerable amount of time and unfortunately got caught by changes and requirements. Lee Burnette, Director of Planning and Development explained from staff's standpoint, it just makes sense to go ahead and rezone the remainder lots to RM-8 because one-third is presently already zoned RM-8 with another one-third being considered for rezoning.

Chairwoman Smothers asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak regarding this matter.

Charles Watson, 209 W. Willis Avenue, owner of the property adjacent to the property in question, expressed opposition to the request. He explained that he is a long-time resident in this area and has seen quite a few changes (good and bad). He felt it should stay single family because zoning it to RM-8 would only escalate drug activity, prostitution and illegal activity. He asked Council to consider a buffer zone between his property and the subject property should they take action to approve rezoning it to RM-8. He suggested a 10-foot fence for his protection as well as his family's protection and for security purposes. Mr. Watson shared that he did make contact with Tim Ilderton as was suggested by the Chair at the first hearing and he is supposed to be checking into it.

Mayor Sims asked staff if this change would be compatible with the Southside redevelopment plans currently underway because for the most part everything being built in the area has been single family. Mr. Burnette pointed out it is consistent with that plan because a lot of the single family efforts are happening further to the north. He noted that primarily about 50% of the structures in that block are either two-family or multi-family, so taking this into consideration and allowing for expansion of the area would not be an impact to the single family of that area, nor would it be an impact to the single family to the north. Mr. Shannon pointed out there is one duplex right next to the subject site as well as another duplex on the corner of Willis and Elm with multi-family structures off Ward and Elm.

Council Member Mendenhall asked staff to explain why the zoning was reverted. Mr. Burnette explained when the Southside District was approved in 2005, there was a directive to rezone a lot of the Southside area from RM-8 to a single family zoning district so a lot of this property and the property to the north was rezoned from a multi-family district to a single family district, which was part of a larger scale rezoning. Mayor Sims asked about the age of the existing duplexes in the area and staff replied these are probably part of the original development and were probably built in the 1940s or 1950s. The Mayor pointed out to a certain extent these duplexes are probably non-conforming at this point and questioned why Council would exacerbate the situation by fixing this when it is not really broken. Mr. Burnette replied that under the current zoning, the duplexes are non-conforming and explained Council could decide to disapprove the applicant's request. Council Member

Wagner asked Mr. Watson if he would be interested in having his property rezoned and he replied that he did not want it to be rezoned.

At this time, Brenda Watson, wife of Charles Watson, approached the podium to address Council in opposition to the request. She explained the foundation has been on that property for a very long period of time and has been a disfigure to the neighborhood. She noted since revitalization has been taking place in the neighborhood over the years, the neighborhood is a lot better. She felt putting multi-family dwellings on the property would create and reestablish a negative mode for the neighborhood all over again. Mayor Pro Tem Davis asked for clarification regarding the number of units being proposed. Mr. Shannon explained it is one lot and it would be a triplex.

Mayor Sims did not believe rezoning this property to RM-8 would be consistent with what the development they desire and are doing on the Southside and felt the commitment of the previous Council was to try to revitalize that neighborhood with single family dwellings. Because of this she felt she could not support the rezoning because it would be unfair to the community since it has already been established that the desire is to go in a different direction. Council Member Mendenhall asked if it would be permissible to just zone the lot that does not have a dwelling on it and Mr. Burnette explained he was advised that he needed to get the entire block rezoned if he wanted his property rezoned, otherwise Council would be dealing with an arbitrary zoning decision (i.e. spot zoning).

Chairwoman Smothers asked if there was anyone else present who would like to speak. There being no further comments, the public hearing was declared closed.

Denied Rezoning Case 13-10.

A motion was made by Council Member Smothers, seconded by Council Member Mendenhall, that Rezoning Case 13-10 be denied. The motion carried by the following 8-1 vote:

Aye: 8 - Mayor Sims, Council Member Douglas, Council Member Ewing, Council Member Golden, Council Member Mendenhall, Council Member Smothers, Council Member Moore, and Mayor Pro Tem Davis

Nay: 1 - Council Member Wagner

[140022](#)

Revised Unified Development Plan - Rezoning Case 05-10 - Shadybrook Partners

A request by Shadybrook for:

A revised Unified Development Plan for Tract C of the White Stone Subdivision. A minor amendment to Conditional Use Permit 05-10 (CUP05-10) to include development standards for townhome uses in Tract C, to amend the landscaping standard for Tract C, and to allow an additional vehicular access point to Tract C from White Farm Lane. The White Stone Subdivision is generally lying north of Willard Road and east of White Farm Lane.

