

City of High Point

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



Minutes - Final

Monday, May 16, 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**ROLL CALL, MOMENT OF SILENCE, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mayor Wagner called the meeting to order at 5:43 p.m. He called for a Moment of Silence; the Pledge of allegiance followed.

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; and Council Member Michael A. Holmes, Ward 6.

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

FINANCE COMMITTEE - Britt Moore, Chair**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSION-REQUEST**

Mayor Wagner recognized staff to speak on items 2022-241 and 2022-2042 recognized planning to speak

Herb Shannon, Senior Planner-Planning and Development advised that the applicant for Leoterra Development, Inc.-Plan Amendment 22-01 and Zoning Map Amendment 22-08 (Items: 2022-241/2022-242) would like to remand his case back to the Planning and Zoning Commission; stated that the applicant was redesigning their request; and was working with staff with said changes.

JoAnne Carlyle, City Attorney advised that it would be procedurally correct for the applicant to withdraw their application; explained the 'remand' procedural process; and would have to go through the public hearing process; asked Mr. Shannon if he could accept the submitted document from the applicant as a withdrawn; and stated that this process would not cause any delays. Mr. Shannon replied, yes.

Ellis Martin, Fox Rothschild, LLP (Representative for the applicant) said that pending that a 'withdrawn' would be fine pending confirmation from his client; and let council know when the applicant had responded.

Ms. Carlyle noted that staff would revisit the section regarding the

language 'remanding; and make necessary changes.

Mayor Wagner advised that this case would continue pending confirmation from the applicant.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Council Member Moore, Finance Committee Chairman, reported that all consent items were approved with a favorable recommendation.

Council Member Moore then moved approval of all Finance Committee matters to the Consent Agenda. Council Member Holmes made a second to the motion. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

[2022-219](#)

Contract - WESCO Distribution, Inc. - Warehouse Stock - Underground Cable

City Council is requested to award a contract to WESCO Distribution, Inc. in the amount of \$384,315.00 for the purchase of five (5) various underground cable types used by Electric Utilities to replenish warehouse stock.

Attachments: [1. Contract – WESCO Distribution, Inc. – Warehouse Stock – Underground C](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve a contract to WESCO Distribution, Inc. in the amount of \$384,315.00 for the purchase of five (5) various underground cable types used by Electric Utilities to replenish warehouse stock. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-220](#)**Contract - WESCO Distribution, Inc. - Residential Voltage (120/240V) Transformers (25kVa)**

City Council is requested to award a contract to WESCO Distribution Inc. in the amount of \$113,221.80 for the purchase of (20) twenty transformers to be installed around the city electric footprint on various projects.

Attachments: [2. Contract – WESCO Distribution – Residential Voltage \(120-240V\) Transfor](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve a contract to WESCO Distribution Inc. in the amount of \$113,221.80 for the purchase of (20) twenty transformers to be installed around the city electric footprint on various projects. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-221](#)**Resolution - Housing Authority of High Point Multifamily Housing - Amended - Revenue Bonds for Daniel Brooks Phase I**

City Council is requested to adopt a resolution approving, for purposes of meeting the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, the issuance by the Housing Authority of the City of High Point in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$14,000,000 of Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds for Daniel Brooks Phase I.

Attachments: [3. Resolution - Housing Authority of High Point Multifamily Housing – Amend](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a resolution approving, for purposes of meeting the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, the issuance by the Housing Authority of the City of High Point in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$14,000,000 of Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds for Daniel Brooks Phase I. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,
Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member

Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Resolution No. 2055/22-29

Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 100

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-222](#)

Budget Ordinance - Purchase of Property 300A Oak Street & 331 W. Russell

Avenue

City Council is requested to adopt a budget ordinance to appropriate \$3,000,000 for the purchase of property at 300A Oak Street and 331 W Russell Avenue for development of a small-scale manufacturing facility.

Attachments: [4. Budget Ordinance – Purchase of Property 300A Oak Street & 331 W. Russell](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a budget ordinance to appropriate \$3,000,000 for the purchase of property at 300A Oak Street and 331 W Russell Avenue for development of a small-scale manufacturing facility. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member

Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Ordinance No. 7822/22-43

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 139

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, 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

[2022-223](#)

Contract - High Point Convention & Visitors Bureau FY 2022-23

City Council is requested to approve the FY 2022-23 Convention and Visitors Bureau budget and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with the High Point Convention and Visitors Bureau for FY 2022-23.

Attachments: [5. Contract – High Point Convention & Visitors Bureau FY 2022-23](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the FY 2022-23 Convention and Visitors Bureau budget and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with the High Point Convention and Visitors Bureau for FY 2022-23. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-224](#)

Approval- FY 2022-2023 Annual Budget for the Market Authority

Council is requested to approve the FY 2022-2023 Annual Budget for the Market Authority.

Attachments: [6. Approval of FY 2022-23 Market Authority Budget](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the FY 2022-2023 Annual Budget for the Market Authority. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-225](#)

Budget Ordinance - Community Development Block Grant - Cares Act Funds

City Council is requested to appropriate a special allocation of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-CV) funds awarded under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) to be used to prevent, prepare for, and respond to

the coronavirus pandemic.

Attachments: [7. Community Development Block Grant - Cares Act Funds - Budget Ordinan](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the appropriation of a special allocation of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-CV) funds awarded under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) to be used to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus pandemic.

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

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Ordinance No. 7823/22-44

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 140

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-226](#)

Budget Ordinance - Fleet Services - Excavator Replacement for Water/Sewer Mains Division

City Council is requested to approve the excavator for surplus, appropriate \$77,000 from the sale of the equipment, and utilize the proceeds for a replacement excavator for the Water/Sewer Mains Division.

Attachments: [8. Ordinance - Fleet Services - Excavator Replacement](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the excavator for surplus, appropriate \$77,000 from the sale of the equipment, and utilize the proceeds for a replacement excavator for the Water/Sewer Mains Division.

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

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Ordinance No. 7824/22-45

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 141

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

2022-227**Capital Project Ordinance - Burton/Washington GO Bond Projects**

City Council is requested to adopt a budget ordinance to appropriate \$10,605,259 for the Washington Street and Burton Avenue projects funded by 2019 voter approved general obligation bonds.

Attachments: [8-1. Capital Project Ordinance – Burton&Washington GO Bond Projects](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a budget ordinance to appropriate \$10,605,259 for the Washington Street and Burton Avenue projects funded by 2019 voter approved general obligation bonds.

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

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Ordinance No. 7825/22-46

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 142

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

2022-228**Capital Project Ordinance - Eastside UV Disinfection**

City Council is requested to adopt a budget ordinance to appropriate \$7,980,726 for the Eastside UV Disinfection project and cost of issuance related to the 2022 Combined Enterprise System (CES) Revenue Bond issuance.

Attachments: [8-2. Capital Project Ordinance – Eastside UV Disinfection](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a budget ordinance to

appropriate \$7,980,726 for the Eastside UV Disinfection project and cost of issuance related to the 2022 Combined Enterprise System (CES) Revenue Bond issuance. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

**Ordinance No. 7826/22-47
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 143**

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-229](#)

Budget Amendment to Record Issuance of Series 2022A, 2022B, and Series 2022C General Obligation Bonds

City Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to record the issuance of Series 2022A, 2022B, and 2022C General Obligation Bonds.

Attachments: [8-3. Budget Amendment to Record Issuance of Series 2022A, 2022B, and Series 2022C General Obligation Bonds](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve a budget amendment to record the issuance of Series 2022A, 2022B, and 2022C General Obligation Bonds. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-230](#)

Resolution - Sale of City Owned Property - 1100 Jefferson Street

Council is requested to adopt a resolution accepting the offer of \$13,000.00 and authorizing

the sale of the

Property located at 1100 Jefferson Street, (Parcel No. 174217) 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: [9. Resolution – Sale of City Owned Property – 1100 Jefferson Street](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a resolution accepting the offer of \$13,000.00 and authorizing the sale of the Property located at 1100 Jefferson Street, (Parcel No. 174217) 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. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

**Resolution No. 2056/22-30
Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 101**

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-231](#)

Resolution - Rescind Resolution Authorizing Condemnation to Acquire an Easement - 302 Montlieu Avenue (Qubein Avenue)

City Council is requested to adopt a resolution rescinding the February 7, 2020 resolution authorizing condemnation to acquire an easement in connection with the Montlieu Avenue Improvement Project located at 302 Montlieu Avenue (Qubein Avenue).

.Body

[Enter body here.]

Attachments: [10. Resolution - Rescind Resolution Authorizing Condemnation to Acquire ar](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to adopt a resolution rescinding the February 7, 2020 resolution authorizing condemnation to acquire an easement in connection with the Montlieu Avenue Improvement Project located at 302 Montlieu Avenue (Qubein

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

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

Resolution No. 2057/22-31

Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 102

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

[2022-232](#)

One NC Grant - Amada America, Inc. - Performance Based Incentives

City Council is requested to approve the pass through grant of \$50,000 in One North Carolina Incentive Funds to Amada America, Inc..

