

VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL  
COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
WESLEY CHAPEL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH  
120 Potter Road, Wesley Chapel, NC 28110  
February 14, 2011 – 7:00 P. M.

The Village Council of Wesley Chapel, North Carolina, met in the Fellowship Hall of Wesley Chapel United Methodist Church at 120 Potter Road South, Wesley Chapel, North Carolina.

**Present:** Mayor Horvath, Mayor Pro-tem Bradford; Council Members Brotton, Hess and Ormiston

**Others Present:**

Clerk/Finance Officer Cheryl Bennett; Planning/Zoning Admin. Joshua Langen; Attorney George Sistrunk

Concerned citizens: Gayla Adams, Butch and Becky Plyler, Carol Mullis, Julie Brown, Elizabeth Greene, Karen Partee, Ray Davis

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM and a quorum was present.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE / INVOCATION

Mayor Horvath led the Pledge of Allegiance and Mayor Pro-tem Bradford gave the invocation.

2. INFORMAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

Julie Brown expressed concerns on suppression of free speech, building a town hall and communications with Carolina Courts.

3. ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, AND / OR ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Bradford made a motion to adopt the agenda with the addition of budget ordinance amendment #6; Ormiston seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES FOR:

Council/Parks and Rec Committee Special Meeting January 13, 2011

Council Meeting January 13, 2011

Council Meeting January 18, 2011

Closed Minutes, Item 10C, December 13, 2010

The following changes were made to the minutes: Council/Parks and Rec Committee Special Meeting on January 13, 2011, page 1- correct typo; page 3 – the line beginning with Butch Plyler delete “with the \$250,000”; . Council Meeting January 13, 2011, page 6 after “Council member Hess said that would not happen”, add “as long as projects are funded in amounts on the CIP”; Council Meeting January 18, 2011, page 19, correct “typo” to “topo”; page 20 – add

reference to the PARTF grant in Hess' motion to approve the amenities and costs; page 21, change wording to "we don't need decisions tonight". A change was requested to delete the reference on page 19 to the bathroom facilities being in the basement; Bennett will check the tape on this and Ormiston suggested we thus wait on the January 18, 2011 minutes. Hess wanted to clarify his statement on page 14 in the January 13, 2011 minutes – notwithstanding that all our surveys come back okay, the owner does get to keep the earnest money. Brotton made a motion to approve the minutes for the Council/Parks and Rec Committee Special Meeting on January 13, 2011; Council Meeting on January 13, 2011 and closed minutes for Item 10C on December 13, 2010 with the above changes. Hess seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. STAFF REPORTS

- a. Review and approve the Village Financial Reports dated January 31, 2011, submitted by Cheryl Bennett, Finance Officer

Bennett reported that for the General Fund January revenues were \$31,718 and expenditures were \$15,259; the cash balance at January 31, 2011 is \$2,332,557. Tax collections are at 96.76% for 2010, 99.02% for 2009, and 99.76% for 2008. Bradford made a motion to approve the January 2011 financial reports; Ormiston seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

**January 2011 Balance Sheet**

**ASSETS**

**Current Assets**

**Checking/Savings**

<b>Fifth Third Bank Checking</b>	63,538.09
<b>Fifth Third Bank Money Market</b>	1,200,928.90
<b>Citizens South CD Bldg 07.03.11</b>	247,479.31
<b>BB&amp;T CD 10.23.2011-.4%</b>	318,192.58
<b>BB&amp;T CD 04.21.11. .568</b>	502,235.40
<b>Target Gift Card for NNO</b>	132.84
<b>Petty Cash Fund</b>	50.00
<b>Total Checking/Savings</b>	2,332,557.12

**Accounts Receivable**

<b>Misc. Fees Receivable</b>	217.50
<b>Total Accounts Receivable</b>	217.50

**Other Current Assets**

<b>Prepaid Exp.</b>	850.00
<b>Property Tax Rec.</b>	5,173.00
<b>Allow. for Doubtful Accounts</b>	-1,451.00
<b>Sales Taxes to be Received</b>	415.02
<b>Total Sales Taxes to be Received</b>	415.02