Attachments: [Revised Unified Dev Plan Rezoning Case 05-10 - Shadybrook Partners](#)

Ordinance No. 1727/14-05

Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014

Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 59

The public hearing for this matter was held on Tuesday, January 21, 2014 at 6:15 p.m.

Herb Shannon of Planning and Development provided an overview of the staff report which is hereby attached in Legistar as a permanent part of these proceedings. Mr. Shannon explained this is a two-part request submitted by Shadybrook Partners for the Whitestone Subdivision. The first part is to amend the Unified Development Plan which requires a public hearing, while the second part is a Minor Amendment to Conditional Use Permit 05-10 which does not require a public hearing, but does require review and action by Council.

Following the presentation of the staff report, Chairwoman Smothers opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone present who would like to comment.

Anthony Lester, 4609 Dundis Drive, Greensboro, representing the applicant, addressed Council in favor of these requests. He pointed out Shadybrook Partners, has been the owner/developer for the Whitestone subdivision since its inception introduced Scott Wallace, the current builder and President of Keystone Homes, who was present in the audience and could answer any questions. He explained they did have a community meeting and sent out mailings to all the residents within the community, as well as adjoining residents within a 300 foot radius. At this meeting, they provided a brief overview of their development plans and the changes and allowed the residents to ask questions. He reported there were no objections raised regarding their project at these community meetings.

Chairwoman Smothers asked if there were any questions of Mr. Lester. There being none, she asked if there was anyone else present who would like to speak in favor of or in opposition to this request.

Robert Nelson, 2432 Whitefarm Lane, owner of the abutting greenhouse, addressed Council. He expressed concerns regarding the height of the Leyland Cypress that were planted when the property was initially zoned and developed in 2005 and shared that he was told that the foundation plantings along that strip would not shade his greenhouses. He explained these trees are currently about 20-feet high, sitting on a 7-8 foot berm and could reach 35-40 feet. The height of these trees present a major problem for him because they shade his greenhouse. Mr. Nelson expressed no objections as far as the townhomes/development, but would like to see what was originally approved take place.

Scott Wallace, President of Keystone Homes with offices at 3708 Alliance Drive in Greensboro, addressed Council in support of the request. He explained he was not aware of Mr. Nelson's concerns until tonight's meeting and offered to have the Leyland Cypress removed and would gladly work with Mr. Nelson and the city staff in providing adequate an adequate buffer that meets the Development Ordinance requirements.

Chairwoman Smothers commended Mr. Wallace for his willingness to come up with a win-win solution. Lee Burnette, Director of Planning and Development, pointed out a Type C planting yard is a lower level planting, and since there is a willingness to change out the plant materials, there should be a material that would meet Mr. Nelson's needs.

Chairwoman Smothers asked if there were any additional comments. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

1. Approved Amendment to the Unified Development Plan for revision of Tract C of the Whitestone subdivision.
2. Approved Minor Amendment to Conditional Use Permit 05-10 based on the findings as outlined in the staff report provide for equal or better performance .

A motion was made by Council Member Smothers, seconded by Council Member Ewing, that this Revised Unified Development Plan and minor amendment to Conditional Use Permit 05-10 be approved. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

[140023](#)

Ordinance -Text Amendment Case 13-06 - High Point Convention & Visitors Bureau

A request by the High Point Convention & Visitors Bureau to amend Section 9-5-16(b) (3) entitled *Prohibited Signs* and Section 9-5-16(g) entitled *Electronic Changeable Copy Signs* of the Development Ordinance to permit Electronic Changeable Copy Signs in the Main Street (MS) District.

Attachments: [Text Amendment TA13-06 - Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Adopted TA13-06](#)

Ordinance No. 1728/14-06
Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014
Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 60

The public hearing for this matter was held on Tuesday, January 21, 2014 at 6:15 p.m.

Bob Robbins of Planning and Development presented the staff report which is

hereby attached in Legistar as a permanent part of these proceedings. With respect to consistency with adopted plans, staff feels this request as submitted is neither consistent, nor inconsistent with relevant adopted plans of the city. Staff feels adoption of this ordinance would not further the intent of the MS District to encourage mixed use, compact and pedestrian oriented development that includes an integration of residential uses and in fact, may actually hinder such goals if many of these signs are erected within the district. As a matter of information, Mr. Robbins pointed out that the IGNITE High Point report issued by Andres' Duany makes the recommendation that only externally lit signage be allowed for the Main Street area and if this is done, it would prohibit the use of electronic changeable copy signs and any other internally lit signage that would be proposed.