Attachments: [11. One NC Grant – Amada America, Inc. – Performance Based Incentives](#)

Sandy Dunbeck, Economic Development Director reported that this was a for the request for the High Point City Council to authorize a pass through of \$50,000 in performance-based incentives from the State of North Carolina in One NC grant funds to Amada North America on Amada Drive; noted that the requirements were met for this phase; the State of North Carolina had shared a One NC Grant payment of \$50,000 for Amada North America and their project on Amada Drive in Premier Center; the High Point EDC staff is asking that High Point City Council authorize staff to pay Amada North America the pass through grant of \$50,000 in One North Carolina Incentive Funds to Amada North America.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the pass-through grant of \$50,000 in One North Carolina Incentive Funds to Amada America, Inc. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-233](#)

Resolution of Support - Metal Works of High Point - Building Reuse Grant

City Council is requested to adopt a resolution of support for Metal Works of High Point being awarded a Building Reuse Grant from the State of North Carolina.

Attachments: [12. Resolution of Support - Metal Works of High Point - Building Reuse Grant](#)

Sandy Dunbeck, Economic Development Director reported that this item was requesting that the High Point City Council approve a resolution of support for Metal Works of High Point receiving a \$100,000 Building Reuse Grant from the State of North Carolina; Metal Works of High Point is a manufacturer of metal components, weldments and assemblies, servicing industries such as material handling, furniture, transportation, power generation and appliance; the Metal Works Expansion project would allow offering additional capabilities in the form of in-house powder coating and assembly; the company would be purchasing an additional facility in High Point at 1245 Hickory Chapel Rd. to add 38,000 square feet and 20 jobs paying above the county average wage; and that the High Point Economic Development staff is recommending that City Council approves a resolution of support for Metal Works of High Point being awarded a Building Reuse Grant from the State of North Carolina.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Jones, adopt a resolution of support for Metal Works of High Point being awarded a Building Reuse Grant from the State of North Carolina. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Resolution No. 2058/22-32

Resolution Book, Volume XXI, Page 103

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Jones, 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

PUBLIC HEARINGS[2022-234](#)**Public Hearing - Metal Works of High Point - Performance Based Incentives - High Point Economic Development (EDC)**

City Council is requested to authorize performance-based incentives for Metal Works of High Point in the amount of \$75,000 and authorize the City Manager to execute a performance agreement with the company containing benchmarks for the company to achieve and a schedule for the payment of such financial incentives.

Attachments: [13. Public Hearing – Metal Works of High Point - Performance Based Incentives](#)

Council Member Moore opened the Public Hearing on this matter.

Sandy Dunbeck, Economic Development Director reported that the High Point City Council is asked to consider a request from Metal Works of High Point, to authorize performance-based building upfit incentives for a project at 1245 Hickory Chapel Road in the amount of \$75,000. Metal Works of High Point is a manufacturer of metal components, weldments and assemblies, servicing industries such as material handling, furniture, transportation, power generation and appliance. The Metal Works Expansion project would allow offering additional capabilities in the form of in-house powder coating and assembly. The company would purchase an additional facility in High Point at 1245 Hickory Chapel Rd. to add 38,000 square feet and add (20) twenty new jobs paying above the county average wage. The source of those monies would be the City's Economic Development Incentive Fund, which is funded by general and electric revenues. the High Point Economic Development staff recommends that City Council authorize performance-based incentives for the project in the amount of \$75,000 and authorize the City Manager to execute a performance agreement with the company containing benchmarks for the company to achieve and a schedule for the payment of such financial incentives. Ms. Dunbeck recognized Elizabeth Hall, Vice President, and Johnathan Hall, President to speak on this matter.

Ms. Hall extended greetings; thanked everyone for the opportunity; shared information for about their company; said that their specialty was in sheet metal; they currently have 52 employees; been in business for 30 years; said that they were under contract to purchase the property at 1245 Hickory Chapel Road, and was expected to close on May 31st; explained how the building's layout would be; outlined the upfit and additions to include cost; said that the functions would become more stream lined with additional space; they would provide a variety of jobs; the plan was to hire 20 new employees with the average wage of \$54,000; and are construction contributors. In conclusion, Ms. Hall and Mr. Hall thanked everyone again for the opportunity to become a part of the City of High Point; and thanked everyone for making High Point a bigger, better, and strong place to live.

Council Member Holmes thanked Ms. Hall for their efforts; and voiced

appreciation for their contributions.

Council Member Moore asked if there were anyone else who would like to speak on this matter, seeing none the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the authorization of the performance-based incentives for Metal Works of High Point in the amount of \$75,000 and authorize the City Manager to execute a performance agreement with the company containing benchmarks for the company to achieve and a schedule for the payment of such financial incentives. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Council Member Moore voiced appreciation for local businesses.

Council Member Williams noted that he represented Ward 2 where said property was located; and voiced appreciation for the opportunity presented.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

2022-235

Public Hearing - Ecolab - Performance Based Incentives- High Point Economic Development (EDC)

City Council is requested to authorize performance-based incentives for the project of up to \$414,863 and

authorize the City Manager to execute a performance agreement with the company containing benchmarks for the company to achieve and a schedule for the payment of such financial incentives

Attachments: [14. Public Hearing - Ecolab - Performance Based Incentives - High Point Ecc](#)

Council Member Moore opened the public hearing on this matter.

Sandy Dunbeck, Economic Development Director; The High Point City Council is asked to consider a request from Ecolab, to authorize performance-based incentives for a project in High Point North Industrial

Center at 2519 Sandy Ridge Rd. in the amount of \$414,863. Ecolab is global leader in water, hygiene and infection prevention solutions and services, making the world cleaner, safer and healthier by protecting people and vital resources. The project will result in the construction of an approximately 825,000-square-foot facility, the relocation of 125 positions, and the creation of 20 new jobs. Ecolab will invest \$27,800,000 in real and personal property which will result in over \$93,000,000 investment. This would be the first project to locate in High Point North Industrial Center an over 550-acre industrial park in north High Point. The source of those monies would be the City's Economic Development Incentive Fund, which is funded by general and electric revenues. The High Point Economic Development staff recommends that City Council authorize performance-based incentives for the project of up to \$414,863 authorize the City Manager to execute a performance agreement with the company containing benchmarks for the company to achieve and a schedule for the payment of such financial incentives.

Sharon Ruppel, Vice President-Ecolab; extended greetings; provided a brief history for Ecolab, founded in 1932 in the city of High Point, NC; spoke to prior renovations; there are two sites-Greensboro, and Winston-Salem; Ecolab is a global leader in water, hygiene and infection prevention solutions and services, helping to make the world cleaner, safer and healthier by protecting people and vital resources; provided photos of products produced by the company; the company supports restaurant, health facilities, and grocery stores; also, is a board member for the United Way of Greensboro; and introduced J.R. to further discuss opportunities.

J.R. Tomlinson, Managing Director-Newmark extended greetings; said that Ecolab would be looking into investing around \$27.8 million into \$93 million dollar investment; the site would be expanding to include new job position; the Winston-Salem site would be moving into the new locating; and that the shuttle miles would be reduced by 662,000 per year.

Council Member Holmes asked Ms. J.R. to explain shuttle miles. Ms. J.R. replied that in terms of sustainability; shuttle miles would be the distance traveled; that the shuttle miles were reduced because of a closer location.

Council Member Jones asked if the total number of new employees would total 145. Ms. Ruppel replied, yes; and that there were currently 600 employees to date.

Council Member Moore asked if anyone would like to speak on this matter. Hearing none, the public hearing was close.

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the authorization performance-based incentives for the project of up to \$414,863

and authorize the City Manager to execute a performance agreement with the company containing benchmarks for the company to achieve and a schedule for the payment of such financial incentives. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-236](#)

Public Hearing - Proposed FY2022-23 City of High Point Annual Budget

Monday, May 16, 2022 at 5:30pm is the date and time established to receive public comments on the proposed FY2022-2023 City of High Point Annual Budget.

Attachments: [15. Public Hearing - Proposed FY 2022-23 City of High Point Budget](#)

Council Member Moore opened the public hearing on this matter.

Stephen Hawryluk, Budget Manager reported that the city's budget was balance in accordance with state statute; gave a brief overview of changes/reductions; that the budget was filed with the City Clerk on May 2, 2022; and that the next budget work session was scheduled for May 19th.

Council Member Moore opened the floor for comments.

Ken Orms; 3525 Sainsbury Ln.; voiced concerns with the increase property assessment with Guilford County; with the increased cost of living expenses; the impact to the economy due to the pandemic; spoke to attracting new residents for High Point; and to the challenges faced for senior citizens due to the increase in property taxes.

Taylor West, 205 Shadow Valley Road; spoke to the walkability concerns on Main St.; and stated that they would like to see more walkability downtown.

