

City of High Point

*Municipal Office Building
211 S. Hamilton Street
High Point, NC 27260*



Minutes

Monday, May 2, 2022

5:30 PM

Council Chambers

City Council

Jay W. Wagner, Mayor

Monica L. Peters, Mayor Pro Tem

*Britt W. Moore (At Large), Tyrone Johnson (At Large), Cyril Jefferson (Ward 1),
Christopher Williams (Ward 2), S. Wesley Hudson (Ward 4), Victor Jones (Ward 5), and
Michael Holmes (Ward 6)*

ROLL CALL, MOMENT OF SILENCE, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Upon call of the roll, the following Council Members were **Present (9)**:

Mayor Jay W. Wagner; Mayor Pro Tem Monica Peters, Ward 3; Council Member Christopher Williams, Ward 2; Council Member Britt W. Moore, At Large; Council Member Tyrone E. Johnson, At Large; Council Member Cyril A. Jefferson, Ward 1; Council Member S. Wesley Hudson, Ward 4; Council Member Victor A. Jones, Ward 5 [arrived at 5:57 p.m.]; and Council Member Michael A. Holmes, Ward 6.

Mayor Wagner called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. He called for a Moment of Silence; the Pledge of allegiance followed.

Present 9 - Council Member Britt Moore, Council Member Christopher Williams, Council Member Cyril Jefferson, Mayor Jay Wagner, Council Member Michael Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Monica Peters, Council Member Tyrone Johnson, Council Member Victor Jones, and Council Member Wesley Hudson

RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

[2022-182](#)

Proclamation - Abay Gidey - Human Relations Commission

Mayor Jay W. Wagner will recognize Abay Gidey's contribution to the Human Relations Commission and the City of High Point.

Attachments: [Proclamation AbayGidey](#)

Mayor Wagner read the proclamation into the record commending Mr. Abay Gidey for his years of dedicated service to the City of High Point and recognizing his devotion to his family and fellow residents. Mr. Gidey's family members were present to accept the proclamation.

[applause, photo op]

[2022-183](#)

Proclamation - Children's Mental Health Month

Mayor Jay W. Wagner will read a proclamation proclaiming May 2022 as Children's Mental Health Awareness Month in the City of High Point.

Attachments: [Children's Mental Health Awareness Month May 2022](#)

Mayor Wagner read the proclamation into the record proclaiming the month of May 2022 as Children's Mental Health Awareness Month in the city of High Point and called upon the citizens to increase awareness and understanding of mental illness, improve the array of mental health services for consumers of all ages, and ensure those who are struggling know they are not alone.

Following the reading of the proclamation, Mayor Wagner presented it to ????????

[applause, photo op]

[2022-184](#)

Proclamation - Municipal Clerks Week

Mayor Jay W. Wagner will read a proclamation recognizing the week of May 1-7, 2022, as Municipal Clerks Week in the City of High Point.

Attachments: [Municipal Clerks Week 2022](#)

Mayor Wagner read the proclamation into the record recognizing the week of May 1 - May 7, 2022 as Municipal Clerks Week in the city of High Point. Following the reading of the proclamation, he presented it to City Clerk Lisa Vierling and Deputy City Clerk Mary Brooks.

[applause, photo op]

[2022-185](#)

Proclamation - Public Service Week

Mayor Jay W. Wagner will read a proclamation recognizing the week of May 1-7, 2022 as Public Service Week in the City of High Point.

Attachments: [Public Service Week May 2022](#)

Mayor Wagner read the proclamation into the record recognizing the week of May 1 - May 7, 2022 as Public Service Week in the city of High Point and presented it to City Manager Tasha Logan Ford, who proudly accepted it on behalf of all city employees.

[applause, photo op]

STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE- Blight Reduction and Marketing & Branding Initiative

[2022-205](#)

Strategic Plan Update

Council Member Chris Williams, Chairman of the Community Development Committee, will recognize staff to provide an update on the Strategic Plan regarding Blight Reduction. Council Member Michael Holmes, Chairman of the Marketing & Branding Task Force will provide an update on the Marketing & Branding Initiative.

Attachments: [Strategic Update - Code Enforcement Activity Report for April 2022.pdf](#)

Blight Initiative

Councilman Williams, Chairman of the Community Development Committee, provided an update on the housing activities for the month of April 2022 as follows:

Code Enforcement Activity April 2022

Minimum Housing Complaints	16	
Active Minimum Housing Cases	253	
Cases before Council (demolition)	2	
City demolished houses	1	
Public Nuisance Complaints	113	
Active Public Nuisance Cases	145	
City Abated Public Nuisance Cases	5	
Owner Abated Public Nuisance Cases	52	
Zoning Complaints (vehicles, signs, etc..)	19	
Active Zoning Cases	102	
Signs Collected	225	
Total Active Cases	500	

Lori Loosemore, Code Enforcement Manager, shared that some property owners continue to repair houses to put back into the housing stock and that the Code Enforcement staff anticipates the number of public nuisance complaints to increase over the next several months due to the Spring growing season.

She then shared a success story and some before and after photos of a home located at 1004 Brentwood Street that was repaired by the owner and put back into the housing stock. She provided a brief history of the case and noted the property was actually sold twice; the first time in June 19, 2020; the owner did not make the repairs; sold again on January 20, 2021; that owner pulled the building permit on March 10, 2021 and recently received their Certificate of Occupancy.

Marketing & Branding Initiative

Council Member Michael Holmes, Marketing & Branding Task Force Chairman, reported that the city of High Point recently had the pleasure of hosting CivicBrand, the consulting firm that is leading the city's marketing and branding effort. While here, they were able to become involved in several events taking place during that time: opening weekend of the Rockers; tour at Congdon Yards, Stock & Grain at the Food Hall; and they were introduced to many other local stakeholders.

He noted that he, along with Ryan Ferguson and Melody Burnette had the opportunity to begin the documentation process of the branding effort; shared that a film documentary would be forthcoming, as well as Podcast called "That's My Point"; the website dedicated to the project, brandinghighpointn.com has been launched. He mentioned a very short survey that would be available on the website and encouraged everyone to visit the website and take the survey so that everybody's voice is heard in the message that comes out of the branding efforts. He relayed that they look forward to hearing from all corners of High Point on how to spread the message about all the great, positive things that are happening in High Point and the direction that High Point is headed.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

[2022-206](#)

Public Comment Period

A Public Comment Period will be held on the first Monday of the regular City Council meeting schedule at 5:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as reasonably possible following recognitions, awards and presentations.

Our policy states persons may speak on any item not on the agenda.

- * Persons who have signed the register to speak shall be taken in the order in which they are listed. Others who wish to speak and have not signed in will be taken after those who have registered.
- * Persons addressing City Council are asked to limit their comments to 3 minutes.
- * Citizens will be asked to come to the podium, state their name and address and the subject(s) on which they will comment.
- * If a large number of people are present to register concerns about the same subject, it is suggested that they might be acknowledged as a unified group while a designated speaker covers the various points. This helps to avoid repetition while giving an opportunity for people present with the same concerns to be recognized.

Thanks to everyone in the audience for respecting the meeting by refraining from speaking from the audience, applauding speakers, or other actions that distract the meeting.

Transcript

Melody Burnette: 1634 N. Main St., For every year in early May, our Visit High Point team asks our mayor to read the obligatory proclamation claiming this time as National Travel & Tourism Week; and we know that Mayor Wagner would have done a fantastic job lifting the industry and reading that proclamation; however, this year, we wanted to do something a little different and deliver that message very personally. We want to formally thank our city leaders during this most notorious time; May 1 - 7th as National Travel & Tourism Week; as this year's theme is #FutureOfTravel. Your leadership and partnership and sharing in our mission to position High Point as a vibrant destination that visitors will enjoy and that locals will want to promote, not only makes for a fruitful visitor economy, but also a great place to live. Thanks to our city council, our city leaders, our private businesses and investors, we're well on our way to have a solid local economy through the future of travel, benefitting our city on the move. In just two years, we're starting to see rebound stats that trend towards a strong economic tourism recovery that was once devastated by COVID-19, and 2020 Visit NC calculated the decrease of direct tourism spending by 47%; dropping Guilford County from the third largest county in State tourism spending to the fifth largest. The official 2021 economic impact numbers have not been formally announced by the state, we can currently trend a rebound where tourism occupancy tax are only two percent off

from 2019, which was the best visitor economy year to date, totaling over \$1.7 million. We are experiencing more visitation from leisure travelers, trippers, a 200-mile drive market, youth and amateur sports education market, home furnishings business travel, and spectator event goers. Our ever-evolving High Point has the attention of small businesses, outside investors, curious visitors, and now, new talent that calls High Point home.

This spring has been active as we just celebrated the opening of the Nido and Mariana Qubein Children's Museum just this weekend. It's only been open for three days and the positive reviews are off the charts online and through social media. Our office has been fielding those phone calls and locals and visitors who are eager to explore. HPU continues to set the bar high, growing the school's offerings to merit more direct tourism and economic impact that benefits our hotels, restaurants, and retail; their climatic impact, of course, this weekend will be commencement where we can expect over 10,000 attendees to sell out our hospitality partners for area celebrations. Earlier this spring, we hosted the NC Largest Rowing Event and NC Rowing Championship that brought close to 4,000 attendees; we hosted our annual spring High Point Market which is close to our 2019 registration numbers, and we also welcomed Ziggy's home to host 1,500 concert goers April 22nd to enjoy Blackberry Smoke, where 90% were from outside of High Point.

Council, leaders, I want to thank you for taking this bold position to make our city a destination. Thank you for taking the interest in our work seriously by attending our stakeholder meetings, by coming to our board committees. Thank you for supporting our industry partners like you did last week attending the J.H. Adams expansion. Thank you for liking and sharing on social media, and thank you for supporting our future of tourism as our High Point is very bright.

I cut out half this letter because I heard the beep.

Jackie Astrop: 3935 Fountain Village Lane. I noticed that Wynnefield is on here as rezoning for a particular parcel, which is behind my home and the address of that is 1559 Skeet Club Road. Since the actual plan that they have for that area is not on the agenda, but only the zoning portion is on the agenda, then I feel that I can talk about why I am here today. So Wynnefield has been trying to build income-based housing behind my

residence for the past three years and twice it was rejected, but for some reason, this time, the Planning and Zoning Committee decided that, by unanimous vote, they agreed to have the particular apartment complex to be built.

When we met with Wynnefield Properties, they told us that it was going to be a 55 unit, 55 parking spaces, senior development. But when I read in the Enterprise on Sunday, there were going to be 72 units, 72 parking spaces; it's on 5.83 acres, and the space between our development, our townhomes, and the field in which they are proposing to purchase, would be this size, to where Mr. Holmes is sitting right here. That's the back of my patio with my fencing and it's only 50 feet from the actual townhome development. It would go all the way down the full side of the development. There would be....they said that they would leave the trees if they were six inches in diameter, but when I read that what they proposed to us in the paper was completely different, I felt that I had to voice my opinion on what makes it through the Planning and Zoning Committee. Why did they unanimously vote to have this particular development built in between two communities, one across the street that has only exit and entrance. My community only has one exit and entrance and everything on Skeet Club from Eastchester all the way down is one-way. I have to make a U-turn out of my development, a right turn out of my development, go down a block, make a U-turn, come back up to Eastchester, pass my house, just almost to get to the grocery store.