Total Other Current Assets	4,987.02
Total Current Assets	2,337,761.64
<b>Fixed Assets</b>	
Land	55,757.91
Office Equipment	13,569.26
Accumulated Deprec.	-13,569.26
Total Fixed Assets	55,757.91
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	<b>2,393,519.55</b>
 <b>LIABILITIES &amp; FUND BALANCE</b>	
Other Current Liabilities	
Escrow from Developers	45,076.00
Deferred Revenue	3,722.20
Payroll Liabilities	488.00
Total Other Current Liabilities	49,286.20
 Fund Balance	
Fund Bal. inv. in Fixed Assets	55,757.91
Fund Balance	2,195,437.31
Excess of Revenues over Exp.	93,038.13
Total Fund Balance	2,344,233.35
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>2,393,519.55</b>

<u>Budget</u>				
<u>Report</u>				
	Jan 11	Jul '10 - Jan 11	Budget	% of Budget
<b>General Fund</b>				
Fees and Licenses				
Payment for Streets	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	100.0%
National Night Out-raffle,cont	0.00	369.00	0.00	100.0%
Contribution for parks and rec	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Fall Festival donations	0.00	7,635.00	6,000.00	127.25%
Cable Franchise (from Time Warn	0.00	5,914.00	13,200.00	44.8%
Engineering Fees Reimbursement	0.00	645.00	10,000.00	6.45%
Zoning Permit	180.00	3,361.50	7,000.00	48.02%
Privilege Licenses	683.60	24,107.65	24,000.00	100.45%
Annexation Exp Reimbursed	-30.00	1,200.00	180.00	666.67%

Misc. Fees	0.00	39.80	140.00	28.43%
<b>Total Fees and Licenses</b>	<b>833.60</b>	<b>93,271.95</b>	<b>110,520.00</b>	<b>84.39%</b>
<b>Interest Earned</b>	<b>251.44</b>	<b>14,530.51</b>	<b>14,000.00</b>	<b>103.79%</b>
<b>Property Tax Income</b>				
Current Year Property Tax	26,965.04	128,885.52	135,274.00	95.28%
Delinquent Taxes	13.66	1,777.11	1,200.00	148.09%
Interest/Ad Fee on Taxes	5.26	345.09	294.00	117.38%
Utility Ad Valorem	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
Vehicle Registration	962.27	4,732.70	7,962.00	59.44%
<b>Total Property Tax Income</b>	<b>27,946.23</b>	<b>135,740.42</b>	<b>145,730.00</b>	<b>93.15%</b>
<b>Revenue Sharing</b>				
Alcoholic Beverage Tax	0.00	0.00	25,000.00	0.0%
Cable (from State)	0.00	22,408.49	80,000.00	28.01%
Excise Tax (Piped Natural Gas)	0.00	529.00	16,000.00	3.31%
Franchise Tax (Electric Power)	0.00	62,161.00	140,000.00	44.4%
Sales & Use Taxes	2,686.72	11,332.03	32,000.00	35.41%
Telecommunications Tax	0.00	2,985.00	13,000.00	22.96%
<b>Total Revenue Sharing</b>	<b>2,686.72</b>	<b>99,415.52</b>	<b>306,000.00</b>	<b>32.49%</b>
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>31,717.99</b>	<b>342,958.40</b>	<b>576,250.00</b>	<b>59.52%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
<b>Operating Expenditures</b>				
Contingency	0.00	0.00	24,000.00	0.0%
Advertising - Clerk	0.00	24.88	1,000.00	2.49%
Annexation Expense	0.00	0.00	800.00	0.0%
Annual Retreat	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
Bank Charges	33.56	214.43	600.00	35.74%
Books & Literature	0.00	29.00	400.00	7.25%
Dues and Subscriptions	0.00	6,975.00	12,000.00	58.13%
Election Expense	0.00	1,268.75	9,200.00	13.79%
Electronic Commun (Tele/RR)	223.52	2,017.56	4,000.00	50.44%
Insurance - Liability	0.00	9,323.50	9,421.00	98.97%
Insurance - Workmen's Comp	0.00	500.00	600.00	83.33%
Land Maintenance	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	0.0%
Town office Maint.	119.85	542.30	985.00	55.06%
Misc town office	0.00	91.43	1,700.00	5.38%
Newsletter	0.00	0.00	1,200.00	0.0%
Office Expense	233.78	1,000.22	4,000.00	25.01%
Postage and Delivery	5.71	1,237.71	1,300.00	95.21%
Rent	1,400.00	9,700.00	20,000.00	48.5%