Justin Stabb, 1207 N Main St.; voiced concerns regarding speeding traffic, and walkability on Main St.; and spoke in favor of investing in the walkability efforts.

Evan Shaw, 605 Gatewood Avenue; spoke to the need for walkability on Main St.; and voiced concerns regarding speeding on Main St.

LaDene Hayes, 4000 Kim Dr.; voiced safety concerns regarding overgrown trees along the electrical lines; said that she had reached out to the city with no resolution; and she has enjoyed living in the city of High Point since 2007.

Council Member Moore spoke to growth, expansion, and maintaining a quality of life in High Point; voiced appreciation for the speakers' feedback; and encouraged the citizens to communicate with their elected officials.

Council Member Jefferson asked Mr. Stabb about his concerns regarding walkability.

Mr. Stabb recognized two his patrons in the audience that had voiced concerns regarding walkability, speeding, and noise; and the challenges faced due to safety concerns downtown.

Mayor Pro Tem thanked everyone for their feedback; and spoke to finding a resolution for their concerns.

Council Member Moore asked if there were anyone else who would like to speak on this matter, seeing none the public hearing was closed; and noted that council would vote on the budget at the June 6th meeting of council.

presented before council

PROSPERITY & LIVABILITY COMMITTEE - Council Member Hudson, Chair

[2022-237](#)

Memorial - Henry "Hank" Wall - Washington Terrace Park

City Council is requested to approve the naming of an entry way at Washington Terrace Park "Hank Wall Way" to establish a permanent memorial honoring his years of service to youth in High Point.

Attachments: [Memorial – Henry "Hank" Wall – Washington Terrace Park](#)

Council Member Hudson voiced appreciation for Mr. Wall's contributions; and was in favor of naming of an entry way at the Washington Terrace Park "Han Wall Way".

A motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to approve the naming of an entry way at Washington Terrace Park "Hank Wall Way" to establish a permanent memorial honoring his years of service to youth in High Point.

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

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

A motion was made by Council Member Hudson, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, 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

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Council Member Williams, Chair

2022-238

Ordinance - Rescind Demolition Ordinance - Multiple Properties - Minimum Housing Code

City Council is requested to rescind ordinances for demolition for dwellings located at 1834 Willard St., 908 Richardson Ave., 1615 Long St., 1220 Lakeview Heights Dr., 262 Dorothy St., 523 N. Centennial St., 605 Langford Ave., 1310 Ragan Ave., 1336 Cox Ave., 317 Fourth St., 811 Willow Pl., 308 Fourth St., 1441 Madison St., and 412 Walnut St, due to properties being demolished and in compliance with the City of High Point's minimum housing code.

Attachments: [Ordinance - Rescind Demolition Ordinance - Multiple Properties](#)

[Ordinance 412 Walnut St](#)

[Ordinance 262 Dorothy St](#)

[Ordinance 300 A Oak Street and W 331 W Russell Ave](#)

[Ordinance 308 fourth St](#)

[Ordinance 523 N Centennial St](#)

[Ordinance 605 Langford Ave](#)

[Ordinance 811 Willow Place](#)

[Ordinance 908 Richardson Ave](#)

[Ordinance 1220 Lakeview Heights Dr](#)

[Ordinance 1310 Ragan Ave](#)

[Ordinance 1336 Cox Ave](#)

[Ordinance 1441 Madison St](#)

[Ordinance 1615 Long St](#)

[Ordinance 1834 Willard Rd](#)

A motion was made by Council Member Williams, seconded by Council Member Hudson, to rescind ordinances for demolition for dwellings located at 1834 Willard St., 908 Richardson Ave., 1615

Long St., 1220 Lakeview Heights Dr., 262 Dorothy St., 523 N. Centennial St., 605 Langford Ave., 1310 Ragan Ave., 1336 Cox Ave., 317 Fourth St., 811 Willow Pl., 308 Fourth St., 1441 Madison St., and 412 Walnut St, due to properties being demolished and in compliance with the City of High Point's minimum housing code.

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

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Ordinance No. 7828/22-49

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 145

Ordinance No. 7829/22-50

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 146

Ordinance No. 7830/22-51

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 147

Ordinance No. 7831/22-52

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 148

Ordinance No. 7832/22-53

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 149

Ordinance No. 7833/22-54

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 150

Ordinance No. 7834/22-55

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 151

Ordinance No. 7835/22-56

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 152

Ordinance No. 7836/22-57

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 153

Ordinance No. 7837/22-58

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 154

Ordinance No. 7838/22-59

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 155

Ordinance No. 7839/22-60

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 156

Ordinance No. 7840/22-61

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 157**Ordinance No. 7841/22-62-1****Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 158**

A motion was made by Council Member Williams, 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

PENDING ITEMS**[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](#)

Lori Loosemore, Code Enforcement Manager advised the Mayor and City Council that this item would remain in pending.

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - Mayor Jay W. Wagner**PUBLIC HEARINGS****[2022-239](#)****Ordinance-Historic Designation Request- Fli-Back Building**

A request by Bricks & Beams, LLC to designate the Fli-Back Building at 710 and 716 W Green Drive as a Guilford County Landmark.

Attachments: [02. Fli-Back Building GC Landmark Designation](#)

Dave Fencil, Senior Planner-Planning and Development Department reported that this request was to consider designation of the Fli-Back Building at 710/716 W Green Drive as a Guilford County Historic Landmark; said that the Guilford County's Historic Landmark program began in 1980 to recognize sites with important elements of culture, history, architectural history, or prehistory for the education, pleasure, and enrichment of area residents; the landmark designation process begins when an application is submitted to the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission. Privately owned landmark properties are eligible for a property tax deferral of up to 50 percent. Landmarks may not be materially altered or demolished without the approval of the Guilford County Historic Preservation. Currently, there are 113 Historic Landmarks in Guilford County with 20

located within High Point. There is no budget impact. The Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission unanimously recommended that the Fli-Back Building be designated a Guilford County Historic Landmark property at its meeting on March 15, 2022. At its meeting on April 13, 2022, the High Point Historic Preservation Commission also unanimously recommended that the City Council approve the local historic landmark designation for the property.

Mayor Pro Tem Peter voiced appreciation for this amazing moment.

A motion was made by Council Member Williams, seconded by Council Member Hudson, to approve the designation of the Fli-Back Building at 710 and 716 W Green Drive as a Guilford County Landmark. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, 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

[2022-241](#)

Resolution- Leoterra Development, Inc. - Plan Amendment 22-01

A request by Leoterra Development, Inc. to change the Land Use Plan classification for approximately 28.5 acres from the Low-Density Residential classification to the Medium Density Residential classification. The site is located at the southeast corner of Old Mill Road and Skeet Club Road.

Attachments: [03. Staff Report PA-22-01 \(Council\)](#)

Note: This item has been withdrawn.

Mayor Wagner recognized Mr. Ellis Martin, Fox Rothschild, LLP to provide an update regarding the applicant's decision to withdraw their application.

Mr. Martin confirmed the applicant's decision to have Plan Amendment 22-01; and Zoning Map Amendment withdrawn.

Ms. Carlyle noted that no action was needed for this decision; and advised Mayor Wagner to acknowledge the request for the record.

Mayor Wagner acknowledged that case PA22-01, and ZMA 22-08 will

both be withdrawn and sent back to the Planning and Zoning Commission; and noted that the property owners living within 300 feet of said property would be notified.

Council Member Jones added that the applicant's new request showed the apartment element to be removed; the applicant is also working with the NCDOT to move the round about as well; and voiced appreciation to the applicants for their efforts.

withdrawn

[2022-242](#)

Ordinance- Leoterra Development, Inc. - Zoning Map Amendment 22-08

A request by Leoterra Development, Inc. to rezone approximately 75.3 acres from the Residential Single Family - 3 (R-3) District to a Conditional Zoning Residential Multifamily - 16 (CZ RM-16) District, a Conditional Zoning Residential Multifamily - 5 (CZ RM-5) District and a Conditional Zoning Residential Single Family - 5 (CZ R-5) District. The site is located along the south side of Old Mill Road and east of Skeet Club Road.

Attachments: [04. Staff Report ZA-22-08](#)

Note: This item has been withdrawn.

Refer to item 2022-241.

withdrawn

[2022-243](#)

Resolution- HEPHIGHPT, LLC-Plan Amendment 22-02

A request by HEPHIGHPT, LLC to change the Land Use Plan classification for approximately 12.5 acres from the Low-Density Residential classification to the Local Convenience Commercial classification. The site is located at the southeast corner of Johnson Street and Skeet Club Road.

Attachments: [05. Staff Report PA-22-02 \(Council\)](#)

Mayor Wagner opened public hearing.

Andy Piper, Senior Planner-Planning and Development Department reported that the site, for the request, is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Johnson Street and Skeet Club Road; staff is recommending denial of the request to change the future land use classification for approximately 12.5 acres to Local/Convenience Commercial because it would not be in harmony with the existing residential character of the surrounding area and there are no policies supporting the establishment of commercial uses in this area; the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this request at its April 26, 2021, public hearing; and all member present recommended denial of

the request as outlined in the staff report.