So, now you're going to add, according to what was in the paper, 77 more units of housing, 77 vehicles, and if it is for seniors who are 55 and older, 55 and older seniors work, they have vehicles, they drive. That particular area has two nursing homes, a retirement community, a daycare, an EMT emergency facility. How is it that they're going to be able to have all of this and keep the people in that community safe? The nursing home, the daycare, the retirement community-there's no....the EMT also has to make a U-turn to get to wherever these facilities are when there's an emergency call. So, according to the first DOT plan from the State, there were supposed to have been soft medians for emergency vehicles, but they're not-they are all the same height. I have seen people cross over those medians with their cars, which is a very dangerous situation and when you're talking about three communities.....

Mayor Wagner: Your three minutes are up.

Jackie Astrop: Three communities make a U-turn out of the same development. That's going to create a major traffic problem. So, I just ask that you consider this before you make your approval of the Wynnefield Property and what they are planning on doing with it. Thank you.

Council Member Jones: Mr. Mayor, just for clarification. I know we're going to talk about this on the 16th, but this project was not denied twice in 2019 or 2020. The application was withdrawn in 2019 and due to COVID delays, it did not make the deadlines in 2020. So, it's never come before Planning and Zoning and it has never come before Council.

Mayor Wagner: Is there anyone else who would like to speak during Public Comment?

Rachel Anderson: My name is Rachel Anderson and I live at 706 Delmont Street.

Mayor Wagner: Rachel, are you here for one of the items for public hearing?

Rachel Anderson: Yes.

Mayor Wagner: I would ask that you reserve your comments for that time then.

Rachel Anderson: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that part.

Mayor Wagner: We'll let you speak. You will get your chance. Is there anyone who would like to speak? Three minutes on anything not on the agenda for public hearing. Okay, then I'm going to close the public comment portion of our agenda.

[end of transcript]

FINANCE COMMITTEE - Britt Moore, Chair
Committee Members: Moore, Peters, Holmes, and Jones

[2022-186](#)**Contract-Sourcewell - Johnson Controls Security Solutions, LLC - Library
Doors-Card Access Upgrade**

City Council is requested to award a Sourcewell contract to Johnson Controls Security Solutions, LLC in the amount of \$97,705.31 for upgrades to Library emergency exit doors and staff only areas.

Attachments: [1. Contract-Sourcewell – Johnson Controls Security Solutions, LLC – Library](#)

Lori Russell, Assistant Library Director, advised that the current emergency exits at the Library need to be upgraded due to the age of the building. She explained when the building was built in 1992, the emergency exits installed did meet the Building Code; however that is no longer the case. She spoke to how the current Building Code requires someone to stand at the door and hold door bars for 15 seconds which creates a very unsafe environment in the case of an emergency such as an active shooter. In addition to these 15 doors emergency egress doors, they are also asking that the same system be put on an additional 22 doors that have key pad access or are in need of key pad access; this brings the total up to 37 doors. A quote has been received from Johnson Controls in the amount of \$97,705.31 to do this work. Ms. Russell noted sufficient funds are available in the Library's budget from the State aid to public libraries grant.

There being no questions and/or comments, Council Member Moore moved approval to award a Sourcewell contract to Johnson Controls Security Solutions, LLC in the amount of \$997,705.31 for upgrades to the Library emergency exit doors and staff only areas. Council Member Holmes made a second to the motion. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-187](#)**Contract - Furniture Market Transportation Grant Agreement - North Carolina
Department of Transportation (NCDOT) - Public Transportation Division**

City Council is requested to approve a grant agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), Public Transportation Division to annually provide financial assistance to assist with transportation services during each of the bi-annual Furniture Markets and that the City Manager be authorized to enter into a contract with the Department of Transportation and execute all agreements and contracts with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), Public Transportation Division.

Attachments: [2. Contract - Furniture Market Transportation Grant Agreement - North Caroli](#)

Angela Wynes, Hi Tran Manager, explained this is a grant agreement with NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT) for Furniture Market funding in the amount of \$1.7 million to cover transportation services for the October 2022 and April 2023 Furniture markets. She noted this is an annual agreement with NCDOT that

has a neutral impact on next year's city budget.

There being no questions and/or comments, a motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, to approve a grant agreement with NCDOT, Public Transportation Division, to annually provide financial assistance to assist with transportation services during each of the bi-annual furniture Markets, and to authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with NCDOT and execute all agreements and contracts with the NCDOT, Public Transportation Division. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-188](#)

Contract-Change Order #2 - Garney Companies, Inc. - Richland Creek Sewer Outfall Aerial Sewer Pipe Replacement Project

City Council is requested to approve Change Order No. 2 to Garney Companies Inc. in the amount of \$119,670.04 for additional construction materials and work outside of the scope of the original contract for the Richland Creek Sewer Outfall Aerial Sewer Pipe Replacement Project.

Attachments: [3. Contract-Change Order #2 – Garney Companies, Inc. - Richland Creek Se](#)

Robby Stone, Director of Public Services, advised this is for consideration of Change Order No. 2 to the Graney companies contract for the Richland Creek Sewer Outfall. He pointed out Change Order No. 1 was for a time extension and explained the contract was awarded to Garney in August 2021; the amount of that contract was just over \$16 million; this sewer outfall conveys approximately five million gallons of sewage per day to the Eastside Wastewater Treatment Plant; the scope of this project was to replace 16 aerial crossings totaling about 5,600 feet with new 48-inch diameter pipe; this change order includes altering the pipe's saddle design with materials for a shorter lead time while adding additional protective coatings to the saddles; funds are available in the current budget..

Council Member Moore inquired about the progress of the project and Mr. Stone replied that the project is moving along as planned.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, to approve Change Order No. 2 to the Garney Companies, Inc. contract in the amount of \$119,670.04 for additional construction materials and work outside of the scope of the original contract for the Richlands Creek Sewer Outfall and Aerial Sewer Pipe Replacement Project. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-189](#)

Contract - Baker Underground Inc. - Waterview Pump Station Improvement Forcemain Extension Project

City Council is requested to award a contract to Baker Underground Inc. in the amount of

\$2,767,305 for the construction of the Waterview Pump Station Improvement Forcemain Extension project and that the appropriate City official and/or employee be authorized to execute all necessary documents.

Attachments: [4. Contract – Baker Underground Inc. - Waterview Pump Station Improvermer](#)

Robby Stone, Public Services Director, advised that the current Waterview Pump Station was constructed in 2007 re replace an older, smaller station that was to be in conflict with the proposed NCDOT widening of Skeet Club Road and with the recent completion of the forcemain replacement along Skeet Club Road and the 2017 installation of a third pump which provided the ability to increase the pumping capacity of the station, but the current receiving gravity sewer along Eastchester Drive limits the ability to achieve the station's full pumping capacity. The proposed project will relocate the Waterview forcemain discharge to the Penny Road Outfall near the intersection of Penny Road and Sunnyside Drive and will require installation of approximately 5,545 LF of 16-inch forcemain and approximately 245 LF of gravity sewer beginning at the intersection of Highway 68/Skeet Club/Wendover Avenue and terminating at the Penny Road outfall.

The project was put out to bid and bids were opened on April 20, 2022; five bids were received and Baker Underground, Inc. was the lowest bidder.

There being no questions and/or comments, a motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, to approve award of a contract to Baker Underground, Inc. in the amount of \$2,767,305 for the construction of the Waterview Pump Station Improvement Forcemain Extension project and to authorize the appropriate City official and/or employee to execute all documents. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-190](#)

Authorize Write-off of Delinquent Utilities Accounts Receivables

City Council is requested to authorize the Financial Services Director to write-off \$839,525 for original billings from the fiscal year 2017-2018.

Attachments: [5. Authorize Write-off of Delinquent Utilities Accounts Receivables](#)

Bobby Fitzjohn, Director of Financial Services, explained this is an item that is brought to Council annually that authorizes staff to write off delinquent utility accounts; staff still attempts to collect these debts using a variety of methods available, including the NC Debt Setoff Program in connection with the NC Department of Revenue; the city's Customer Service Department's efforts maintain an impressive 99.5% collection average; staff is recommending approval to write-off \$839,525 for original utility billings from FY 2017-2018.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Jones, to authorize the Financial Services Director to write-off \$839,525 for original billings from the fiscal year 2017-2018. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-191](#)

Authorize Write-off of Delinquent Miscellaneous Accounts Receivables

City Council is requested to authorize the Financial Services Director to write-off \$992 for prior years original billings through the fiscal year 2017-2018:

Landfill fees \$328.00
Miscellaneous Water & Sewer AR \$443.00
Total \$992.00

Attachments: [6. Authorize Write-off of Delinquent Miscellaneous Accounts Receivables](#)

Bobby Fitzjohn, Director of Financial Services, offered apologies for bringing a \$992.00 item to Council to be written off the books; noted in the future, staff would consider combining these with the utility write-off; this authorizes staff to write of \$992.00 in miscellaneous receivables from the 2017-2018 fiscal year.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to authorize the Financial Services Director to write-off \$992.00 for prior years original billings through FY 2017-2018 for the following:

Landfill fees\$328.00
Miscellaneous Water & Sewer account receivables \$443.00
Total.....\$992.00

The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-192](#)

Resolution - Sale of City Owned Property - 210 Jay Place, (Parcel No. 192976)

Council is requested to adopt a resolution accepting the offer of \$12,000.00 and authorizing the sale of property at 210 Jay Place, (Parcel No. 192976) through the upset bid procedure of N.C.G.S. 160A-269 and direct the City Clerk to publish a public notice of the proposed sale in accordance with N.C.G.S. 160A-269.

Attachments: [7. Sale of City Owned Property - 210 Jay Place, \(Parcel No. 192976\) Resolution- Sale of Property- 210 Jay Place.pdf](#)

Kim Thore, Right-of-Way Coordinator, advised the city has received a bid of \$12,000 for a city-owned property located at 210 Jay Place and asked that Council approve the sale of the property through the upset bid procedure as outlined in N.C. General Statute 160A-269.

Resolution No. 2052/22-26

Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 97

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, to authorize the sale of city-owned property at 210 Jay Place through the upset bid procedure of N.C. General Statute 160A-269 and to direct the City Clerk to publish the required public notice of the proposed sale in accordance with N.C. General Statute 160A-269. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-193](#)**Resolution - Donation of Real Property- Estate of John David Haworth, Sr. - 800 Woodbury Street**

City Council is requested to adopt a Resolution to accept the donation of real property located at 800 Woodbury Street, from the Estate of John David Haworth, Sr. (Deceased), contingent upon the City being able to confirm ownership and obtain proper title insurance on the Property.

Attachments: [8. Resolution – Donation of Real Property- Estate of John David Haworth, Sr. Resolution- Donation of Real Property- 800 Woodbury St \(Haworth\).pdf](#)

Kim Thore, Right-of-Way Coordinator, advised the administrator for the estate of John David Hayworth, Sr. and the property owner of 800 Woodbury Street has offered to donate this property to the City. Staff is recommending approval.

Resolution No. 2052/22-26
Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 97

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Johnson, to accept the donation of real property located at 800 Woodbury Street, from the Estate of John David Haworth, Sr. (Deceased), contingent upon the City being able to confirm ownership and obtain proper title insurance on the property. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-194](#)**Easement - North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) - 4501 Johnson Street**

City Council is requested to approve an easement dedication to North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) on property owned by the City, located at 4501 Johnson Street for a temporary drainage easement.