<b>Seminars</b>	0.00	345.00	1,500.00	23.0%
<b>Tax Collection Fee</b>	419.25	1,882.07	2,620.00	71.84%
<b>Travel &amp; Entertainment</b>	123.16	1,435.98	2,500.00	57.44%
<b>Utilities- Temp. Town Hall</b>	217.07	1,361.82	3,000.00	45.39%
<b>Welcome Committee</b>	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total Operating Expenditures</b>	<u>2,775.90</u>	<u>37,949.65</u>	<u>106,826.00</u>	<u>35.53%</u>
<b>Gen. Govt. Salaries</b>				
<b>Admin. Assistant</b>	225.00	2,582.50	4,680.00	55.18%
<b>Allowance for Salary Adjustment</b>	0.00	0.00	5,984.00	0.0%
<b>Mayor</b>	0.00	2,400.00	4,800.00	50.0%
<b>Mayor Protem</b>	0.00	1,500.00	3,000.00	50.0%
<b>Council Salary</b>	0.00	3,600.00	7,200.00	50.0%
<b>Clerk Salary</b>	3,293.75	23,700.00	46,800.00	50.64%
<b>Finance Officer Salary</b>	807.70	5,653.90	10,500.00	53.85%
<b>Payroll Taxes</b>	634.03	5,300.94	10,938.00	48.46%
<b>Payroll exp - Unemployment</b>	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
<b>Fringe Benefits - Insurance</b>	1,292.24	7,103.68	15,648.00	45.4%
<b>Fringe Benefits - Retirement</b>	516.83	3,891.73	6,942.00	56.06%
<b>Total Gen. Govt. Salaries</b>	<u>6,769.55</u>	<u>55,732.75</u>	<u>117,492.00</u>	<u>47.44%</u>
<b>Planning &amp; Zoning</b>				
<b>P/Z Seminars</b>	0.00	199.00	900.00	22.11%
<b>P/Z Travel</b>	0.00	793.55	900.00	88.17%
<b>P/Z Dues,Subscriptions</b>	0.00	350.00	800.00	43.75%
<b>Administration (COG)</b>	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
<b>P/Z Admin. Salary</b>	3,961.54	28,541.44	51,000.00	55.96%
<b>Planning &amp; Zoning Board Salary</b>	0.00	1,302.00	4,032.00	32.29%
<b>Advertising</b>	0.00	164.18	2,000.00	8.21%
<b>P/Z Office Expense</b>	0.00	129.55	1,200.00	10.8%
<b>Planning/Zoning Expense</b>	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total Planning &amp; Zoning</b>	<u>3,961.54</u>	<u>31,479.72</u>	<u>63,832.00</u>	<u>49.32%</u>
<b>Professional Fees</b>				
<b>Department of Transportation</b>	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	100.0%
<b>Codification</b>	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.0%
<b>Audit Fees</b>	0.00	3,700.00	3,700.00	100.0%
<b>Engr. Consulting</b>	0.00	1,080.00	11,800.00	9.15%
<b>Legal Fees</b>	1,752.50	9,020.03	48,000.00	18.79%
<b>Security</b>	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total Professional Fees</b>	<u>1,752.50</u>	<u>63,800.03</u>	<u>144,500.00</u>	<u>44.15%</u>