Mayor Wagner asked if there were anyone else who would like to speak on this matter, seeing none the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Council Member Jones, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, to deny the request to change the future land use classification for approximately 12.5 acres to Local/Convenience Commercial because it would not be in harmony with the existing residential character of the surrounding area and there are no policies supporting the establishment of commercial uses. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Council Member Jones, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, that this matter be denied. 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

[2022-244](#)

Ordinance- HEPHIGHPT, LLC-Zoning Map Amendment 22-09

A request by HEPHIGHPT, LLC to rezone approximately 12.5 acres from the Residential Single Family - 3 (R-3) District to a Conditional Zoning Retail Center (CZ-RC) District and a Conditional Zoning Limited Business (CZ-LB) District. The site is located at the southeast corner of Johnson Street and Skeet Club Road.

Attachments: [06. Staff Report ZA-22-09 \(Council\)](#)
[CZ Ordinance Case 22-09 \(Revised 05-11-2022\)](#)

Herb Shannon, Senior Planner-Planning and Development Department reported that this was a request by HEPHIGHPT, LLC to rezone approximately 12.5 acres from the Residential Single Family -3 (R-3) District to a Conditional Zoning Retail Center (CZ-RC) District and a Conditional Zoning Limited Business (CZ-LB) District; the site is located at the southeast corner of Johnson Street and Skeet Club Road; the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this request at its April 26, 2022 public hearing and recommended denial of the request as outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Shannon also provided the following additional comments:

- The applicant has requested RC zoning for the purpose of allowing drive-through restaurants and to allow development to exceed 50,000 square feet in gross floor area.
- If an LB District was proposed for the entire site, the drive-through restaurant use would not be permitted, and the total of all development could not exceed 50,000 square feet.
- Finally, conditions pertaining to referencing the Institute of Transportation Engineering (ITE) Manual for determining a land use, hours of operation and times for deliveries/trash service must be removed as they are unenforceable.

Mr. Shannon also read the Consistency and Reasonableness Statement for the record as followed:

That Zoning Map Amendment 22-09 is not consistent with the City's adopted policy guidance

because the Land Use Plan and other adopted policy guidance documents do not support the

establishment of commercial uses, at the intensity proposed by the applicant, at this location.

Furthermore, the request is not reasonable and in the public interest because the RC District

accommodates high-intensity retail serving a regional area, and it would not be in the public

interest to establish commercial development of this intensity in a predominately Residential Low-Density area as classified by the Land Use Plan.

Andy Harris, Attorney, Wyatt Early Harris wheeler, LLP, 1912 Eastchester Drive (applicant's representative extended greetings; Mr. Harris provided an overview of the proposal to rezone the site for a commercial development. He stated that his client proposes to develop the property to include a grocery store, and several outparcels with additional commercial uses such as neighbourhood-oriented retail services and a drive-through restaurant. Mr. Harris also made the following comments in

support of the request:

- The applicant has provided conditions to restrict uses, increase design standards and increase the buffer

standards.

- He pointed to the significant population growth in the northern portion of High Point and the lack of personal services uses. The residents of the area may not have moved there for commercial development, but the city must balance [population growth] with the ability to provide services. A lack of services adds to longer commutes and traffic congestion.

Mr. Piper noted that the restaurant was dropped for this request.

Mr. Shannon noted that there was not a land use policy supporting the plan.

Council Member Jefferson asked about reserving the historic property-home. Ms. Smith said that removing the home would remove the context of the home and would make it ineligible.

Discussion took place regarding the historic designation of the home.

Mr. Fencil explained the landmark designation process; and stated that there wasn't anything in the national registry to protect the home.

Council Member Hudson asked about the approving authority in regard to relocating the home. Mr. Fencil replied that a proposal would be required; and explained the process..

Mayor Wagner opened the floor for comments.

Rick Moore 4302 Johnson Street; present at the Historic Preservation commission meeting in Greensboro to have one year waived to demolish home; and spoke in opposition of the grocery store.

Julian 4104 John street; advised council that she had a petition with 1200 signatures opposing this request; and voiced the importance for saving the historical home.

Debra Adams; 3907 drive; noted that she was from Kentucky; spoke to what's good for High Point; and to the effect of the development.

Council Member Holmes spoke to improving the quality of life; and stated that he was not in favor for said request.

Council Member Moore spoke to the great things going on in High Point; Publix is a family-owned organization; and that unfortunately he could not support this request.

Mayor Wagner asked if there were anyone else who would like to speak on this matter, seeing none the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Council Member Jones, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, to deny the request to rezone approximately 12.5 acres from the Residential Single Family - 3 (R-3) District to a Conditional Zoning Retail Center (CZ-RC) District and a Conditional Zoning Limited Business (CZ-LB) District, and because of the conditions pertaining to referencing the Institute of Transportation Engineering (ITE) Manual for determining a land use, to remove the hours of operation and times for deliveries/trash service as they are unenforceable. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Moore, to adopt the Consistency and Reasonableness Statement. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

Consistency and Reasonableness Statement

That Zoning Map Amendment 22-09 is not consistent with the City's adopted policy guidance

because the Land Use Plan and other adopted policy guidance documents do not support the

establishment of commercial uses, at the intensity proposed by the applicant, at this location.

Furthermore, the request is not reasonable and in the public interest because the RC District

accommodates high-intensity retail serving a regional area, and it would not be in the public

interest to establish commercial development of this intensity in a predominately Residential Low-Density area as classified by the Land Use Plan.

A motion was made by Council Member Jones, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, that this matter be denied. 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

[2022-245](#)

Ordinance- Crescent Acquisitions, LLC- Zoning Map Amendment 22-10

A request by Crescent Acquisitions, LLC to rezone approximately 85 acres from the Agricultural (AGR) District to a Conditional Zoning Employment Center (CZ-EC) District. The site is located along the north side of Clinard Farms Road, approximately 900 feet west of NC 68.

Attachments: [07. Staff Report ZA-22-10 \(Revised - Council\)](#)
[CZ Ordinance ZA-22-10 \(Revised 05-11-2022\)](#)

Herb Shannon, Senior Planner-Planning and Development Department reported that this request was by Crescent Acquisitions, LLC to rezone

approximately 85 acres from the Agricultural (AGR) District to a Conditional Zoning Employment Center (CZ-EC) District. The site is located along the north side of Clinard Farms Road, approximately 900 feet west of NC 68 P&Z Staff is recommending approval and that the request is consistent with the city's policy and reasonable.

Mayor Wagner opened the public hearing.

Mark Isaacson, attorney, Isaacson-Sheridan, 804 Green Valley Road, Greensboro. Mr. Isaacson provided an overview of the proposal to rezone the site for a business/industrial park. He noted that Crescent Acquisitions recognized the shift in distribution patterns in connection with growth and expansion of e-commerce and alternate methods of buying and selling merchandise. The site sits adjacent to the NC 68 corridor and it is approximately two-and-a-half miles from I-40 and less than 10 miles from PTI Airport. Thus, vehicles coming and going to and from this proposed development will be able to use the NC 68 corridor to quickly reach I-40 or the airport. Mr. Isaacson concluded by noting that based on recommendations from their Traffic Impact Analysis they have offered conditions for roadway improvements including right-of-way dedication to widen and improve Clinard Farms Road and Millwood School Road, construction of a spine road that will serve as the primary roadway through the development, and improvement to the NC 68/Clinard Farms Road intersection.

Mayor Wagner asked if there were anyone else who would like to speak on this matter, seeing none the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Council Member Jones, seconded by Council Member Holmes, to rezone approximately 85 acres from the Agricultural (AGR) District to a Conditional Zoning Employment Center (CZ-EC) District. The site is located along the north side of Clinard Farms Road, approximately 900 feet west of NC 68; and to adopt the consistency and reasonable statement. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,
Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Ordinance No. 7843/22-63

Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 160

Consistency and Reasonableness Statements

The Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 to approve the following statement:

That Zoning Map Amendment 22-10 is consistent with the City's adopted policy guidance because the proposed CZ-EC District is in harmony with the Restricted Industrial land use designation governing this portion

of the City's Planning Area and it promotes an orderly growth pattern. Furthermore, the request is similar and compatible with previous EC District zoning approvals granted in this northern portion of the City's Planning Area.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Holmes, 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

[2022-246](#)

Ordinance- 350 South Land Holdings, LLC - Annexation 22-02

A request by 350 South Land Holding, LLC for a voluntary non-contiguous annexation of approximately 60.9 acres in the northwestern portion of the City's Planning Area. The request consists of:

Part A: Four parcels, totaling approximately 11.74 acres, lying west of the intersection of Sandy Ridge Road and Gallimore Dairy Road. These parcels are also known as Guilford County Tax Parcels 170825, 170854, 170866 and 170855 (2503 Sandy Ridge Road, 2505 Sandy Ridge Road, 2419 Sandy Ridge Road and 750 Margate Drive);

Part B: An approximate 18.07 acre parcel lying north of the intersection of Sandy Ridge Road and Sandy Camp Road. The parcel is also known as Guilford County Tax Parcel 170893 (2301 Sandy Ridge Road);

Part C: An approximate 4.89 acre parcel lying west of the intersection of Adkins Road and Boylston Road. The parcel is also known as Guilford County Tax Parcel 171057 (8545 Adkins Road).