Attachments: [9. Easement - 4501 Johnson Street - North Carolina Department of Transportation Temporary Drainage Easement 4501 Johnson \(NCDOT\).pdf](#)

Kim Thore, Right-of-Way Coordinator, advised that the NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is requesting the City grant a temporary drainage

easement at the corner along the front of a city-owned vacant property at 4501 Johnson Street for the widening of a portion of Johnson Street and Sandy Ridge Road. The easement will be needed for extra work for a drainage construction in the existing right-of-way.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve an easement dedication to the N.C. Department of Transportation (NCDOT) on property owned by the City, located at 4501 Johnson Street for a temporary drainage easement. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-195](#)

Resolution - Sale of City Owned Property - 229 Windley Street, (Parcel No. 175647)

Council is requested to adopt a resolution accepting the offer of \$4,000.00 for a City owned vacant lot located at 229 Windley Street, (Parcel No. 175647) through the upset bid procedure of N.C.G.S. 160A-269 and direct the City Clerk to publish a public notice of the proposed sale in accordance with N.C.G.S. 160A-269.

Attachments: [10. Resolution - Sale of City Owned Property - 229 Windley Street, \(Parcel N Resolution- Sale of Property- 229 Windley Street.pdf](#)

Kim Thore, Right-of-Way Coordinator, advised that the City has received an offer of \$4,000.00 from the Assemblies of Christ Church Ministries for a city-owned lot at 229 Windley Street. Staff is requesting approval of the sale of this property through the upset bid procedure.

Resolution No. 2054/22-28
Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 99

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a resolution accepting the offer of \$4,000.00 for a city-owned vacant lot located at 229 Windley Street (Parcel No. 175647) through the upset bid procedure outlined in N.C. General Statute 160A-269 and to direct the City Clerk to publish a public notice of the proposed sale in accordance with N.C. General Statute 160A-269. The motion carried by the following unanimous 9-0 vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Council Member Williams,

Chair

Committee Members: Williams, Hudson, Jefferson, and Johnson

[2022-198](#)

Ordinance - Demolition of Dwelling - 900 Anderson Place

Adoption of an ordinance ordering the building inspector to effectuate the demolition of a dwelling located at 900 Anderson Place belonging to Emis Chirinos.

Attachments: [900 Anderson Council Packet](#)

Councilman Chris Williams, Chairman of the Community Development Committee, noted that staff has requested this matter be placed on the Pending List in the Community Development Committee.

A motion was made by Council Member Williams, seconded by Council Member Moore, to place this matter on the Pending List in the Community Development Committee. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-199](#)

Ordinance - Demolition of Dwelling - 1222 Carter Street

Adoption of an ordinance ordering the building inspector to effectuate the demolition of a dwelling located at 1222 Carter Street belonging to Syed S. & Rafia S. Mehdi.

Attachments: [1222 Carter St Council Packet](#)
[Demolition Ordinance 1222 Carter St..pdf](#)

Lori Loosemore, Code Enforcement Manager, advised a complaint was received on October 22, 2019 regarding the condition of the house; a hearing was held on November 6, 2019 and no one appeared; an Order to Repair or Demolish was issued on November 20, 2019 with a compliance date of December 23, 2019; there were some notification issues because a QuitClaim deed was issued transferring the property to Ms. Mehdi and she passed away; there was a Lis Pendens recorded; staff has talked with Mr. Mehdi was aware of the issues with the house; staff has had several conversations with him and he indicated an interest in making the repairs; staff talked to him in February 2022 and he said he had a contractor who would be going out and giving him a quote to make the repairs; he requested that staff email him a list of the violations. Ms. Loosemore shared some pictures of what the house looked like. There are no delinquent property taxes on the property.

Council Member Williams asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak regarding this matter. Hearing none, he proceeded with the following motion.

Ordinance No. 7818/22-39
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 135

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Hudson, to adopt an ordinance ordering the building inspector to effectuate the demolition of a dwelling located at 1222 Carter Street. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-164](#)**Ordinance - Demolition of Dwelling - 524 Roy Avenue**

Adoption of an ordinance ordering the building inspector to effectuate the demolition of a dwelling located at 524 Roy Avenue belonging to Sonia Elizabeth Portillo.

Attachments: [524 Roy Council Packet2](#)

Council Member Williams, Community Development Chair, advised that staff has requested this matter be pulled and returned to staff.

A motion was made by Council Member Williams, seconded by Council Member Moore, that this matter be removed from the Agenda. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

**PROSPERITY & LIVABILITY COMMITTEE - Council Member Hudson,
Chair
Committee Members: Hudson, Holmes, Jefferson, and Peters**

[2022-197](#)

One High Point Commission - Consideration of Candidates for Appointment

City Council is requested to consider the One High Point Selection Committee's selected candidates for appointment to the One High Point Commission. The Mayor is requested to establish the time and date for the first meeting of the Commission as per the One High Point Commission Resolution.

Attachments: [FINAL Agenda Item - One High Point Commission 25 April 2022 \(AutoRec\)](#)

Council Member Wesley Hudson, Chairman of the Prosperity & Livability Committee, asked the One High Point Selection Committee members present in the audience to please stand and be recognized [applause]. He then acknowledged Managing Director Jeron Hollis, and asked him to provide the report to Council regarding the One High Point Commission Selection Committee's recommendations for appointments to the One High Point Commission.

Mr. Hollis spoke to the next steps in the One High Point Commission process that commenced in May 2021. He stated that many discussions, revisions, resolution outlines have taken place; that the resolution calls for a selection of nine residents and two alternates by the selection committee, as well as two appointees to the One High Point Commission from the NAACP and two from the City Council. The selection committee forwarded the following nine residents for consideration for appointment to the One High Point Commission: Joseph Alston, Dawn Alston-Paige, Lovelle McMichael, Megan Oglesby, Dories Patrick, Janet Riley-Wright, Robert Sims, Bridgett Tolliver, Robert Williamson

Additionally, the following two individuals are being recommended for appointment as non-voting alternates to the One High Point Commission: Willie Davis and Constance Reynolds.

The following two individuals are being forwarded for appointment at the recommendation of the NAACP High Point Branch as their representative: Courtney Alston Wilson, Charles Hinsley

The following two Council Members: Michael Holmes (Ward 6) and Tyrone Johnson (At Large).

Staff is requesting Council's acceptance and approval of the appointments of these individuals to serve on the One High Point Commission and that the Mayor also establish the date and time for the first meeting of the One High Point Commission. Mr. Hollis noted these recommendations for appointments to the

One High Point Commission are being forwarded within the time frame established in the One High Point Commission Resolution that was adopted on February 7, 2022.

At the conclusion of the report, Mr. Hollis entertained any questions.

Council Member Jones asked for an explanation of the role of the non-voting alternates. Mr. Hollis explained the non-voting alternates would be two members from the community that would fill in in the event that one of the nine members selected would not be able to participate and would be unable to fulfill the assigned duties for whatever reason. He also added that the expectation for the non-voting alternates would be for them to stay abreast and apprised everything going on with the Commission. He advised that the non-voting members would become voting members in the absence of one of the original nine appointees.

Mayor Wagner inquired about the number of applications received and was informed there were about 21.

Per the One High Point Commission Resolution, Mayor Wagner established the following date/time for the first meeting: Thursday, June 2, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. in city hall.

He asked if there were any additional questions/comments. Hearing none, he entertained a motion.

A motion was made by Council Member Hudson, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to accept the One High Point Commissions' list of selected candidates for appointment to the One High Point Commission. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote.

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - Mayor Jay W. Wagner

[2022-200](#)**ROW Encroachment - RE-22-0010**

A request by Peters Holdings LLC to install a 4-foot high fence within the Emerywood Drive right-of-way. The site is located at the corner of Forest Hill Drive and Emerywood Drive (909 Forest Hill Drive).

Attachments: [RE-22-0010 Final Agenda Packet](#)
[C-200](#)

Chris Andrews, Interim Director of Planning and Development, reported that Peters Holdings LLC is requesting permission to allow the installation of a 4-foot aluminum fence with four entry columns within the Emerywood Drive right-of-way. The Technical Review Committee reviewed this request and determined that the proposed encroachment would not affect public safety or interfere with any maintenance on Emerywood Drive. Staff recommends approval of the requested right-of-way encroachment with the conditions depicted on the easement exhibit drawings.

Following staff's presentation, Mayor Wagner asked if there were any questions/comments. Hearing none, he proceeded with the following motion.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Hudson, to approve the Right-of-Way Encroachment (RE-22-0010) as requested by Peters Holdings LLC to install a 4-foot high fence within the Emerywood Drive right-of-way at the corner of Forest Hill Drive and Emerywood Drive (909 Forest Hill Drive). The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

PUBLIC HEARINGS[2022-201](#)**Ordinance- Wynnefield Properties, Inc. - Zoning Map Amendment 22-06**

A request by Wynnefield Properties, Inc. to rezone an approximate 5.8-acre parcel from a Conditional Use Office Institutional (CZ OI) District and the Residential Single Family - 3 (R-3) District to a Conditional Zoning Office Institutional (CZ OI) District. The site is lying along the east side of Skeet Club Road, approximately 240 feet north of Fountain Grove Drive (1559 Skeet Club Road).

Attachments: [Staff Report ZA-22-06](#)
[Ordinance ZA-22-06.pdf](#)

The public hearing for Zoning Map Amendment 22-06 was held on Monday, May 2, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. as duly advertised.

_____ Transcript _____

Mayor Wagner: We have two items on for public hearing. Both are regarding Wynnefield Properties. The first one will be the case on Skeet Club Road. I will open the public hearing and recognize Herb Shannon of our staff for a presentation. After that, we will hear from the applicant, and then the floor will be open to the community for comments.

Herb Shannon: Herb Shannon, Senior Planner with the Planning and Development Department. I will provide you with a summary of this case and the staff recommendation. This is a request to rezone a 5.8-acre parcel from the current Conditional Use Office Institutional (CZ OI) District and the Residential Single Family-3 (R-3) District to a Conditional Zoning Office Institutional (CZ OI) District. The site is located along the north side of Skeet Club Road, approximately 240 feet north of Fountain Grove Drive. The primary intent of this application is to update zoning conditions that were established on this property when it was initially annexed and established city zoning in 1993.

I would note for the members of the public, this request did not trigger a requirement for a Traffic impact analysis study and anytime there is a request for a use that's going to have residential uses, we include in the staff report and that's in the table, impacts from schools and we forwarded that information to Guilford County Schools Facilities Management and the information in that report as the school impact is directly from Guilford County Schools.

In the early 1990s, this parcel formed a northern edge of the city limits in this area. At that time, the only adjacent development was the Birchwood single-family subdivision to the west. The rest of the land abutting this site were undeveloped. During the past 29 years, the city limits have been extended northward to Gallimore Dairy Road and to I-40. I would also note in 2000 as part of the Land Use Plan evaluation, the land use designation for this site was updated. This site was previously designated for industrial use. The Land Use Plan was updated for it to be designated for office-type use. You can see that area highlighted in blue where the zoning site was located and part of a larger area in 2000 when the Land Use Plan was changed from Industrial to Office.