<b>Parks &amp; Recreation</b>				
Materials & Supplies	0.00	0.00	3,500.00	0.0%
Maintenance/Grounds	0.00	0.00	3,575.00	0.0%
Events	0.00	6,805.35	9,000.00	75.62%
Insurance	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
Office Expense	0.00	0.00	1,250.00	0.0%
Professional Fees	0.00	23,075.00	23,075.00	100.0%
Dues & Subscriptions	0.00	500.00	600.00	83.33%
<b>Total Parks &amp; Recreation</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>30,380.35</b>	<b>43,000.00</b>	<b>70.65%</b>
<b>Public Safety</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>369.76</b>	<b>37,600.00</b>	<b>0.98%</b>
<b>Capital Outlay</b>				
Reserve for Capital Outlay	0.00	0.00	55,000.00	0.0%
Computer Equip.	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.0%
Furniture & Equipment	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
Software	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total Capital Outlay</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>63,000.00</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>15,259.49</b>	<b>219,712.26</b>	<b>576,250.00</b>	<b>38.13%</b>
<b>Net General Fund</b>	<b>16,458.50</b>	<b>123,246.14</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Capital Projects Fund</b>				
<b>Capital Projects Revenues</b>				
<b>Transfer from General Fund</b>				
Appropriated for Dogwood Park	0.00	0.00	825,000.00	0.0%
Appropriated for Town Hall	0.00	0.00	650,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total Approp. for Capital Projects</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1,475,000.00</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Capital Projects</b>				
Dogwood Park Capital Outlay	2,715.41	27,715.41	825,000.00	3.36%
Town Hall Capital Outlay	0.00	2,492.60	650,000.00	0.38%
<b>Total Capital Projects</b>	<b>2,715.41</b>	<b>30,208.01</b>	<b>1,475,000.00</b>	<b>2.05%</b>
<b>Total Other Expense</b>	<b>2,715.41</b>	<b>30,208.01</b>	<b>1,475,000.00</b>	<b>2.05%</b>
<b>Net Capital Projects Fund</b>	<b>-2,715.41</b>	<b>-30,208.01</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	<b>13,743.09</b>	<b>93,038.13</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

b. Review and approve budget ordinance amendments 2011-2011 # 6  
 Bennett explained that budget amendment 2011-2011 #6 is to appropriate revenue from the newsletter sponsor, record adjustments to salary accounts for changes made by Council in prior meetings and appropriate expenditures for the

newsletter. Bradford made a motion to approve budget amendment 2011-2011 #6; Ormiston seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Budget Ordinance 2010/11 Amendment #6**

Ord. 2011.03

BE IT ORDAINED by the Governing Board of the Village of Wesley Chapel, North Carolina, that the following amendment be made to the annual budget ordinance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011:

Section 1. To amend the General Fund, the appropriations are to be changed as follows:

	Decrease	Increase
<u>Revenues:</u>		
<u>Fees and Licenses:</u>		
Newsletter Sponsor		\$2,000
<u>Expenditures:</u>		
<u>Gen. Govt. Salaries</u>		
Admin. Assistant		\$ 25
Allowance for Salary Adj.	\$ 1,250	
Clerk Salary		\$ 75
Fringe Benefits - Retirement		\$ 75
<u>Planning &amp; Zoning</u>		
P/Z Admin. Salary		\$ 1,075
<u>Operating Expenditures:</u>		
Newsletter		800
Postage and Delivery		\$ 1,200

Section 2. Copies of this budget amendment shall be furnished to the Clerk to the Governing Board, and to the Budget Officer and the Finance Officer for their direction.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of February, 2011.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl Bennett, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Brad Horvath

c. Presentation of Planning and Zoning Report by Joshua Langen

Langen reported 13 permits were issued in January including two commercial upfits for Carolinas Healthcare and Target. Some progress has been made on the bond between JDH and Union County. Attorney Sistrunk said he needs to do a

title update and verify the borders on the two acres being donated by JDH. Langen reported on the status of various text amendments.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ON CHANGES TO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE  
ARTICLE 4: RETENTION OF EXISTING VEGETATION AND  
MARGINAL ACCESS STREETS

Mayor Horvath opened the public hearing. John Lepke had provided written comments (in italics) with Langen's responses. Lepke wrote:

*Here are some comments I'd like entered at the public hearing as I don't think I'll make it in person.*

*3A - Removal of large dead and fallen trees from stream beds is regulated/prohibited by State/Feds. Only that which can be removed by hand is allowed. Maybe we should add 'unless prohibited or regulated by other regulations' to this exemption or cite the specific statutes.*

Langen: okay, and Attorney Sistrunk suggested we reference specific regulations.