Part D: An approximate 12.18 acre parcel lying along the south side of Adkins Road, approximately 800 feet east of Staples Road. The parcel is also known as Guilford County Tax Parcel 170740 (8423 Adkins Road);

Part E: An approximate 12.77 acre parcel lying along the north side of Staples Road, approximately 160 feet west of Staples Road. This parcel is also known as Guilford County Tax Parcels 170728 (8702 Staples Road); and

Part F: An approximate 1.31 acre parcel lying along the north side of Staples Road, approximately 215 feet west of Staples Road. The parcel is also known as Guilford County Tax Parcel 170714 (8706 Staples Road).

Attachments: [08. Staff Report AN-22-02 \(Council\)](#)

Mayor Wagner opened the public hearing.

Herb Shannon, Senior Planner-Planning and Development Department

advised that this would be a combined presentation with items 2022-246 and 2022-247; and would require separate votes. The owner has a buyer that desires to develop an approximate 2.2 million square foot business/industrial park. The NCDOT has recently completed plans for the widening of Sandy Ridge Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes, which has impacted the initially-intended signalized access point of this development. Therefore, the applicant has purchased land at the intersection of Sandy Ridge Road and Gallimore Dairy Road to serve as the primary entrance to their development and they will construct an extension of Gallimore Dairy Road through the site to Adkins Road. Additional land has also been purchased along Adkins Road and Joe Drive to square up the boundary of the site to allow for more buffer/separation from adjacent lands. It also allows for room to work around any environmentally sensitive lands and to provide sufficient onsite stormwater control measures. An additional 60 acres is proposed to be added to this development under this current approval petition. This annexation petition represents a logical progression of the City's annexation policy for this area as the proposed annexation site is generally surrounded by the City's corporate limits and City services and service vehicles are already present in this area. The annexation of this parcel will not negatively impact the City's ability to provide services in this area. Staff is recommending approval.

Mark Isaacson, Applicant's representative; met with staff and discussed the best interest for a new standard under the current ordinance; agreed to make improvements; said that he enjoyed working with staff; and that the project would be completed in two phases.

Mayor Wagner opened the floor for comments.

Robert C. Colfax reported that he was unaware of this request until tonight; voiced concerns for the Amazon site located on Bunker Hill regarding construction traffic, noise, and traffic; is not in favor nor support this request.

Alisha Hearly, Atkins Rd.; voiced concerns regarding the environmental impact; said that there were sink holes; and flooding concerns.

Mayor Wagner asked if there were anyone else who would like to speak on this matter, seeing none the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, to approve a voluntary non-contiguous annexation of approximately 60.9 acres in the northwestern portion of the City's Planning Area. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,
Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council

Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

Ordinance No. 7844/22-64
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 161

Ordinance No. 7845/22-65
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 162

Ordinance No. 7846/22-66
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 163

Ordinance No. 7847/22-67
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 164

Ordinance No. 7848/22-68
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 165

Ordinance No. 7849/22-69
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 166

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Jones, 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

[2022-247](#)

Ordinance- 350 South Land Holding, LLC - Zoning Map Amendment 22-11

A request by 350 South Land Holding, LLC to rezone approximately 558 acres from the Planned Development Mixed (PDM) district, and the Agricultural (AG) District and the Residential Single Family - 40 (RS-40) Districts both within Guilford County's zoning jurisdiction, to the Planned Development Periphery (PD-P) District. The zoning site consists of multiple parcels generally lying south of I-40, west of Sandy Ridge Road, north of Boylston Road and east of Bunker Hill Road.

Attachments: [09. Staff Report ZA-22-11 \(Council\) \(1\)](#)

Note: Refer to item 2022-246 for a combined presentation on this matter.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, to to rezone approximately 558 acres from the Planned Development Mixed (PDM) district, and the Agricultural (AG) District and the Residential Single Family - 40 (RS-40) Districts both within Guilford County's zoning jurisdiction, to the Planned Development Periphery (PD-P) District. The zoning site consists of multiple parcels generally lying south of I-40, west of Sandy Ridge Road, north of Boylston Road and east of Bunker Hill

Road; and to adopt the consistency and reasonableness of statement. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

**Ordinance No. 7850/22-70
Ordinance Book, Volume XXII, Page 167**

Consistency and Reasonableness Statements

The Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 to approve the following statement:

That Zoning Map Amendment 22-11 is consistent with the City's adopted policy guidance because the proposed zoning amendment supports land use policies of the Community Growth Vision Statement, the Land Use Plan and the Northwest Area Plan. Furthermore, the proposed zoning amendment updates zoning standards for this site to align with the recently adopted 2017 City of High Point Development Ordinance.

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, 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

GENERAL BUSINESS AGENDA

A motion was made by Wagner, seconded by Council Member Williams, to suspend the rules to consider matters regarding the Suez Treatment Solutions, Inc.-Hazen-Incinerator, and Jason Ewing-Consent Judgement. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

City Council is requested to settle the matter of City of High Point v Suez Treatment Solutions, Inc. et.a. by accepting payments totaling \$1,500,000.00 (\$800,000.00 from Defendant Suez and \$700,000.00 from Defendant Hazen), and retaining the contested amount of \$1,600,000.00, equaling a total amount awarded to the City of \$3,100,000.00, and dismissing, without prejudice, claims asserted against CPPE.

A motion was made by Wagner, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Peters, the matter of City of High Point v Suez Treatment Solutions Inc. et.al. by accepting payments totaling \$1,500,000 (\$800,000 from Defendant Suez and \$700,000 from Defendant Hazen), and retaining the contested amount of \$1,600,000, equaling a total amount awarded to the City of \$3,100,000, and dismissing, without prejudice, claims asserted against CPPE. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, 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

2022-252

City of High Point- Jason Ewing- Consent Judgment

City Council is requested to settle the eminent domain matter of City of High Point v Jason Ewing, et.a. through a Consent Judgment in the amount of \$285,000.00 (On October 5, 2021, this Council approved the amount of \$245,000.00 as just compensation for the taking of the Ewing property. After negotiations and additional information, based upon property appraisals, the fair and just compensation allows the provision of an additional \$40,000.00.) Council is also requested to authorize the City Manager to execute the Consent Judgment.

A motion was made by Wagner, seconded by Council Member Williams, to settle the eminent domain matter of City of High Point v Jason Ewing, et.al. through a Consent Judgment in the amount of \$285,000. (On October 5, 2021, this Council approved the amount of \$245,000 as just compensation for the taking of the Ewing property. After negotiations, and additional information based upon property appraisals, the fair and just compensation allows the provision of an additional \$40,000.) Council is also requested to authorize the City Manager to execute the Consent Judgment. The motion carried by the following 9-0 unanimous vote:

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

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Johnson, 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

2022-240

Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) - Human Relations Commission

City Council is requested to adopt the following three recommendations of the HRC for the City of High Point to become a FHAP: (1) Accept the HRC recommendation that High Point become a Fair Housing Assistance Program and direct City staff to undertake the required steps for FHAP certification. (2) Adopt a Fair Housing Ordinance that is substantially equivalent to federal fair housing laws. (3) Create a "Human Relations Specialist" position, enabling the Division to offer additional Fair Housing trainings to residents and housing professionals and to process Fair Housing complaints.

Note: Please refer to 2022-253 Amendment to the Fair Housing Ordinance and 2022-254 Creation of a "Human Relations Specialist" Position.

Attachments: [Ordinance – Fair Housing Assistance Program \(FHAP\) – Human Relations C](#)

*****[beginning of transcript]*****

Jeron Hollis: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, members of Council, also to Council Member Johnson, the HRC liaison. I want to take just a few minutes to talk about our Fair Housing update. This is a presentation that we most recently did on the Community Development Committee Agenda on May 3rd, so we'll be revisiting some of that information and talking about what some of the findings are and some recommendations from staff.

The Fair Housing conversation is one that began years ago. Primarily, we'll be discussing our most recent history stemming from the January 2021 HRC Work Plan Update that resulted in Council assigning HRC to explore the feasibility of having a fair housing program in High Point. The goal here is to look at having local access to fair housing support for High Point residents. Currently, our process, we refer all fair housing cases that come into our office to be handled and investigated out of Raleigh. Essentially, what that means is that High Point residents that have issues with fair housing, they have a process that involves another layer outside of

local resources in order to get resolution. So, what that could look like would be if someone's coming in and they have to have documents, the documents would, and many of the people that we work with, they would start with our staff and then we'd have to get copies of those documents to Raleigh in order to try to complete the process where we're trying to get the residents resolution information on fair housing cases. Those are some of the ways that a fair housing program would, what we like to say, is to present exceptional customer service for our residents to walk in that have those particular issues.