With the surrounding lands now zoned and developed to support a variety of residential and office related uses, the applicant is requesting rezoning to

develop the site with a multi-story, multi-family use. Although that is their intent, any time there is a zoning application, staff looks at all uses that are permitted in that zoning district unless uses are specifically prohibited or the applicant offers conditions to prohibit that use. So, we looked at this for the applicant's proposal is for multi-family, but we also looked at the other uses that are permitted in the OI District. The current OI District on this site allows a wide variety of institutional, healthcare, social service, personal service, and residential uses at a density up to 16 units per acre. All these uses are currently permitted on the site today.

The primary changes with these updated zoning conditions are as follows:

1. In 1993, there was no standards in the Development Ordinance regarding exterior lighting. With the adoption of the 2017 Update to the Development Ordinance, there are now standards for exterior lighting that are more stringent than those previous conditions, so those previous lighting conditions are being removed and the current standards of the Ordinance will be met.
2. Permanent landscaping. The current zoning approval only had a provision for higher landscaping standards along the western boundary of the site. With this updated zoning proposal, the applicant has offered a condition for higher landscaping to provide it around the perimeter of the site and they've also included a condition that 50% of that planting material is to consist of evergreen materials.
3. As far as building height, the Development Ordinance permits a building height of 50 feet for the abutting single-family developments to the west and allows a height of up to 80 feet for the Office Institutional zoning to the north and east even though they're developed with residential uses. The applicant is requesting to remove the current condition regarding a restriction to a one-story height restriction. I would note that we do not use the term, one-story anymore because that is very imprecise, and you could have a situation where you could have a one-story structure that is the same height as some of the surrounding uses. Yes, you're not going to do a residential structure that high, but the Office Institutional District allows office uses/institutional uses and other uses which could have heights of 30-40 feet depending on how they're constructed.

Under this application, the applicant has offered the same height

restrictions as the abutting single family and that is a condition that they have proposed to limit building heights to 50 feet to match the abutting limits of the single-family development to the west.

Key items to point out from the Staff Analysis and Findings:

As for compatibility with the surrounding area, this site is part of a larger 60-acre area that is designated by the Land Use Plan for Office. This zoning request does not introduce any land uses that are not currently allowed and allowable uses of the OI District are compatible with the surrounding area which is a mixture of Office, townhomes, single-family, and life care, assisted living.

As conditioned the building height will be as permitted on the adjacent single-family parcels and they have offered conditions for a higher landscaping to help with compatibility of surrounding uses.

Also required standards of the Development Ordinance pertaining to landscaping/screening of trash receptacles, and exterior lighting will further mitigate the impacts.

As I previously noted, a Traffic Impact Analysis was not required. The Transportation has looked at this and noted no transportation issues and I will also note that the recent upgrade of Skeet Club Road from two lanes to four lanes will also assist with any traffic impacts.

Finally, as far as mitigating impacts to adjacent properties, the zoning request does not change the current allowable uses and the applicant has offered conditions pertaining to the building height and landscaping to mitigate any negative impact to adjacent property owners. Therefore, the Planning and Development Department is recommending approval of this request to rezone this site to a Conditional Zoning Office Institutional District. The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this request at their April 26th public hearing and recommended approval by a vote of 9-0. The commission stated that the request is consistent with adopted policy guidance because the site is within an area along the Skeet Club Road corridor that is classified by the Land Use Plan as Office and the allowable uses and density of the proposed Office District are supported by adopted policy guidance established for this area. Furthermore, the commission

stated the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the requested CZ OI District does not change allowable uses or density. Furthermore, the conditions offered by the applicant and the standards of the Development Ordinance provide greater lighting, landscaping standards, and allows the development to be similar as to what is permitted on adjacent lands.

That is a quick summary. I would note about the prior application, just as a matter of clarification, the 2019 application was submitted for this site. That did proceed to the Planning and Zoning Commission and at that time they recommended denial, but it was withdrawn prior to going to City Council. As Council Member Jones has noted, the previous request was right when the COVID situation started, and they withdrew that request after several of the public hearings were postponed.

That is a quick summary of this application. Are there any questions of staff at this time?

Council Member Moore: Herb, this is Councilman Moore. What is the threshold or requirement when a project comes in that triggers a TIA?

Herb Shannon: I'll let the Transportation Department address that information.

Greg Venable: Greg Venable, Interim Transportation Director for the City of High Point. The number of trips are 150 trips in the peak hour like 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Council Member Moore: 150 trips?

Greg Venable: 150 trips in the peak hours.

Council Member Moore: And that wasn't recognized here as needed?

Greg Venable: It was not.

Council Member Moore: Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Any other questions for staff before we hear from the

applicant? Okay, Mr. Stone.

Craig Stone: Thank you council members. My name is Craig Stone with Wynnefield Properties, 5614 Riverdale Drive, Jamestown. Thank you for the opportunity to present Walnut Ridge. This proposal is currently proposed up to 84 units. I think when we did present to the local community folks, we did present up to 84 units. You may be aware in the past, we have presented and been involved working with the community with Admiral Pointe, Addington, Kirkwood, Hartley, Avondale, and Abbey. Those have went through a competitive financing process that is dictated as we have moved through, there has been adjustments. So, in this case, it was proposed up to 84 units per acre and then that was shown to the community when we presented that. I did hear earlier mention of 55. I think that maybe we target folks who are 55 and older, that may be where the number 55 came up. I'm not sure, but I think it was presented actually a little bit more than what was mentioned earlier at 84 units. It will likely go down from there.

As you know, we have done a number of properties in the community. One of the things about this particular community in this particular location, we sought counsel and talked to local folks a number of different times. The original applications were for family. That was one of the concerns. This particular application is for elderly. We are proposing, while there is a height, that we asked and worked with staff on of I believe 50 feet. Our actual application and design is two-story. So, one of the things as we've moved through the process, we've tried to make adjustments and do different things to this particular application and hope that certainly it is a little bit better than what was initially presented. This would amount to a 13-million-dollar investment and a continuation in affordable in the community, something that a lot of the studies have shown there's overwhelming need for.

As you know, we use brick, hearty plank materials, mostly siding, metal stairs and those kinds of things. I hope the architectural design and long-term durability of the products proposed are ones that meet all of the standards and is something that everyone can be proud of in the community. I'm not sure what other questions there may be at this point. I want to present myself and see if I could answer any questions at this time.

Mayor Wagner: Any questions for the applicant?

Council Member Jones: How many units were we at in 2019? It was One hundred eighty something, right?

Craig Stone: I think maybe we started off at 120 with an application as a family community. This one is up to 84. The process is going through right now. It likely could go to 60 units, but we do have it proposed for up to 84 units.

Council Member Jones: I believe the previous plan you had had more of the dwellings towards the exterior of the property with parking internally.

Craig Stone: One of the things that moving from a family design to an elderly design, it allowed us to go as best as possible loading towards the center of this particular parcel, so there would be parking and then buffers and then we've also indicated that whatever over six inches in gauge materials, plant material that's there, trees, we would keep those.

Mayor Wagner: Any other questions?

Council Member Moore: Any other major changes? I think you've gone through them, but from your 2019 design, I know you got a lot of feedback and you didn't get through P & Z, but it's my understanding that you made substantial changes based on what was asked of you from the community.

Craig Stone: We did make substantial changes. I would say the most significant change was moving from a family to an elderly. I think there were some questions about children and things of that nature. In doing so, as moving to an elderly, it changed the design and changed a number of different things which, you know, eliminated a number of concerns. One thing that I would point out, connectivity to any of the adjacent residential parcels, the only connectivity is to Skeet Club Road and, you know, it's not up to us. We have a current proposed design, but that design must go through the regular TRC process with staff. It goes through DOT and those types of things and as those checks and balances come out, you know, it'll be vetted and each of the departments will have input related to it.

Council Member Jones: Mr. Stone, you went from a three-story to a

two-story as well, though, right?

Craig Stone: We did. We went from three stories to two.

Council Member Jones: That was one of the main objections in 2019 was that you had two-story houses, and all those neighborhoods over there in Fountain Village all of a sudden they're looking out their back yard and there are three-story structures. I think one lady even commented that they would be looking right in my windows. I think Wynnefield did a great job with the feedback accommodating those concerns.

Mayor Pro Tem Peters: Tell me if this is correct or not. I did talk to somebody on P & Z just to kind of ask about and his comment was that by law, you're required to say 55 and up, you can't just randomly say 63 and up. It has to be 55 and up. But the majority of the residents that he's found in those elderly areas are around 75. Would you find that to be accurate?

Craig Stone: You know, I wouldn't....we have a number of independent living communities that are targeted to 55 and older. You actually could be a fully handicapped individual and be younger than 55 technically, but we see an age range all over the place. We have, for Admiral Pointe, which is not too terribly far from this location, I think 1,500 people on a wait list. So, it's a very diverse age population of folks. We see everything from 55 and older.

Council Member Holmes: So, would you say because you have a wait list, you're able to determine your median age from the current wait list that you have?

Craig Stone: No, because the need is so overwhelming it's really, by the time you go through Fair Housing compliance and everything, really it's more indicative of who comes in first more so than a complete population. We have some communities that have one particular age population and another community that may have another. It's really, there's just not enough housing.

Council Member Holmes: In order to meet the compliance requirement for housing, in one of those developments, you have to list that you meet the certain age requirement, correct?

Craig Stone: Correct.

Council Member Holmes: So, from the data that you collected from your applicant pool of 1,500, you should be able to determine your median age of the wait list?

Craig Stone: We do not take that data and then correlate that, whether it be age or a number of demographics. From a Fair Housing standpoint, something it's something that we've not ever really done, so I don't have the data. It's not something that we would readily collect. You may be able to, but I'm not sure legally, but we just don't take it and correlate it.

Council Member Holmes: How long ago did you meet with the surrounding residents?

Craig Stone: It's been within the last couple of months, and we gave the report to staff in March.

Council Member Holmes: What was the feedback recently? I mean did you find support, opposition, or what was the.....

Craig Stone: Obviously, in an event like that there are folks that are asking questions and there are a number of folks that had questions and concerns that live in the area and certainly respect those and I would say there were a number of folks that did have questions because this particular parcel sat here for some time and they wanted it to develop in one pattern. So, what we do is affordable housing and what we do is, you know, this particular use type, so we're seeking that and trying to serve the folks that we serve. We've tried to accommodate and answer the questions and do design work as we moved through the process starting off with the family community and do the best we can. But, at the same time, we would like and want to seek to serve the folks that we work with.

Council Member Holmes: So, are there any plans to take the most recent suggestions from the citizens and incorporate that into maybe adjustments, if that's possible?

Craig Stone: Well, I think the process and how rigorous the TRC and all of

the departments in what they go through, whether it be traffic. Traffic, we don't have direct access to any of the residential uses in the area. So, there's not us directing towards any residential use, it would be to Skeet Club and the Transportation Department gets involved. It's not up to us. What we submit, we start off and then it goes through and then they will make suggestions. I'm not sure, to be honest, a small trigger of this would be that a TIS would be amenable, but that's something that could come through the process and there may be other items related to maybe say a slowdown lane or those types of things. So, I think that the plan as proposed accommodates a number of those things to the point that we can. There's a point where we can't accommodate all of those things and we would certainly respect that. I mean if it is ultimately to develop what our intended use is at this site versus another, we're not going to be able to accommodate that. But I think a lot of the other items that have been talked about whether it be stormwater management, whether it be traffic, whether it be a number of different things. We either have contemplated those in the proposed plan or know that as it moves through the process, those things will either be looked at or addressed and they're not just completely up to us as the applicant.