Staff is recommending that the request be denied as submitted because they feel just allowing these signs in the MS District would be inconsistent and arbitrary in regard to not allowing them in the less restricted business districts such as GB (General Business), NB (Neighborhood Business), Shopping Center District and Limited Business District as well. Mr. Robbins explained that staff also feels that it is a little early to assess the effectiveness of the regulations that were put into place in November 2012. He noted that should Council approve the amendment, staff would support that under the guise that it will do what the applicant wishes it to do which is allowed in the main Street District, but in all fairness, business owners in the other business districts should also be allowed these types of signs.

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this request at their December 10th meeting and recommended unanimously to approve Text Amendment Case 13-06 as submitted by the applicant. They also initiated a text amendment in response to staff's suggestion to permit electronic changeable signs in the GB, MB, SC, and LB Districts. This amendment will come before the City Council in February for consideration.

Chairwoman Smothers opened the public hearing and recognized Doyle Early, who had signed in to speak in support of the request.

Doyle Early, 405 Hillcrest Drive, High Point, attorney with Wyatt, Early, Harris Wheeler law firm, addressed Council in support of this request on behalf of the Convention & Visitors Bureau (CVB). He shared that he has been involved with the CVB since its beginning in 1983 and has served in some capacity since that time. He noted he was a little confused about staff's opinion regarding this matter regarding not approving this request in the MS District because it is not allowed in the other business districts. He pointed out one of the suggestions rendered by the Planning & Zoning Commission was to also initiate the change for the other business districts and everyone seemed to be in agreement with that. Mr. Early informed Council that everything that has been submitted by them meets every requirement and reminded Council that the CVB is here for the economic development of High Point.

He also mentioned that the CVB will be moving from their old location at the corner of Green and Main to their new location (housed in the Chamber of Commerce Building) at the corner of State and Main. He felt this move is one of the most important things that has happened around the city because it truly creates a win-win situation for the Chamber of Commerce as well as the CVB. He relayed that it promises to be one of the finest visitor centers in NC and would be state-of-the art with a variety of kiosks, active video, etc.... He equated the sign they are seeking approval for as a tool to further their purposes and to further promote High Point and asked for Council's approval.

Since Council Member Wagner serves as liaison to both the CVB as well as the City Project Board, Council Member Mendenhall pointed out the fact that this kind of sign was discouraged in the Duany report and asked if the City Project Board has taken a position on this particular sign because of its Uptowne location. Council Member Wagner stated he did not believe the City Project Board has stated either opposition or support for it and one of the main things is these types of signs will be limited to monument signs, which tend to be very costly. He also agreed that it would be a vital tool for marketing High Point and expressed support for it. Council Member Davis noted that he is not necessarily opposed to digital signs, but he also bought into the argument that staff and the Planning & Zoning Commission has made that there are less restrictive zoning districts than the MS District that the signs would not be allowed in. He recommended to table action on this request until the text amendment comes up for consideration in February so a decision could be made for everybody.

Chairwoman Smothers suggested this action was time-sensitive and asked about the effective date of CVB's move. Mr. Early confirmed the CVB plans to move to their new location February 1st. He explained the Planning & Zoning Commission did express some of these same concerns, but they did not want to hold the CVB up to change/approve the amendment for the other districts. He pointed out the sign that they are proposing costs \$20,000 plus and he felt the cost itself would limit the number of signs.

At this time, Chairwoman Smothers asked if there were any additional comments/questions. There being none, she closed the public hearing.

Adopted Ordinance amending Section 9-5-16(b)(3) entitled Prohibited Signs and Section 9-5-16(g) entitled Electronic Changeable Copy Signs of the Development ordinance to permit Electronic Changeable Copy Signs in the Main Street (MS) District based on neither consistency or inconsistency with the City's Land Use Plan. Additionally, Council considers this action to be reasonable and in the public interest as a means of identification for the public and promotion of High Point.