I want to look at a timeline just briefly here. On this timeline, it kind of talks about how we got here and then we'll take up to current steps and where we are now. So, if you look on the timeline, back in 2007, based on the city's Analysis of Impediments through Community Development, the Council adopted a local Fair Housing Ordinance. Well, the Fair Housing Ordinance that was adopted is a little bit different than other ordinances that we have that come up. This ordinance is essentially many elements of federal Fair Housing Law that are set to meet the requirements and the standards of HUD guidelines. The Council is, would be essentially approving the language that's in the Fair Housing Ordinance and HUD would look at that to make sure that it's substantially equivalent. We'll talk a little bit about what some of the tweaks or changes that could be made by a jurisdiction. In 2009, that ordinance came before HUD and HUD found that the ordinance was not substantially equivalent. What that meant was, in one example, the ordinance didn't adequately articulate the designation of appointed board members and city staff as it related to individual cases. So, there was some clarity that was needed and there were also other areas of opportunity that that ordinance had.

What we did in looking at that history from October 2009, is we tried to look at the ways that we could learn from that and move forward with something that would be as fairly substantially equivalent as HUD would look for in away that was bringing in the expertise of subject matter experts. We worked directly with HUD. We brought in community stakeholders. We worked with our Legal team and outside counsel as was necessary and we also worked with the State Human Relations Commission office. That was, some of the takeaways from that history in 2009.

But if you fast forward to 2016, the City Council adopted an amended Fair Housing Ordinance that would reflect the actual

practice of the Human Relations Division. So, the function was moved from being a department to a division and the ordinance that was put in place in 2016 essentially reflected the use that the current capacity allowed, which I outlined a little bit earlier in referring cases to Raleigh and being in a support capacity.

So, if we move onto more recent history, the Council tasked the commission to come up with the feasibility of having a fair housing program and what that looked like was staff and the commission working on housing security workshops. Now, the housing security workshops that were put forth started in July and in those workshops, we found that our participants there were overwhelmingly encouraged that it was a valuable education tool. We learned a lot of things. For example, the Disability Advocacy Center, we helped to learn from that that the primary thought when people think about disability is physical, but mental disability is also covered as far as protected classes. Or, the work we did with the Family Justice Center. A lot of people didn't know that evictions are set up in ways that sometimes can be counterproductive to victims of domestic violence, so if you have a situation at a property where there are lots of issues of domestic violence, even after the offender is removed from the location, the victims families that are still there might have an issue where the residency at that place is in question because of all the issues and problems that happened. That's a fair housing issue. But. Most of what we found was that the majority of fair housing cases are disability cases. That's really the crux of what most of these cases are.

So, we move on through the presentation and the staff went through, had the housing security workshops, and in August the Human Relations Commission voted unanimously to recommend that High Point does seek the fair housing program designation.

So, now we're at the purpose of the program. We're almost done here. The goal is, again, to provide that exceptionally level of customer service for our residents that come in seeking housing support, and it's also to provide free technical assistance for housing providers. A lot of housing providers, when they have claims and they have issues that come up, they don't intend to be in violation of the law. A lot of times they're doing the best business practices they know based on what they've been doing. So, this creates a buffer so that if there is an issue or a concern, our local landlords, our local housing providers have a resource here in the building that will help them navigate some of those things and same them some headaches and, oftentimes, some difficult conversations

with their tenant. It also gives robust fair housing education and outreach, partnership opportunities and the services are designed for High Point residents and housing professionals. So, now if you had a case that really needed to be looked into, a Raleigh investigator has to set on their calendar, along with all their other locations for the state, they have to include High Point. What this will provide is if we have a High Point issue, we can send High Point people that are familiar with the community and have relationships with the housing providers that they're able to go and have that as their only area of focus because we'd just be looking at the City of High Point fair housing cases.

So, when you talk about being substantially equivalent, that means a couple of things. There's a set of criteria, and essentially what you're saying is that the ordinance must offer the same protections and rights and remedies as the Fair Housing Act. Now, the Fair Housing Act already exists, so we're not creating a new law. These laws, our housing providers are already subject to. It's just the support level, the engagement, and the enforcement is a layer removed from the local level. So, what this is doing is creating an ordinance that is falling in line with what HUD expects from the Federal Fair Housing Act. So, you're talking about civil enforcement action that would include judicial power to award damages and grant relief as appropriate. What we found is that for the vast majority of interactions, most of them are able to be, the vast majority, are able to be conciliated before they get to this point, but if you do have a situation that goes to that extreme, we have to have the pieces in place that allow it to line up with federal law.

The FHAP Agency, the Fair Housing Assistance Program Agency, must be empowered with decision-making authority, so that's where we get into receiving, accepting, processing, dismissing complaints, investigating allegations of complaints, conciliating complaints, and deciding, first of all when something comes in whether it's a frivolous matter or something that really needs to be pursued.

So, when we worked through this, we mentioned earlier about some of lessons learned in 2009 and what we did this time through, is we really got some partnerships to make sure that we're starting off on the right foot. There was lots of assistance and support from our attorney's office. Thank you, JoAnne and Meghan. We worked with the HUD Office of Fair Housing and got some insight and feedback from them on the best way to proceed if we wanted to present an ordinance and a program for Council to consider. We mentioned

earlier, working with the State Human Relations Commission. Some of these partners, I think, are still here with us. I think they managed the entire meeting, so our support from the High Point Regional Association of Realtors, Guilford County Family Justice Center, Community Builders. I think we've got some folks here with Community Builders, YWCA. So, those are the people that what we tried to do was get an idea of the customers, get an idea of the stakeholders, whether they were landlords, whether they were tenants, whether they were residents and create an environment where we had the educational component so that people understood what was coming their way.

So, should Council decide to entertain a Fair Housing Ordinance that's substantially equivalent, the recommendations from staff are as follows:

- To accept the recommendation that High Point become a Fair Housing Assistance Program, and direct staff to undertake the required steps for certification.
- To adopt a Fair Housing Ordinance that's substantially equivalent to the Federal Fair Housing Law, and, JoAnne, this is an amended ordinance that we will be doing, then finally.
- To create a Human Relations Specialist position enabling the division to offer that support, that customer service that we talked about before that would also include fair housing training to residents and housing professionals to process those fair housing complaints.

So, I went through that rather quickly. I think, as part of what we did for Community Development, there was a section where our folks on Legal kind of explained what the process would look like just in a nutshell based on the ordinance. I don't know if we planned to do that tonight or not, but we are available here for questions. We also have Rase McCray, our Division Manager, and Jelani Biggs, our DEI Officer. I can't go on enough about how much time and energy they put in to make sure we had this information, appropriate and accurate. So, we're available for questions and we'll answer what we can.

Mayor Wagner: Does anyone have questions for staff?

Council Member Holmes: What is the....under the current process, how does this impact city staff in terms of managing these complaints? Does it come to you, Joanne, in the Legal department?

How do we currently manage the process coming from Raleigh?

Jeron Hollis: Well, in a nutshell, what happens is you have the complainant, the resident that comes in. It can be a real case, or it could be an inquiry. There's an intake process that would happen. So, we would have a staff member that processes intake. Based on what they hear in the intake, then you'd have that decision tree, where does it go from there? So, that case would go to the housing specialist that comes in the position that we're talking about asking for, and then there are a number of factors. Jelani used to be an investigator, so I'm giving the real cliff note version here, but if the case proceeds to a point where it can't be conciliated, where the resident and the landlord can't come to an agreement about that ramp, about that lease, about whatever it is, we'd have a small amount of cases that would be escalated that legal would have to decide in the process what the next steps were and those are based on the criteria laid in the ordinance. So, now the entire process from intake to final disposition is handled in Raleigh. With this ordinance, all that would be handled internally which is why we were asking for that specialist to take care of that.

Council Member Holmes: So, the ability to fact-find, make contacts with the involved parties, introduce the facts to Legal, adjudicate and make a final determination would now be able to circumvent Raleigh and stay right here and we'd be able to do that? What would be the time regained for a case, you know if we had a case to come in tomorrow, under the current process versus the new process, what would be the time gained?

Jeron Hollis: Well, I think for that part, and Rase correct me if I'm overstating something, but I think now the residents that come in, many of the residents that we have come in have barriers. Barriers to transportation, barriers to technology, barriers to even outside community. So I can think of a recent person that came in and the process of just making a call to the person in Raleigh that would be doing their intake, the process of sending documents to Raleigh that we could handle here. So, for us, it's cutting down on the number of trips and the number of contacts that the resident had, depending on how intricate the case is, that is your time savings. But essentially it's handling everything here at the local level, so we don't introduce....many of the people that walk in that have these issues, they've got enough barriers just to make it down to City Hall and the last two clients that we've had that we had to forward to Raleigh, had transportation issues just getting down here. So, what we found, things that we take for granted about being able to navigate any

process, those things are more barriers and more of a challenge for many of the folks that we deal with on a day-to-day basis. So, we're talking about providing that customer service that our residents come to expect with many of our services, but in this case, it's in the fair housing context. I don't know if that answered your question.