Mayor Wagner: Any other questions for the applicant?

Council Member Williams: Just for clarity, this is income based?

Craig Stone: So, this would be similar to Admiral Pointe, Kirkwood, Hartley, Avondale, and Abbey. We have an application in with NC Housing Finance Agency for 9% tax credits.

Council Member Williams: Basically, all working individuals?

Craig Stone: Some folks call it work force housing, its low-income housing tax credit under the Section 42 tax credit at the IRS. It's technical, but yes.

Council Member Williams: Kind of a redefined affordable housing. That's what I'm trying to get to.

Mayor Wagner: Anyone else? Thank you, Mr. Stone.

Craig Stone: Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Is there anyone else?

Herb Shannon: Just a clarification for Council and for the members of the public, the applicant has noted their intent on how they wish to develop the project as far as age limit. I would note that our Development Ordinance does not specify that. We just have multi-family and we do not base zoning on age limits of residents because we can't enforce that. Also, just note the concept plan that the applicant submitted to the residents during their citizen's information meeting, and that report is within your staff report. It's in the back of the staff report. That is illustrative. There is no binding plan on the site because things may move around, so I just wanted to make sure everyone was aware of those two key factors that, as far as zoning purposes we would just consider this a multi-family use.

Mayor Wagner: Thank you, Mr. Shannon, for that clarification. Is there anyone here that would like to speak for or against this item?

Jackie Astrop: What was the question?

Mayor Wagner: Is there anyone here who would like to speak for or against this item. I think we've already heard from you.

Jackie Astrop: I'd like to speak again.

Mayor Wagner: No, that's fine.

Jackie Astrop: I can't speak again?

Mayor Wagner: No, once you have your chance to speak.

Would you like to speak? You can come forward and give us your name. Give us your name and address.

Jackie Astrop: I'd like to speak again. I only got three minutes.

Mayor Wagner: We generally give people one opportunity to speak.

Barbara Moreno: My name is Barbara Moreno. I'm here on this property

and the next one, so I don't have to say the same thing. I don't think the council has enough information to make an informed decision. It's bouncing from a small amount, a small society to something that's huge. I mean the number of units have grown. Even Sunset, it's 2.1 acres and it's my understanding it keeps growing. It's now 54 units. That's the backside of the hospital.

Mayor Wagner: This property is on Skeet Club Road, Ma'am.

Barbara Moreno: Well, okay. Well, that's all I'll say. I just don't think you all have enough information and I think more of the public needs to know about it because this has not been before the public, except what's been brought up today. That's what I wanted to say.

Mayor Wagner: I think there was a hand in the back. Yes m'am if you'd like to come forward and give us your name and address for our record.

Brenda Myers: My name is Brenda Myers and I live in one of the developments right up next to where this property is.

Mayor Wagner: Can we have your actual address for the record?

Brenda Myers: 4201 Somma Court, 27265. Mayor and City Council Members, Wynnewood representatives and citizens of North High Point that live I this area, I'm here to let you know that I oppose the Wynnewood development in any form. It is slightly better to know that it is for senior citizens but you are still not addressing our concerns.

One, it is a very small piece of property. I understand at first you wanted to put 84 apartment units. I believe now that it's 74 but I haven't heard the final word. Either way, both are way too much for that small piece of land. If you had 74 units, then that means 74+ cars will have to exit this property and turn right onto Skeet Club in order to go to Highway 68 or the Harris Teeter shopping center. They have to go down to the stop light at the next development which is my development, and make a U-turn and then go back. You can't turn left out of that development, you have to turn right. The road construction on Skeet Club has concrete islands which is why you can't turn left, you have to go down to a stop light and make a U-turn. That's 74+ cars making a U-turn in front of our development. Sorry, I just

got off work and I got here late. Give me a minute.

Two, the lighting in the parking lot of your development will have to be bright to meet safety concerns. That destroys the peace of my development. We like the pole lights we have throughout the neighborhood. Your lighting will disturb our peace.

Three, the noise level will be higher.

Four, crime. That many more people will raise the crime rate as more people will come to our area. Crime was almost non-existent when I built my house and moved in 28 years ago. The more the people that came, the higher the crime rate went. We have had break-ins, assaults, people checking cars during the middle of the night to see if they can find one unlocked so they could steal from it, and all of this. A lot of us have security cameras and we have this on film on the security cameras.

I find that my neighbors are very good people, but criminals look for a dense population as their odds of finding someone to rob are higher. What are you going to do to prevent more crime? I built my home 28 years ago when it appeared additional development would be along the same lines and I am disturbed that you are enforcing me to sell my home because your development is not what we envisioned when we moved here. I always thought that when we elected a representative to represent us and our feelings, they spoke for us. I am disappointed in all of you if you pass this. Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Is there anyone who hasn't spoken who would like to speak? Yes Sir.

John Burdette: My name is John Burdette. I live at Birchwood Gardens cluster homes. It's the adjacent property to the left where you see Anji Court. It was presented to the people here, which you're not seeing a lot of representation from our area. My neighborhood is elderly people. It was presented to them as an elderly community that's coming in. Which we know something is going to go on this property at some point. I don't think things are being taken into consideration. One thing we asked for was fencing. You know we asked, give us a privacy fence. The way the property is going to set up, they're going to keep six-inch trees on the part

by Fountain Village. We have no six-inch trees. You pull up to us, your headlights are right in our door. People are looking in our doors. So, I'd like to....if they're going to do it, put a fence up and give us some kind of privacy. Keep people from wandering from there into our yards, into our houses. We have enough traffic anyway with people coming off of Skeet Club taking a short cut through the field and coming through our private community. That's one aspect.

Traffic, like the lady mentioned, coming out of this property here. The only way you can go is you can turn right. You've got to make this U-turn. So, they're talking about elderly, handicapped people and 74 more cars coming around having to make that U-turn and come back. One of the things, I think, the traffic department hasn't taken into consideration is there's another development that's back behind us now. There's another 80 some houses they've added into there. So, that's additional traffic that's coming out of Birchwood. So, Birchwood is getting pretty congested right now. Not only because of that but people living on Fountain are having to come back down and circle around to come to Birchwood so they don't have to make that crazy U-turn. That U-turn is ridiculous-fire trucks, everybody else trying to make that corner. It's a bad situation. I don't think they're taking the full impact to traffic that we're seeing and they really need to look at it heavier. I mean it is a dangerous situation. I don't know if they need to....if the traffic department needs to put them an access or a light or something else to turn and come off of that area.

Everybody in the meeting that I attended, they presented it. I mean everybody in there asked about, you know, fences make good neighbors. You know we asked about fencing on the side of it to protect our homes, to keep people from wandering, and that is really.....I don't think that's a lot to ask for. I mean Mr. Peters is getting a four-foot fence. Give us a six-foot fence to keep people from looking in our doors. I mean you've got 84 more units coming in here that they're presenting, and give us some protection. I know people over at Fountain would like the same thing, they would have something in there to keep people from wandering into their backyards. It's two steps away and you're into their porch. So, thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Anyone else? Okay, with that **I'm going to close the public hearing and I'm going to make a motion for approval of item 22-06. Is there a second?**

Council Member Jefferson: **Second.**

Mayor Wagner: There's a motion and a second for approval of the item. Is there any discussion?

Council Member Jones: Yeah, I'd like to make a point that this development was highly opposed in 2019 by a lot of residents there. I got hammered with phone calls, emails, and everything about it. I communicated everything with Mr. Stone about their concerns. I'll paraphrase it, but he said, you know, when we build a product, we want to be welcomed to that community. So, they went back to the drawing board, withdrew their application, went back to the drawing board, came back with a similar product which is still not very well-received. So, when Council Member Holmes and I had our Town Hall on April 11th, it was very highly attended-it was the most highly attended Town Hall I've ever had. There was quite a few of the main, if you look in the notes on the agenda, the people that signed in the neighborhood meetings, several of them were there at the meeting that Wynnefield had and they were at the town hall. And that was on our agenda, so people knew that we were going to discuss that. We went through several agenda items, but when we go to that item, I said, guys, I'm here to represent you and if you guys do not want me to support this let me know now. But, talking to the main players that kind of have a pulse on the community there, Mike and I asked them and they said, no, with the change of it being for seniors, the three-story to two-story, all the units being on the inside of that tract, and all those changes, you know, we're actually okay with it. And that was what they said in the news interviews and everything. So, there's always going to be opposition to everything, and I hear those statements and emails and I emailed back and forth with Ms. Jackie about this as well. Something is going to be developed there at some point and I think this, out of all the things that have been proposed for that site, has the least change to the composition of that area, so based on the feedback I've gotten from emails, phone calls, and our Town Hall, I think a majority of the neighbors there do support this project coming in there.

Mayor Wagner: Let me also state and jump in that my motion also includes the adoption of the reasonableness and consistency statement made by the Planning and Zoning Board. I know that's a requirement.

Mayor Pro Tem Peters: If I could make one comment real quick. So, last week I went to the NC League of Municipalities and just so you know, that cities across North Carolina and actually across the Nation whether they're 1,500 in population or 500,000, have a lot of the same issues and concerns. And one that we listened to from mayors and council members from all over North Carolina is that one of the best things that we can do as council members is listen to our planning departments because they know how to create mixed-use spaces, so that we make the best bang for our bucks in the city and can keep your taxes low. So, just know, that we encourage our planners to think outside the box and do what's best for our city. That's all.

Mayor Wagner: Mr. Holmes.

Council Member Holmes: Councilman Jones is exactly right. We did.....at our Town Hall, we did have this discussion but I think there's also some very glaring questions that we have to answer. There's some very compelling arguments about the flow of this traffic and I don't know if this was covered, if this was addressed. How deeply did these concerns get discussed with the citizens of the area? I mean we're talking about numbers of people that have only one way to turn, a U-turn to get through. I can't see how that doesn't cause some type of issue. I mean I don't see how it doesn't. So, you know, even though there's some support and we talked about it, I do think this needs to be looked at. I think this needs to be looked at deeper and more thoroughly because we're talking about adding additional people and additional cars and additional traffic, additional.....and I don't know if we've done anything with the current structure of the road to accommodate that. I'm looking at these concerns and I'm looking at it myself and I don't see what we've done to mitigate those things and I think we need to have this discussion. I don't know what the traffic department missed. I don't know what they missed or if there's anything missed, I don't want to assume that there was. But these are very compelling arguments that these citizens have made. And, you know, I think they deserve at least some type of consideration on what they're going to do. I understand that this land is going to be developed, but it shouldn't be developed at the detriment of the people who currently live there in terms of their quality of life and the way they travel.

Mayor Wagner: I see Mr. Venable already approaching. I know that th

Ordinance No. 7819/22-40
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 136

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Hudson, that this matter be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-202](#)

Ordinance- Wynnefield Forward, LLC. - Zoning Map Amendment 22-07

A request by Wynnefield Forward, LLC to rezone approximately 2.1 acres from the Residential Single Family - 5 (R-5) District and the Office Institutional (OI) District to a Conditional Zoning Residential Multifamily - 26 (CZ RM-26) District. The site is located east of Carrick Street, between Sunset Drive and W. Ray Avenue.