A motion was made by Council Member Smothers, seconded by Council Member Wagner, to follow the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission and approve Text Amendment Case 13-06 as submitted by the applicant, adopting the Ordinance amending Section 9-5-16(b) Prohibited Signs, and Section 9-5-16(g) Electronic Changeable Copy Signs, regarding electronic changeable copy signs in the Main Street (MS) zoning district. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

140024

Ordinance - Text Amendment Case 13-07 - City of High Point

A request by the City of High Point Planning & Development Department to amend Table 4-7-1 (Permitted Use Schedule) of the Development Ordinance to add Antique Stores and Used Merchandise Stores as a permitted use in the Light Industrial (LI) District.

Attachments: [Text Amendment TA13-07 -CHP](#)
[Adopted TA13-07](#)

Ordinance No. 1729/14-07

Introduced 1/21/2014; Adopted 1/21/2014

Ordinance Book, Volume XVIII, Page 61

The public hearing regarding this matter was held on Tuesday, January 21, 2014 at 6:15 p.m.

Doug Loveland of Planning and Development provided an overview of the staff report which is hereby attached in Legistar as a permanent part of these proceedings. He reported that the Planning and Development staff is recommending approval of this amendment, noting that it would make the permitted use schedule more consistent in regulating uses within the LI District and that the application of the development standards makes the use compatible with the LI District allowing or encouraging reuse of vacant, industrial type buildings within the LI District. The Planning & Zoning Commission heard this matter at their December meeting and approved it by a vote of 8-0.

As a matter of clarification, Council Member Wagner asked if this zoning classification also includes pawn shops. Staff replied that it does not because there is a separate use for that.

Chairwoman Smothers opened the floor for comments. There being none, the public hearing was declared closed.

Adopted Ordinance amending Table 4-7-1 (Permitted Use Schedule) of the Development Ordinance to add Antique Stores and Used Merchandise Stores as a permitted use in the Light Industrial (LI) District based on consistency with the City's Land Use Plan as outlined in the staff report. Additionally, Council considers this action to be reasonable and in the public interest because: 1) it will make the permitted use schedule more consistent in regulating two very similar uses; 2) it will allow a use in the LI District that is compatible with the district; and 3) it will further encourage the occupation and re-use of the City's many vacant industrial buildings.

A motion was made by Council Member Smothers, seconded by Council Member Mendenhall, that the Ordinance amending Table 4-7-1 (Permitted Use Schedule) of the Development Ordinance to add Antique Stores and Used Merchandise Stores as a permitted use in the Light Industrial (LI) District be adopted. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

[140025](#)**Proposed Highland Cotton Mill Village National Register Historic District**

A request by the Southwest Renewal Foundation to the North Carolina National Register Advisory Committee to establish the proposed Highland Cotton Mill Village National Register Historic District.

Attachments: [Highland Mills National Register](#)

The public hearing for this matter was held on Tuesday, January 21, 2014 at 6:15 p.m.

Bob Robbins of Planning and Development provided an overview of the request which is hereby attached in Legistar as a permanent part of these proceedings. He reported that the nomination (financed by the Southwest Renewal Foundation) was prepared by Laura Phillips, an architectural historian from Winston Salem. The High Point Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the application at its January 8, 2014 meeting and found that it meets the requirements for listing on the National Register. The Commission's comments, along with any comments made at the City Council meeting, will be forwarded to the North Carolina National Register Advisory Committee in time for its February 13, 2014 meeting, where this nomination will be presented.

For clarification purposes, Council Member Ewing asked if granting this designation would have any effect on properties that might be considered for demolition. Mr. Robbins explained that the designation is mostly honorary and explained that because the mills were income producing property, in this situation, it would allow for possible tax credits for renovation. To answer the question more directly, Lee Burnette, Director of Planning and Development, added that this would not prohibit individuals because it only affects it if it is a landmark or if it's in a local historic district.

It was mentioned that the mills were recently renovated by CISCO for a showroom and Chairwoman Smothers asked if the property was for sale. Dorothy Darr, stated she did not think so and noted they currently are using about 40-50,000 square feet out of 240,000 square feet. She explained CISCO is still in the facility and working on bringing in international companies and that she and Sandy Dunbeck with the High Point Economic Development Corporation met with them recently to start the conversation of what incentives might be available through the Historic Preservation tax credits and discussed various other tax credits that might be available as well.

At this time, Chairwoman Smothers opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak.

Donald Jones, 1003 Mill Avenue, who owns property directly adjacent to the Mill, spoke in opposition of the designation of this property as a historic district. He shared that although he is good friends with Mr. Cisco, he did not see how the designation would benefit or profit the adjacent and adjoining property owners because of all the regulations that come into play when making

renovations. He explained that he was told that any planned improvements to his property would require it being restored to like it was originally. He pointed out there are many houses in this area that are not owned by the people that were originally there with many being rentals more so than owner occupied.