Council Member Holmes: So, in the decision-making process, we do the determination then it goes to legal if there's any enforcement or litigation that happens?

Jeron Hollis: Rase, do you want to talk a little bit about that?

Rase McCray: Yeah, so the way a fair housing case would be processed, you always have kind of three levels, one is intake, one is kind of processing, and one is the further side of determination and case review. So, we would be....when we're in-house, we would have a staff member doing intake; we would have a staff member kind of investigating and looking into complaints; and then all of that would be ultimately reviewed and if it was determined that there was an act of discrimination. So, ultimately, if you're looking at a case and you say, you know there was not enough evidence to support this complaint, then that would actually be handled entirely in the Human Relations Division. If, on the other hand, the investigator said I believe there was enough evidence to do that, we would bring the legal team in ultimately to say, does this meet the legal standard according to our attorney's office.

Council Member Holmes: So, technically this could also protect a landlord who wanted to evict someone, but they filed a frivolous discrimination case. It would come here and you guys could adjudicate it quickly and also help the landlord move through the process?

Rase McCray: We believe so, yes.

Council Member Holmes: Okay. So, we essentially would take Raleigh's hands off of this until there was an escalation?

Jeron Hollis: Well, this is removing Raleigh from the equation.

Council Member Holmes: Period?

Jeron Hollis: Yes. Raleigh exists in the capacity as a housing provider except they're covering the entire state. So, what this does is for High Point residents, it keeps that process entirely in-house.

Council Member Holmes: Local, efficient, personal.

Jeron Hollis: Yes.

City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle: It gives the City of High Point the authority that Raleigh currently has and it will not escalate. We would actually file a civil suit in Superior Court if it got to be that point. And it's my understanding, especially based on the history and our expert investigator over there that we've worked with, there's very few cases that we expect to reach that point. So, as far as any additional burden on the legal department, we don't really expect a lot.

Council Member Holmes: That was my next question.

City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle: Don't forget, too, that we are in the process of hiring some additional staff.

Council Member Holmes: Two, right?

City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle: Yes Sir.

Council Member Williams: Can you go ahead and give me the same stat that you gave us in Community Development?

Jelani Biggs: Sure, so there are a litany of ways that investigations can conclude, administrative closures, cause findings, no cause findings. In conciliation, a very small percentage, about three to five percent of those cases are actually cause findings. Even once you reach that determination, legal would have another opportunity to conciliate that case with the parties involved.

Council Member Jones: Mr. Hollis, when I was on the Human Relations Commission board for two years, do you remember when that guy came here from Raleigh to meet with the committee?

Jeron Hollis: Gene Troy.

Council Member Jones: I don't know his name but it was the gentleman who came and spoke with us at the Human Relations Commission about the process.

Jeron Hollis: I think it was Gene Troy. We've been working with Gene and the process.

Council Member Jones: Yeah, that's right. And I remember I asked him and you, I said are we losing any efficiency, is there any lag time with us letting Raleigh carry the burden of this service, and both you and that gentleman all confirmed there would be no benefit from us taking it in-house, that Raleigh was on top of it and there was no lag time in this service. And that was the discussion that I had with you guys when I was on that committee. Now, I'm hearing that there's.....I haven't heard anything about lag time changes, the only thing I'm hearing is there may be some access to some tools and resources on a local level, but not lag times. It's not a timing thing, it's just more of an access to resources is the only advantage I'm hearing right now.

Jeron Hollis: Is that a question?

Council Member Jones: Is that what you're proposing? Between the three of you, all I've heard is this is not going to speed up the process and I will say that this is not going to help any landlords. This is not going to speed up the process. This is simply, the benefit would be access to resources, filing paperwork and submitting documents. Is that what you're claiming would be the benefit of that?

Jeron Hollis: No, that's not what we're claiming. What we're claiming is that the transaction that a High Point resident.....and one thing that, just to be mindful, we have a relationship with the State Human Relations Commission now. We've had, Gene, which I think is who you are referencing. Gene has come in and he's told us, just within the last year, we've had cases that they've had to try to conciliate. They've been right here, local issues, local cases. But, what happens is the workload that the Human Relations Commission has is spread out, like I was saying earlier, it's spread out over the entire state. So, in the conversation we had with Gene and that we had with the State Human Relations Commission, this is actually a benefit. It helps them to free up their schedule for places that are much smaller jurisdictions. It allows them to focus on other areas where they allow High Point, like some of the other municipalities in the state, it allows us to focus on our High Point cases and frees them up to handle other parts of the state that don't have this service available. So, for the state, they have a number of cases that HUD expects them to do to cover all of North Carolina. What we'd be doing is taking the High Point workload off their plates and allowing them to focus on other areas where they have just as much expectation. They don't have unlimited investigators, so when you talk about them going to a particular place, like I was mentioning, they've got to schedule High Point in with everywhere else. So, from

a turnaround time, that's where we think.....from a timing, that's where we think that will be an additional benefit. With some recent cases that we're working on now, it's not uncommon in the heat of these particular situations, someone could be coming back, locally coming back on a regular basis throughout the week and they'd be talking to someone, a real person here in City Hall, familiar with the area, able to go out and see the actual site and not putting them on a calendar, on a schedule, based on the rest of the state. So, in our conversations with the state, and Rase, I know that in the conversations we had, they were supportive of us taking this move to actually bring the fair housing certification in-house to the city.

Council Member Johnson: This is Councilman Johnson. What I look for a service, I look for a couple of things. Of course, touchable, accessible, okay. And, as you mentioned before, that some of our residents have issues, transportation issues with just coming to City Hall much less having to drive to Raleigh, okay. Not knowing what the timeframe is; however, if we can do it locally and better and time consuming for them, for our constituents, why would we not offer that? That's my first comment. Why would we not offer that?

I did see some of the stats that our manager sent out to us and the need is definitely there in High Point for us to have this, okay. Why we haven't had it all along, I have no idea, but, however, as we've always mentioned about us being a growing city, anytime we grow, there's sometimes growing pains that are associated with it. So, why would we not offer this, because, again, this is great customer service. If I can....whether I have an automobile or not, if I can catch a ride down to High Point City Hall is better than me hitching a ride to Raleigh or calling to Raleigh. Now you put me in a number. But if I'm able to get down to City Hall, I'm able to touch the person, not physically, okay, but I'm able to touch the person, okay, you sitting right across from me, okay, so what's my time limit, I mean what's going on, okay. I'm not saying that Raleigh's not doing a great job, okay. I'm not saying they're doing a bad job. I'm just saying that if we can handle it in-house, here, for our people that voted us in, then it's a no brainer for me.

Council Member Jones: Councilman Johnson, are you aware how many cases we actually send to Raleigh per year? 2019- 2020 (12 cases for the whole year); 2020-2021 (10 cases for the whole year); 2021-2022 (14 cases). So, we're getting all that service for free that we don't have to put on the backs of the taxpayers in High Point, yet, we're going to hire someone full-time, actually not one person, a full-time department for something that happens once a month.

That's a lot of.....and the reason we got rid of it, High Point used to have it in house, the reason we got rid of it was because it didn't financially make sense. I think we'd be the dumbest municipality in the State of North Carolina. If you look at the numbers that I requested from the city manager, Winston-Salem is the smallest, single city that has this service in-house. Winston-Salem's population is over twice the City of High Point. So, with less than half that population, less than half that tax base, we're going to sit here and say that we should do this in-house and foot the whole bill and drop it on the taxpayers to pay for a service that handles one complaint per month.

Council Member Johnson: If you're that one person in that number 12, you would want it.

Council Member Peters: Well, but also.....

Council Member Williams: I've got a question. I'm sorry.

Mayor Wagner: Go ahead, Councilman Williams.

Council Member Williams: I'll make this really short. Okay the numbers he's talking about that was pushed to Raleigh, was any of those part of the 3% that you were telling us, the three to five percent? Or, were they just general complaints that were pushed to Raleigh?

Jeron Hollis: That's a good question. So, the requirements that HUD has, we fall in Ban 2 of the population band, so that's for populations 90,000 up to 300,000. So, what happens is HUD expects a certain number of inquiries. That's what we talked about earlier. Someone calling and saying, hey, my landlord won't change the color of the blinds, I think I'm being discriminated against. For intake, that's when we say, no, that's not a fair housing issue, so that wouldn't be something that we would escalate to Raleigh. If it is something that has the elements that would be something that needed more investigation, then Raleigh is the place where we would send them to because we saw, well, this sounds like an issue. What HUD requires for a fair housing provider in our population ban is they require eight cases, eight cases that, not inquiries, not questions, not people coming in wanting to get directions-eight cases that have the elements, the elements that would be something that needed to be investigated. It may be conciliated. It may turn into something. It may be in those 3-5%, but these are things that actually take the time, the energy, the staff, site visits, investigations. So, the number

for HUD is eight. Now, eight is that number if, as your population ban goes up, there's more cases required. In each of those three years that you quotes, the 12, the 10, and the 14, those more than satisfy, for a municipality our size, those more than satisfy what HUD is requiring of what's needed for a functioning program.