Attachments: [Staff Report ZA-22-07](#)
[Ordinance ZA-22-07.pdf](#)
[Petition in Opposition ZA 22-078.pdf](#)

The public hearing for this matter was held on Monday, May 2, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. as duly advertised.

_____ Transcript _____

Mayor Wagner: The next item on the agenda is Zoning Map Amendment 22-07. This is Wynnefield Forward, LLC and the site is located around Carrick Street, between Sunset Drive and W. Ray.

The public hearing for this matter is open.

Herb Shannon: Herb Shannon with the Planning Department, once again. This is a request to rezone this 2.1- acre site from its current Residential Single Family - 5 (R-5) AND Office Institutional (OI) District to a Conditional Zoning Residential Multifamily - 26 (CZ RM-26) District. As you previously noted, the site is located east of Carrick Street, between Sunset Drive and W. Ray Avenue. This site is part of a block that abuts the Lindsay Street office corridor. The applicant is requesting rezoning to support development of a multi-family development. Included with this application is a Conditional Zoning Ordinance in which the applicant has offered conditions pertaining to building height, lot combination, and sidewalk/pedestrian access. This request did not trigger the requirement for

a Traffic Impact Analysis and we do have information included in the staff report as to impacts from Guilford County Schools.

This site is located within the Core City area. It's at the northwest edge of the hospital area noted as the Medical District in the Core City Plan. It's also abutting a residential area that's also classified as a residential area in the Core City Plan to the west of Lindsay Street. The Plan speaks to enhancing qualities of residential neighborhoods, but it also encourages a wide range of housing types at high to moderate densities and higher density housing should be located closer to Mixed Use Centers in the downtown areas and key corridors.

I would also note that the site has a Land Use Plan designation of Office. This is a copy of the Land Use Plan for this area. The area that's highlighted in blue is designated as Office. That permits a wide range of Office Institutional and Residential uses. The area that's highlighted in yellow is the residential neighborhood that the Core City Plan notes and the Land Use Plan notes as a low-density residential area. As you can see, the block in which this site is located is entirely designated as office by the Land Use Plan.

To mitigate impacts, the developer has offered conditions to limit building height where they've offered a condition to restrict building heights to 50 feet to match the abutting single family as long as those single-family homes remain on this parcel. As you can see, the eastern half of this block fronts along Lindsay and is developed with Office use. You have the zoning site and then the three remaining parcels that the applicant was unable to acquire as part of this zoning application. Because of those remaining parcels and our negotiated conditions with the applicant, they've offered a condition that as long as those homes remain that the building height be restricted to 50 feet. That's the maximum height of that single-family district. If those homes are no longer used for single family, then they can go to the maximum height allowed by the Office Institutional District.

Key items to note from the Findings in our Analysis. As far as compatibility with the surrounding area, the requested multi-family zoning will act as a transition between the office and business uses along the Lindsay Street corridor and the residential neighborhoods lying west of Carrick Street. As conditions, allowable building heights will be similar to what is permitted on

those adjacent single-family parcels.

In regards to mitigating impacts, standards of the Development Ordinance pertaining to landscaping, screening of trash receptacles, exterior lighting, and landscaping around the parking lot will assist to mitigate impacts on adjacent properties and the fact that you have public streets that help separate this site from the abutting neighborhood will also provide additional separation between this site and those neighborhoods to the north and to the west.

Finally, there were questions and concerns raised at the Planning & Zoning Commission regarding stormwater runoff. This site is within the Yadkin-Pee Dee non-water supply area. If development, grading, or site improvements exceed one acre in area, then the stormwater regulations would require the applicant to provide stormwater run-off controls where they would have to mitigate their impervious coverage. I would note when this issue came up in the Planning & Zoning Commission, they only have to mitigate their stormwater run-off. They will not be required to address stormwater run-off that are generated from adjacent sites and all that land from Main Street was developed prior to our current standards. Main Street is a ridge line, so everything does flow westward. So, you do have that stormwater issue from development that took place prior to our current standards, but the applicant would have to address their impacts.

Finally, as far as support of change in the area, the Land Use Plan does support the office-type development and higher intensity residential in this area as do policies in the Core City Plan which supports higher intensity residential housing close to the downtown area and key corridor streets. Thus, staff is recommending approval of the request for the Conditional Zoning Residential Multi-Family - 26 zoning on this site. The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this application at their April 26th public hearing and recommended approval by a vote of 9-0. The Commission is forwarding you a consistency statement that the request is consistent with adopted policy guidance because the proposed RM-26 District is supported by the Land Use Policies of the Community Vision Growth Statement, the Land Use Plan, and the Core City Plan. The Commission also stated that the request is reasonable because the zoning request includes most of the western half of this block and is situated within a portion of the Core City where adopted policy guidance supports office or

higher density residential uses to provide a wide range of housing opportunities.

That's a brief summary of this request from staff. Are there any questions?

Mayor Wagner: Any questions for staff?

Council Member Holmes: The stormwater run-off, my understanding is there are issues with flooding in this area.

Herb Shannon: The neighbors had expressed concerns with flooding in this area.

Council Member Holmes: Any plans in the development to address that? Is that something that with the expansion of the impervious surface, is that going to exacerbate this problem?

Herb Shannon: As far as future plans, I don't know if there's anyone here from Public Services. I know that's something that the Public Services Department has been looking at in this area. The applicant, if they obtain approval, when they go through the site plan review process through our Technical Review Committee, they will have to address their impervious coverage, so any new impervious coverage on this site if they have grading or development more than an acre in area, they will have to address their new impervious coverage from their development.

Mayor Wagner: And our regulations require anything to be captured on-site. So, they would be required to meet that standard.

Council Member Hudson: It actually is an improvement over what exists now because we don't have a catch basin, so it would be an improvement over that problem.

Mayor Wagner: Thank you, Mr. Shannon. Mr. Stone, welcome back.

Robby Stone: Thank you for allowing me to speak concerning Market Square. As proposed, this is a 52-unit elderly community: 26 one-bedroom, 26 two-bedrooms. This would amount to roughly right now about an 11-million-dollar investment on this particular site in this area. Similar in

design, architecture, materials, textures as to some of the other developments that we've done throughout the community.

There was a number of concerns related to stormwater that exists currently and also traffic that were brought up. And one thing that I would say, some council members may remember Kirkwood Crossing that we developed. This was a concern for that particular parcel. That particular parcel as it was before we developed that site, was creating similar off-site and other uses. Off-site is not able to do the same things, but our development, since that time, has mitigated some of the concerns that were coming from our site. So, this particular site has some topography movement on it. Some of the folks that spoke around adjacent to this particular site. My understanding is from Public Works that there is planned activity down from this site, located down gradient from this site. Our particular design, as folks know, as you move through this process and disturb more than one acre, we will be required to go through a process that deals with the water as it is on this particular site, whether that be through retention systems, cistern, things of that nature. In most cases, because this currently is not dealing with that water in any manner, it does become an improvement and it is something that helps the area. I think that there are other things that are being addressed in this area certainly off-site. And we can't address items off-site, but as it relates to this particular parcel adjacent to the doctor's office and the single-family uses that currently has no storm retention features designed in it; it's just standard elevation and topography as it exists today. We would be required to go in and deal with what we're creating, you know, as far as additional stormwater issues and mitigate that and would be required to deal with that on-site. That's not up to us. We submit, through our architecture and engineering design plans and specifications that go through a process that all of the departments look at and the departments above them and get certification. So, I feel confident that, through this process, those are items that will be looked at and addressed and it won't be up to just us. As we submit through our engineers and through our architects how that's dealt with, it will be required through a pretty rigorous process that ties into state requirements and other things like that.

As it relates to traffic, this is a 52-unit elderly community. I do not believe this particular site, as it's currently contemplated, would generate a TIA. It could as it moves through the process. That's another thing that the

Transportation Department and staff could ask to be done and any other features that it might require whether that be speed bumps inside and those kinds of things. But those are things, that there's a very thorough process that staff goes through that we're required to meet and we will propose something. But, again, it's not up to us.

So, I don't know if that answers some of the questions and I think there are some folks that are here tonight. If there's other questions that we can answer. But, I wanted to present myself if there was. This, again, is similar in fashion financing-wise and target population as our last proposal. So, I'd like to answer any questions if there are any.

Council Member Moore: If I remember from the past, this is Councilman Moore, the waiting list that you referred to through the years, and I'm sure we're not catching up on it, all you've got to do is pick up the paper. You, obviously, you know we have constitutional rights, you can't limit the applications that come into you geographically or any other way, can you?

Craig Stone: No, at Addington and Admiral, we opened the doors and within three months had over 3,000 applicants. Now, we stop at a point so that we're not taking application fees and things like that and we have Fair Housing standards and those kind of things that we have to maintain those lists and do, but the need is overwhelming.

Council Member Moore: I get it, but I guess my point being is that if the housing Feds would give the local people a little more leeway, we could try to attack a little bit of the problem that we have in our area within a certain parameter, but, I guess constitutionally that doesn't pass muster.

Craig Stone: One thing I would add, the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency has a process. We are involved in that process via the QAP that they put out. It is likely, with cost increases, but because of COVID, their normal application output would be 40-45 awards. This year I doubt that that's 20-25 because of doubling of costs. The need is overwhelming. Mike McNair and his department, I think, more than 5,000 it's quite a bit more than that as far as need goes. And we're talking about 52 apartments here. So, there's not enough tools for affordable housing.

Council Member Moore: Right, I get it, but like I said, I just think if the

whole thing was reshaped a little bit then maybe local communities could address their local community issues and everywhere across the country. That is what it is.

Craig Stone: I do agree that if we had more tools we could use.

Mayor Wagner: Any other questions for Mr. Stone? Thank you, Mr. Stone. Hang around, we may have more questions.

Craig Stone: And we do have some bond applications coming.

Mayor Wagner: Okay, several people signed up to speak and I will take them in the order that they were listed on the sheet, but if you didn't get a chance to sign up I will open the floor in case anyone else would like to speak on this item as well. The first one is Greg Adzima. Welcome back to city hall, Greg. Greg used to work for us at one point.

Greg Adzima: Thank you City Council and Mayor for your time today. My name is Greg Adzima and I live at 800 W. Ray Avenue and I've been a 34-year resident on W. Ray Avenue and many of you know me for 12 years on the Board of Adjustment and various other city items. I'd like to start with the info session that the developer put forth for this property. It was somehow announced, but it was before the sign went up announcing the property and it was before the sign went up for Planning and Zoning and it was before the sign went up for City Council. So, I'm not sure how anybody would have gotten their information really.

This property is not congruous with the neighborhood. The next four blocks has properties up to five acres in size and we are talking 78 bedrooms, probably 100 people and 100 cars on two acres. I'm sure some of you folks live on two acres or have two acres near you. How would you like 100 cars and 100 people on that? We don't want that.

Obviously, it's not currently zoned for this development. We mentioned traffic issues in some previous discussions. Obviously, that many cars and people are going to increase the traffic on W. Ray Avenue which has gone up quite dramatically in the last 30 years as have the speeds.