Council Member Moore asked Mr. Jones if Mr. Cisco has talked with him about a historical district. Mr. Jones replied that Mr. Cisco has never brought the subject up. Chairwoman Smothers asked if staff could answer Mr. Jones' concerns relative to making improvements to his property. Mr. Robbins explained that this is not a local district, nor is it a county landmark, it is simply an honorary designation and if someone chooses to renovate or desires to go through the tax credit process, they can, but there is no obligation for them to do so. Council Member Mendenhall shared that she attended the meeting that was held last week and got to see the presentation, along with the summary and pictures of the village. She reiterated this is strictly an honorary designation and clarified that homeowners can certainly do whatever they wish to with their property and explained the only time there would be restrictions is if they apply for a loan from the state. Dorothy Darr clarified that there are no restrictions or obligations and no oversight unless an individual chooses to apply for a tax credit on income producing property. She pointed out the designation would not affect Mr. Jones at all.

David Willett, 1501 Delk Drive, spoke in favor of the request. He noted that he was not aware of this being on tonight's agenda, but thinks the designation would be real important for High Point because the Highland Mill Village and Cloverdale Dye Works are part of High Point's history. He shared that he grew up right next to the Highland Mill Village and he actually worked at Cloverdale Dye Works.

Chairwoman Smothers asked if there were any additional questions/comments.

Council Member Wagner also felt the designation was really important because there are very few intact mill villages left in the State of North Carolina and this would be an opportunity to preserve one. Council Member Mendenhall mentioned the 10-minute presentation and hoped that it could be shown to Council at a future meeting. She noted it is amazing the way the houses have been kept up and that homeowners like Mr. Jones has taken such good care of their property. Chairwoman Smothers remembered when Cisco had its first market there and felt the overall excitement was welcoming in the neighborhood. Council Member Moore stated he certainly appreciates the fact there's still some vitality there, but added the city would be a lot better off if it were still a cotton mill operating as it was originally intended.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Acknowledged that the public hearing was held on this matter and recommended to the North Carolina National Registry Advisory Committee that

the application to establish the Highland Cotton Mill Village on the National Register of Historic Districts be approved.

A motion was made by Council Member Smothers, seconded by Council Member Mendenhall, to recommend to the North Carolina National Registry Advisory Committee that the application to establish the Highland Cotton Mill Village on the National Register of Historic Districts be approved. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS APPOINTMENTS AND VACANCY REPORT

[140026](#)

Boards and Commissions - Vacancy Report

Attached is the current list of vacancies for all Boards and Commissions.

Attachments: [Vacancy Report](#)

This information is attached for informational purposes only. No action is required on this item.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

[140027](#)

Approval of the following Minutes

Finance Committee meeting held Monday, January 6th @ 4:30 p.m.

City Council Regular meeting held Monday, January 6th @ 5:30 p.m.

Comprehensive Planning Committee meeting held Tuesday, January 7th @ 4:00 p.m.

Attachments: [January 6 2014 Finance Committee Meeting](#)
[January 6 2014 High Point City Council](#)
[January 7 2014 Comprehensive Planning Committee](#)

The minutes for the preceding minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

A motion was made by Council Member Smothers, seconded by Council Member Mendenhall, that the preceding minutes be approved as submitted. The motion PASSED by a 9-0 unanimous vote.

Questions Regarding Pcard Information

Council Member Douglas asked for an opportunity to ask some questions regarding the Pcard information that was recently released. He asked if Thursday might be a more suitable time giving the lateness of this meeting. Mayor Sims noted the agenda has already been set for the Thursday meeting, but noted he could certainly bring the information to the meeting in case there's time to ask the questions.

CLOSED SESSION- PERSONNEL

At 9:00 p.m., Council Member Ewing moved to enter into closed session pursuant to N.C. General Statute 143-318.11(a)(6) to discuss a personnel matter. Council Member Mendenhall made a second to the motion, which

carried unanimously.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Council reconvened into Open Session at 9:30 p.m.

[140037](#)

Support of the City Manager

Council is requested to affirm support of the City Manager and confidence in his work.

Affirmed support of the City Manager and confidence in his work.

approved

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. upon motion duly made and seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bernita Sims< ayor

Attest:

Lisa B. Vierling, MMC
City Clerk