The other thing that we didn't include, for the sake of time, HUD actually provides the city with financial resources, whether you're talking about training, whether you're talking about outreach, whether you're talking about community, so there are federal dollars that are coming in and that help offset and support some of the activities that we will be doing such as fair housing education, then for the research, and even for training.

Council Member Moore: Those dollars are available to us now?

Jeron Hollis: Those dollars are not available to us. Those dollars would be available if we became a fair housing program.

Council Member Jones: Not salaries. It doesn't cover their salaries.

Jeron Hollis: Well, yes and no. The reason I say yes and no, when there's an initial setup for the program, when you're in your interim phase, HUD has dollars that they appropriate that help offset costs. Those are to help the particular municipality get set up and make sure that they're running the process and doing those things. Once that period is over, there are dollars, but just like with, not for training, but for salaries, and as we were talking to budget, we didn't want to schedule dollars to offset salaries if we didn't know for sure that those were going to be dollars that were going to be in there. So, it's safe to say during the start-up period HUD does provide more funds. Once we are pushed off and able to kind of float on our own, then that would be a staff cost as a position, but we will have the support even from the most recent track record of the dollars for training, the dollars for education, the dollars for support. So, that's kind of the dollars and sense of it. There would be some financial support. Part of being a FHAP is financial support from HUD, but you also have auditing that comes from HUD because they want to make sure that if they are giving you dollars and they are giving you resources that you are actually doing what they're asking you to do. That's in Raleigh, that's in Greensboro, that's wherever if you have a fair housing program.

Mayor Wagner: Councilman Williams, go ahead. It's your floor.

Council Member Williams: You answered the question about the

numbers, but two points I want to make and then I'll be quiet. One, that doesn't account for the ones that do not call because they've been discouraged in the past. I field plenty of those calls from my ward, from different housing, different levels, private ownerships, or subsidized housing, I field a ton of those calls and I forward them and try to explain how it operates here and they get discouraged and walk away. So, I think the important element in that is educating those people on how to take those steps. That's what this position would do. And the second thing to keep in mind is rents were not what they are now back then. You shouldn't see an escalation of those calls because it's expensive and everybody would want everybody to be a fair and decent landlord, but not all are. So, what you're going to have is people having issues, small debates or large debates, when it comes to they can't afford a place to stay, or this landlord knows I can turn it around and get a higher rent and this person is gone. That's happening already. So, to say that that part is not going to influence, how this couldn't be beneficial to that is a little short on looking down the road on what's next. I'm going off of information from different local organizations that talked about an increase, including the Family Justice Center, including the Continuum of Care which helps us to help assist people in homelessness situations. Some of those folks could have been helped if these elements were in place. So, I think it's important, you know, that we look a little farther down the road and what the potentials are and it will also help me, at least educating myself when I get those calls, and I do still currently get them. So, but thank you.

Mayor Wagner: I've got one question. So, based on the numbers that we've got, as Councilman Jones said, we're averaging roughly one case a month, okay. What is the specialist going to do with their time between this one case a month?

Jeron Hollis: I'll defer to someone that's actually done the role before.

Jelani Biggs: Sure, so I think the goal for that position is to be a dedicated investigator. It's part of the expectation of a FHAP Agency that you're doing robust training in the local community that you have a dedicated investigator that's walking that case from intake, investigation, whether that's interviewing parties, whether that's document gathering that may require site visits. In addition to walking that to conclusion, creating a final determination and kind of consulting with legal all the way through the process.

Mayor Wagner: My recollection, and I was on Council in 2016 when we reversed how we handled this, but my recollection from 2016 was that the vast majority of complaints that come in don't end up being actual cases. And, you know, at that time, the impetus to change how we did it was mainly coming to us from the realtors. There were landlords as I recall, who felt that they were being, essentially, harassed by tenants who were filing frivolous cases or attempting to file frivolous cases in retaliation for their landlord, you know, in the non-payment of rent or whatever. That coupled with the fact that we could refer everything to Raleigh and we were not really losing any time. The only thing we were doing here was, like you said, we were evaluating is this a fair housing case or not. And, then, based upon that, we were making a determination whether it needed to be sent to Raleigh. So, I agree with what you were saying there. I mean I intend to agree with Councilman Jones on this. I don't know that where we are right now and the amount of cases that we're dealing with, I don't know that that justifies the expense of what we're doing, of what we're being asked to do. It just seems to me that we are.....this is a solution in search of a problem and I think you can't say, oh well if we do this, we're going to discover a bunch of old cases. I mean we could go back to before 2016 and look at the numbers too. There's nothing to base that on. You don't know about the cases that are out there that we don't know about. You don't know about what you don't know, you know. So, it's hard fo

A motion was made by Council Member Jefferson, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Johnson, and Council Member Hudson

Nay: 3 - Council Member Moore, Mayor Wagner, and Council Member Jones

[2022-253](#)

Amendment to the Fair Housing Ordinance

Staff is recommending the adoption of an Amendment to the Fair Housing Ordinance that is substantially equivalent to federal fair housing laws, which will require an amendment to the City of High Point's Code of Ordinance amending Sec 4.3.1, Article A, Chapter 3, Title 4.

Note: The City Council's Rules of Procedure states "According to the City Council's Rules of Procedure, Section 9 Adoption of Ordinances and Approval of Contracts states "An affirmative vote equal to a majority of all the members of the council not excused from voting on the question in issue shall be required to adopt an ordinance, commit the expenditure of public funds, to take any action that has the effect of an ordinance, or to make, ratify, or authorize any contract on behalf of the city. In Addition, no ordinance or action that has the effect of an ordinance may be finally adopted on the date on which it is introduced except by an affirmative vote equal to or greater than two-thirds of all the actual membership of the council, excluding vacant seats."

A motion was made by Council Member Jefferson, seconded by Council Member

Johnson, that this matter be adopted. Although the motion carried by the following 5-4 vote, it actually failed because of the six votes required for approval.

Aye: 5 - Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, and Council Member Johnson

Nay: 4 - Council Member Moore, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-254](#)

Human Relations Specialist Position

Staff is requesting the City Council create a "Human Relations Specialist" position, enabling the Division to offer additional Fair Housing trainings to residents and housing professionals and to process Fair Housing complaints.

A motion was made by Council Member Jefferson, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Council Member Williams, Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, and Council Member Johnson

Nay: 4 - Council Member Moore, Mayor Wagner, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Hudson

[2022-250](#)

Appointments- Board of Adjustment (Tyler Walsh/John Kennett)

Council is requested to accept the resignation of John Kennett as a regular member on the Board of Adjustment; approve the appointment of Tyler Walsh as a regular member; and approve the appointment of John Kennett as an alternate member on the Board of Adjustment. The appointment of Tyler Walsh as a regular member will be effective immediately and will expire on June 30, 2023; the appointment of John Kennett as an alternate member will be effective immediately and will expire on June 30, 2024.

Attachments: [Appointments BOA.pdf](#)

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, to accept the resignation of John Kennett as a regular member on the BOA; and approve the appointment of John Kennett as an alternate member on the BOA effective immediately and will expire on June 30, 2023; and approve the appointment of Tyler Walsh as a regular member on the BOA to be effective immediately and expire on June 30, 2024. The motion carried by the following unanimous 9-0 vote:

Aye (9): Mayor Wagner, Mayor Pro Tem Peters, Council Member Moore, Council Member Johnson,

Council Member Jefferson, Council Member Williams, Council Member Hudson, Council Member Jones, and Council Member Holmes

A motion was made by Mayor Wagner, seconded by Council Member Jefferson, 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

[2022-248](#)**Minutes To Be Approved**

The following minutes will be submitted for approval at the June 6, 2022 City Council Meeting.

May 2, 2022 Special Meeting @ 3:30 p.m.

May 2, 2022 Regular Meeting @ 5:30 p.m.

May 3, 2022 Community Development Committee @ 4:00 p.m.

May 4, 2022 Prosperity & Livability Committee @ 9:00 a.m.

May 11, 2022 Special Meeting (Budget Review) @ 3:00 p.m.

May 12, 2022 Finance Committee @ 4:00 p.m.

For Information Only

ADJOURNMENT**COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

Council Member Johnson requested to bring the Fair Housing Ordinance back to council.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting adjourned at 11:19 p.m. upon motion duly made by Council Member Jefferson and second by Council Member Moore.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jay W. Wagner, Mayor

Attest:

Mary S. Brooks, CMC
Deputy City Clerk