The developer said that they would mitigate flooding, but I will say that this

area floods very often, especially at the corner of Rotary and W. Ray Avenue. I personally waded up past my knees to help emergency vehicles, ambulances, and policemen get out of there because they had been stuck. How would you like to be in an ambulance stuck in there? Maybe you're dying on the way to the hospital. Not a good thing because this is a major cut through to the hospital. This is a direct route to the emergency room and, you know, the city's slogan, "creating the single most livable safe prosperous community in America," none of that applies to this. This is an over-burdened piece of property at two acres and it makes absolutely no sense for this area to be developed in this manner. I mean we're talking multiple, multiple. The previous development we're talking about has maybe a 13-14 units per acre. This one has 26 units per acre. Just think of what one acre is. Twenty-six apartments, probably 40 people and 40 cars on it. You might as well live in New York City. There's a lot of us folks that came to High Point because it was not New York City. We like it the way it is. Thanks.

Mayor Wagner: Thank you, Greg. Rachel Anderson.

Rachel Anderson: Hello, my name is Rachel Anderson and I live on 706 Delmont Street. It is my first house and I love it. It's a work in progress, but that's a fun bit. If it's alright, could I pass you guys this. I put out a petition, and as you can see, there's a copy for each of you. And they have their addresses there and every single person who signed is going to be affected by this project-like they're within three blocks away.

Firstly, I would like to...I already did that, sorry. Please note that all the addresses will be ones that will be directly influenced by the proposed development. The total number is 50. I actually have more, but that was before I was getting them to put down addresses and I wasn't able to get back in touch with everybody. I've had a great deal of pleasure of meeting a good deal of my neighbors while putting this together. All individuals and families who invested into this city when we decided to make High Point our home. Each name and address is a person who thought it was worth their time to voice their concerns and opinions about this proposed project.

The most talked about was water drainage, or in many cases, the lack thereof. Our neighborhood streets and homes have been subjected to increasing levels of water and flooding. Much of which head straight

towards us from downtown and the hospital. The area that the construction is proposed upon is one of the last substantial green places that separates us from that wash of concrete. It absorbs a substantial amount of water. There's also a gulley in the center that would have to be filled in which would further increase the land's ability to actually stop that flow. It would be ridiculous and short-sided to approve any construction until the drainage issue in our neighborhood has been properly addressed. It will result in property damage. It's already happening now and it's worst. And, again, this property will deal with the water that falls on it, not the stuff that it's absorbing now. So, all that's still going to go down towards us. It also has the potential for bodily harm when ambulances have to re-route to avoid flooded streets or simply get stuck in them.

To ask us to accept these risks to ourselves, our loved ones, and our property is unreasonable at best. Furthermore, to do so in the face of the concerns of so many names in front of you borders on unconscionable. Another concern of many is the parking. Fifty-two parking spaces for 52 units, half of which will be two-bedroom is not possibly going to contain the amount of vehicles or staff for this development and doesn't even take into consideration any visitors that they would have. Some single units will have two occupants and the possibility of two vehicles. Two bedrooms even more. Parking is already slim in this area on regular days, not even considering the added traffic and parking concerns during Market, which, of course, we're right up against.

For myself, personally, I would have no problem with this project if the infrastructure in place could handle it and if the plans made sense. Unfortunately, they don't and until they do, I cannot. In closing, no construction should be thoughtfully endorsed without a good groundwork in place to support it. This project has needed the actual pipes or community's support to make it a solid or considerable choice at the moment. Again, I would like you to take a look at the names and addresses in front of you and ask if our concerns for our homes and the quality of our lives that we live in them is worthy of your consideration. Also, like the previous development that was talked about, this one is right up against the street. And, again, three stories high, and one of the suggestions we have on there is the possibly downgrading it to 16-R instead of 26 and just lowering it so that's a little bit more reasonable for our neighborhood because that's going to be right up against our street and everywhere. Thank you so much

for your time. I really appreciate it. Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Cameron Ledbetter.

Cameron Ledbetter: Hello, my name is Cameron Ledbetter. I also reside at 706 Delmont Street. Also, I'd like to thank Tyrone Johnson and Michael Holmes for being the only members of this committee to answer my email on this subject. One of the concerns that I've seen that hasn't been brought up yet is that in the plans listed, that's been shown by Wynnefield Properties, they have the building, the setback for the building in the plans as presented, shows a 10-foot setback from the street for a 50-foot-tall structure. Ordinance Number 7626-1708 that was passed, I believe, on January 17, 2017, states that for RH-26 zoning that it would need to have a setback of 20 feet and if you're looking at the plans as presented, you literally can't move a building that size 20 feet without having to be on top of someone's house. So, it's already not up to code for the zoning that's been requested. Which is not a good sign, generally. Once again, 78 tenants, at least 52 parking spaces. I'm just not seeing it.

Also, one thing that has been brought up is that, well, it was brought up a good bit about there being screened in dumpsters, also within those plans it is one recycling dumpster and one regular waste dumpster for 78+ people. That's not enough capacity. So, basically, in order to still maintain that would mean that Waste Management routes would have to be increased there which, obviously, is going to have its own problems as well.

As far as traffic, yeah, it's really annoying when traffic backs up and, yes, that will be a big issue considering that the main entrance on Sunset is just up from the traffic circle. During Market, it already backs up past Ray and just across Lindsay right at the intersection is already where those paramedics actually stage their trucks for dispatch. So, backing up further can cause some serious problems there.

Hold on, I'm sorry. Oh yeah-traffic. If you've actually gone down Sunset, just past Currick and Delmont, you probably have noticed that there's an extreme sight distance right there. So, if you have cars coming in and out from that entrance, it's a pretty tight street and there's really not anywhere to swerve as it is, you're going to end up having wrecks at that entrance basically like both coming in off of Lindsay and going towards Lindsay. It

doesn't make sense to have cars going in and out of there that much, given the site distance.

I swear, I'm trying to keep it down to things that have not been overly discussed. I know your time's valuable. Also, for a three-story senior building, it seems kind of crazy to have six handicapped parking spaces and no elevator in the plans. I'm not really sure how that's supposed to work. And, once again, with it not having proper offset from the street, the reason why, because they're in place and I'm sure you know, has to do with fire ladders and being able to have enough distance from buildings to get up to higher floors, so there's issues there as well.

Let's see. Oh yeah-power grid strain. So, a lot of the presentations I've been seeing have to do....seem to be really, really heavy on the idea that the infrastructure in place already is doing great, and in reality, it's not. Once again, if you visited the site, you'd know. Those roads are already crumbling. If you bring in that much heavy construction equipment that's required to go up a three-story building, they will crumble further in pretty short order. One thing that you don't seem to really notice that much, I guess, is that we actually experience a ton of power outages in the area. Seventy-eight seniors in a building, many of whom would end up because also prioritizing people with disabilities, rely on medical devices. So, that site is actually on a separate grid from the hospital which is set up to handle those kinds of devices in case of power outages. We see a lot of power outages in the area already. It seems like it would be a strain on the power system.

Let's see.....mostly I'm just suggesting that the rezoning instead be for RH -16. It seems like this type of project could be done pretty easily within that zoning if it met the requirements for it. Even in the article in the High Point Enterprise, Wynnefield even alludes to the fact that it's a very tight fit because it doesn't fit. I also keep hearing, well, there's commercial here that could be, you know, 80 feet tall. It isn't. Those commercial properties, those offices are converted one-story cottages. We're not talking about having a smooth transition between a big, booming commercial there with tall buildings down to single-family. This would be the towering structure in the area. It just seems like whatever is convenient, things are well planned out and it will go great and whenever anything is brought up, it's up in the air, the city will figure it out. I just don't have the confidence with this.

Additionally, it's also where I keep hearing about how great their current sites are managed. Quick Google search, the reviews say completely otherwise. They tend to all have the same kind of issues, primarily with waste management. I've seen probably at least about one quarter or more of the complaints are there's trash piled up everywhere. Even more if you include pest control issues that come from that. I just do not have faith in this project. Period. And I think it's just reckless to go forward with it as it is currently planned. Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Thank you, Mr. Ledbetter. Is there anyone else present who would like to speak regarding this item? You've already had your chance.

Unidentified person in audience: The only thing I want to say is we didn't even know about it.

Mayor Wagner: If you're going to speak, you have to come forward to the podium and give us your name and address please. Thank you.

Terry Currie: I didn't really plan on coming up here, but my name is Terry Currie. I sent y'all an email, 401 Colonial Drive. We didn't even know about this. I think Mr. Ledbetter didn't even get the letter about the meeting until the day after and it was only 300 feet that they sent out letters to. I heard about it a week ago and I came to the Planning meeting. So, there would have been a lot more people here had they known about it, to voice their concerns and I'm worried about the traffic. Being so close to Lindsay with the entrance and exit, the only one going in and off the street. So, I mean if you could expand the time some more people could voice their concerns. It would really help. Thank you.

Council Member Moore: Can I ask her a question? When did you get notification?

Terry Currie: I never got notification. I'm on the corner of Delmont and Colonial.

Council Member Jones: It's outside the radius to be contacted.

Council Member Moore: Just outside.

Terry Currie: But it affects me dramatically.

Council Member: I'm sure. Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Before she steps down, Mr. Shannon, can you state what the requirement is for notification to the neighborhoods.

Herb Shannon: We notify all the property owners within 300 feet of the property.

Mayor Wagner: To your knowledge, has the applicant complied with that? The city gives notification.

Herb Shannon: Yes, and we provide that list to the applicant for doing their citizen information meeting.

Terry Currie: And when did you get your notification?

Cameron Ledbetter: For the Planning and Zoning meeting, just barely within the time requirements.

Rachel Anderson: And two of our neighbors who moved in this year were on the street and they didn't get anything. We're the only reason they knew it.

Mayor Wagner: There's a list in your packet of everyone who received notification.

Terry Currie: Thank you.

Mayor Wagner: Anyone else who would like to speak?

Unidentified person: I'd just like to say I'm at 406 Sunset and I never got notice.

Council Member Moore: I've got one quick question for Mr. Shannon. Who determines the 300 feet? Is it city ordinance?

Herb Shannon: State statutes require notification of property owners within 100 feet. The city Development Ordinance, we have higher standards and we've upped that to all property owners within 300 feet.

Council Member Moore: Thank you. I wanted that kind of rhetorically for the record and for that to be known by the neighbors.

Rachel Anderson: My neighbors didn't get it. They are, like, on the same street as me. They are within the 100 feet.

Mayor Wagner: Okay, with that I'm going to close the public hearing. I think a lot of what has been brought up, I think everybody needs to understand the process of what we're doing. What we're being asked to do is to determine whether the new zoning is correct, okay? We're asked to rezone the property. We're not here to approve their site plan. We're not here to approve what they are planning to do with it. I don't know if...Mr. Stone...I don't know if his company actually owns the property. Do you actually own this property?

Craig Stone: I have an option contract.

Mayor Wagner: So, this property could be sold to someone else. It could be redeveloped in another way. So, all we're asked to do is approve the request for rezoning. As far as where the building is built on the property, whether they have to put in stormwater controls, whether they have to put in a turn lane, you know, or what they might have to do to address any kind of transportation issues, those are things that are handled after the fact through our technical review process with the city because, the developer, when they come back, they have to produce their site plan, they have to produce their plans to the city for approval and all of those things go through the Technical Review Committee. They review those and they determine whether what's been proposed meets the requirements of our ordinances. So, a lot of the things that were brought up are things that, really, we can take into account, but are really things that if the zoning is approved would be handled once an actual plan is produced and filed with the city. With regard to the stormwater, that's one thing that's been brought up over and over, as Mr. Shannon stated, they are required that if they are going to disturb more than one acre of land, that they have to put in stormwater

controls. That will control...every drop of rain that hits that development has to be controlled. It is related to impervious surface, and they will have to catch and retain that water on that site. Now, our experience typically has been that whenever we have new developments that go into an older area that's experiencing or has experienced some sort of stormwater problem, usually the new development makes it better. Because what you have right now is roughly two acres where there are no stormwater controls and if, in the future, this is developed, you'll have two acres where there are stormwater controls.

I have one question, though, for our staff and I don't know if Robby Stone is still here or somebody. One of our stormwater projects was that lower area. Ray Street I believe. Has that project been completed or is that still in the works?

Eric Olmedo: I don't believe it's been started.

Mayor Wagner: Okay, any timeframe on that?

Eric Olmedo: Not to my knowledge.

Mayor Wagner: Anyway, I want to get that out there before we continue so that folks will have a better understanding of, really, what our role is at this current phase. It's really just a question of zoning.

So, with that and to keep things moving, **I'm going to make a motion for approval of this item and I'm going to state in my motion for approval that I will adopt a reasonableness and consistency statement as stated by the staff in the staff report.**

Council Member Johnson: Second.

Mayor Wagner: And there is a second for that motion. So, now the floor is open for Council for discussion or any questions you might have. The public is closed. Does anyone have any questions for staff or comments?

Council Member Holmes: No, I guess this is for Mr. Stone. I see here that there was a suggestion for alternate zoning to RH-16. Was that discussed in your meeting with the residents about maybe lowering the density requirement for some of these concerns that they had?

Craig Stone: Alternate zoning was not discussed and one thing I would add, in addition to the notifications, we placed a rather large sign on the site as notification to the community of the proposed development as well, so that it would be front and center and publicly seen. But there w

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, to adopt an Ordinance providing for the rezoning of approximately 2.1 acres from the Residential Single Family - 5 (R-5) District and the Office Institutional (O-I) District to a Conditional Zoning Residential Multifamily - 26 (CZ RM-26) District. and to adopt the following Consistency and Reasonableness Statements:

"That Zoning Map Amendment 22-07 is consistent with the City's adopted policy guidance because the proposed RM-26 zoning is supported by land use policies in the Community Growth Vision Statement and the Land Use Plan and the Core City Plan. Furthermore, the zoning request includes most of the western half of this block and is situated within a portion of the Core City Area where adopted policy guidance documents support office or higher density residential uses to provide a wide range of housing opportunities."

The motion carried by the following unanimous 9-0 vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

GENERAL BUSINESS AGENDA**[2022-203](#)****Establish Budget Public Hearing - Monday, May 16, 2022, 5:30pm**

City Council is requested to establish the Budget Public Hearing for Monday, May 16, 2022, at 5:30 pm and establish the following dates for City Council budget work sessions.

Wednesday, May 11, 2022, 3-5 pm

Thursday, May 12, 2022, 3-4 pm (if necessary)

Thursday, May 19, 2022, 3-5 pm (if necessary)

Monday, May 23, 2022, 3-5 pm (if necessary)

Attachments: [FY 2022-23 Proposed Budget Presentation](#)
[FY 2022-23 Proposed Budget - 5-2-2022 - City Council.pdf](#)

The public hearing for this matter was held on Monday, May 2, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. as duly advertised.

Stephen Hawryluk, Budget and Performance Manager, provided a brief overview of the Proposed FY 2022-2023 Budget.

He spoke to the challenge of preparing the budget due to COVID-19 and the variants; how there's a new normal that everyone is having to deal with; how that new normal affects the city's daily delivery of services; supply chain issues regarding timing of equipment/vehicle orders; inflation (costs much higher than originally anticipated); trying to factor these into department budgets so they can continue to deliver services that they're used to delivering; there is a major impact of fuel prices; the challenges associated with the retention and recruitment of employees; the drastic impact that the Guilford County tax revaluation would have on every citizen; continuation of the restoration of budgets to pre-pandemic levels.

He reported the total budget for all funds proposed for the FY 2022-2023 budget is \$464.3 million and shared a pie chart showing the percentages of all funds. He noted that the purchase of wholesale power is the largest expenditure, which equates to about 20% of the entire budget. Looking at the total revenues and comparing the proposed budget to last year's adopted budget, he noted that charges for services is the largest revenue category which is made up of electric fund revenues, water/sewer revenues, solid waste revenues--charges for services from the Enterprise Fund.

Mr. Hawryluk advised that the proposed budget reduces the tax rate by three cents to 61.75 cents per \$100 valuation; a proposal for a 4% increase in water/sewer rates; several fee schedule changes; new fees for fire inspections, fire permitting, and fire violations, etc...; some increased fees for cemeteries, library, and a fee for USB drives in the City Clerk's office for public records requests. He stated that the proposed budget does not recommend any increases to electric rates, stormwater fees or landfill and garbage collection fees.

Regarding the property tax rate, Mr. Hawryluk noted that one cent is equivalent of \$1.27 million and explained that the property tax rate is divided between the Debt Service Fund and the General Fund; the debt service fund remains at 3.4 cents allocation to it and the three cent reduction is effective in the General Fund going from 61.3 cents to 58.35 cents. He further explained that because this is a revaluation year, the city would need to publish a revenue neutral tax rate which is a tax rate that would produce the same revenue if no revaluation occurred, but still assumes natural growth. He advised the current tax base, which at a current rate produced a current levy of about \$66.9 million and noted that it would require a revenue neutral tax rate of 52.97 cents taking into consideration the proposed tax base, tax rates, etc..... and the average growth of 1.87 cents.

Regarding the Guilford County revaluation, he pointed out a house valued at \$150,000, under the new proposed rate, would be paying almost an additional \$187 annually or \$15 monthly. He explained that the annual/monthly change would be indicative of the value of the property and how it changed in the reval which would vary from homeowner to homeowner.

Sales tax revenues are growing and have been growing throughout the year; the current year projections have the city ending the year at a little over 11% as compared to the end of 2021, which is over \$2.6 million; staff's projections for 2022-2023 assume a 4% growth above the projected year and staff feels this is a very conservative estimate.

On the expenditure side, Mr. Hawryluk noted that personnel services make up about 33% of the total budget and increasing almost \$12.9 million or 9% due to the 2.5 percent cost of living adjustment for employees and the increase to the minimum hourly rate to \$15 an hour. The salary changes proposed in the FY 2022-2023 Budget are:

- Average 3% mid-year merit pay adjustment (\$1.86 million);
- Increased city match for 401K/457 contributions from 1% to 3% (effective January 1, 2023) (\$786 thousand);
- Increased employer contribution to the Local Government Employees' Retirement System (LGERS) (\$2.03 million);
- Increased employer costs to city health plan (no increase to employee contribution) (\$1.64 million).

He reported that several benefits were researched during the budget process as to what the benefit would be to the employee, the fiscal impact, and how the city of High Point compares to other municipalities. The three specific benefits that were researched were the city matched 401K/457 contributions; paid parental leave; and an employee health clinic. He reiterated that the budget proposal does include the city's match increase from 1% to 3% for 401K/457, but does not

include the paid parental and employee health clinic benefits.

There are 11 full-time and 3 part-time new positions included in the budget at a total cost of \$1,203,707.00. In addition to these new positions that are additions to the employee count, nine full-time and two part-time titles are proposed; management and staff will look at identifying and repurposing vacant positions to lessen the fiscal impact.

On the operating side for expenditures, fuel is a huge driver impacting the budget; the proposed budget restores the fire apparatus replacement program suggesting a dive truck and engine be replaced; these were deferred during COVID; staff was able to fund some fire vehicle replacement as part of the critical items that were deferred during last year's budget when that was approved back in February; the proposed budget also includes an additional \$1 million for fleet vehicle and rolling stock replacements.

On the capital side, the budget restores general capital to about \$2.55 million; \$1.4 million of that is funded by the General Fund; there is one project that has shared funding through some of the Enterprise Funds; that is going from zero to \$1.4 million; which is a big driver of the increase in capital.

Mr. Hawryluk noted the budget document notebooks for Council could be picked up in the manager's conference room. He concluded his presentation with the following proposed dates for the upcoming budget work sessions:

Wednesday, May 11th from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Thursday, May 12th from 3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.(if necessary)

Thursday, May 19th from 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (if necessary)

Monday, May 23rd from 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (if necessary)

Regarding a question that was asked in the Special Meeting held earlier at 3:30 p.m. on the street resurfacing budget, staff replied that the total resurfacing budget for FY 2022-2023 is \$3.3 million which is the same budget as in the current year; noted that it was increased in FY 2021, but remains the same for FY 2023.

Mayor Wagner asked if there were any questions for staff regarding the proposed budget. Hearing none, he proceeded with the following motion.

proposed dates that need to be established for the budget work sessions; and asked that Council set the public hearing date for the proposed FY 2022-2023 for

Monday, May 16th at 5:30 p.m.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, to establish a public hearing date on the budget for May 16th at 5:30 p.m.; and established the following dates for City Council Budget Work Sessions: Wednesday, May 11th (3-5 p.m.); Thursday, May 12th (3-4 p.m.) (if necessary); Thursday, May 19th (3-5 p.m.) (if necessary); and Monday, May 23rd (3-5 p.m.) (if necessary).

The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-214](#)

Purchase of Property- 300 A Oak Street and 331 W. Russell Avenue

Staff recommends City Council approve the purchase of the properties located at 300 A Oak Street and 331 W. Russell Avenue at a purchase price of \$3,000,000 and to authorize the mayor to execute the agreement.

Attachments: [300 Oak agenda item.pdf](#)

Mayor Wagner moved to suspend the rules to place this matter on tonight's agenda for consideration. Council Member Hudson made a second to the motion which carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote.

A motion was then made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Moore, to approve the purchase of the properties located at 300 A Oak Street and 331 W. Russell Avenue at a purchase price of \$3,000,000.00 and to authorize the mayor to execute the agreement. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-215](#)

Grant Project Ordinance Amendment

Council is requested to approve an ordinance amending the Grant Project Ordinance for the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021: Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds for the purchase of property at 300 A Oak Street and 331 W. Russell Avenue for development of a small-scale manufacturing facility.

Attachments: [300 Oak - Grant Project Ordinance updated.pdf](#)
[Budget Amendment 300 A Oak and 331 W Russell \(ARPA Funds\).pdf](#)

Mayor Wagner moved to suspend the rules to place this matter on tonight's agenda for consideration. Council Member Hudson made a second to the motion, which carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, to adopt a Grant Project Ordinance Amendment that would authorize the use of ARPA funds for the purchase of the property at 300 A Oak Street and 331 W. Russell Avenue in the amount of \$3,000,000.00. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

2022-204

Minutes To Be Approved

April 13, 2022 Prosperity & Livability Committee Meeting Minutes @ 9:00 a.m.

April 14, 2022 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes @ 4:00 p.m.

April 18, 2022 Special Meeting Minutes @ 4:00 p.m.

April 18, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes @ 5:30 p.m.

April 20, 2022 Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes @ 4:00 p.m.

Attachments: [1. April 13 2022 Prosperity Livability Committee Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

[2. April 14 2022 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes \(2\).pdf](#)

[3. April 18 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

[4. April 18 2022 Special Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

[5. April 20 2022 Public Safety Committee Minutes.pdf](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

ADJOURNMENT