*3E - I think 'replacement should be considered' should be replaced with replacement is 'required'.*

Langen: this regards utility companies, and has been addressed.

*There should be an exemption for any property that has been planted for timber production on which harvesting is intended as long as the use of that property remains timber production. Not sure we have any 'forest products' business in Wesley Chapel but the ordinance should not prohibit the practice of forestry.*

Langen: This section is only for major subdivisions.

*4 ii - Typo 'for for'*

Langen: fixed this.

*Retention standard allows 70% of 100 % wooded area to be cut! This doesn't encourage developers to use land that has already been cleared. This seems inconsistent with the purpose and intent. The retention standard should clearly favor development of areas already cleared so that we maintain maximum benefits of existing tree canopy.*

Langen: a sliding scale is used.

*Could we have a 'clearing permit fee'? e.g. 10% of existing canopy can be removed for free, additional 10% may be permitted for \$5,000 per acre, additional 20% for \$20,000 per acre, \$100,000 per acre if clear cut. This would certainly encourage developers to use land that is already cleared.*

Langen: I would rather not get into fees. We can adjust the scale if desired.

*Heritage tree definition at 20" still allows some very big trees to be cut. Trees this big are very rare so we aren't protecting very many. Trees this big are also old and might be reaching end of life. If we allow everything smaller to be cut*

*there will be no new Heritage trees coming in behind those that die of natural causes. Consider reducing to 15" so that we have a stock of new Heritage trees on the way.*

Langen: Twenty inches was the general guideline as discussed with the arborist, it is up to Council.

*The accidental damage provision is a 'get out of jail free card'. Accidental tree damage should not occur if tree protection measures are taken. How do we distinguish between accidental damage and just negligent practices? There should be some motivation/incentive to ensure protection. i.e. It should be more costly for owner/developer to remediate than it is to protect. Damage to desired/protected vegetation, accidental or not, should carry consequences.*

Langen: Page 4-4 shows replacement standards and they are whether it was accidental or not, to replace at 1.5 to 2 times and triple for heritage trees.

*Public Parks should be added to 6 (D) iii Priority Replacement Areas list as a mitigation option.*

Langen: This is not in public parks, this applies to major subdivisions.

*If this applies only to development of new subdivisions there doesn't appear to be any protection of trees present at existing homes. This poses a risk. e.g. A developer follows the rules but tells home buyers they can cut what ever they want after they move in. Tree preservation should apply to Heritage trees where ever they stand.*

Langen: Planning Board didn't want it to apply to individual homes or administrative subdivisions; only to major and minor subdivisions.

The Public Hearing was closed.

## 7. TOWN HALL BUILDING COMMITTEE UPDATE

- Interviews with Proposed Architects
- Discussion on Price Negotiations
- Vote on Any Decisions Arising Out of the Above Discussions

Howard Brotton reported the committee went through interviews and invited their top three choices to present at the meeting tonight.

Creech & Associates presented first: David Creech, Brent Green and John Crawford were present. Their team includes Optima Engineering for mechanical plumbing and electrical, Walker Engineering for structural, and Jane Alexander from ColeJenest & Stone for civil/structural engineering. They are finishing work at the NC Research Campus; they also are the architects of the Huntersville Town Hall, Town Center and Discovery Place Kids, as well as the Cornelius library and police headquarters. They designed the Lancaster City Hall where a more formal space was preferred. In Mount Holly they converted a mill to a town hall and police department. They are working with Mint Hill and should start construction in 30-45 days. In Albemarle they did a large addition to a WPA building, and won a Main Street award. David Creech said they would site the town hall to give prominence, and they liked the master plan. They would verify space needs,

be sensitive to the budget and suggested sharing of spaces – typically the council chambers. The charrette process could involve the public, and they noted they have learned much from people’s input in previous projects. They have a quality control process with all drawings taped to the wall and then reviewed by all involved; they said they want the client to understand them. They have done lots of LEED buildings, and have a sustainable approach, whether you go for certification or not. They presented renderings, the two story is more prominent but has some inefficiencies. When asked what they felt the greatest challenges to the site were, Creech said it appears flat, he hadn’t seen soil reports, but how compacted it is and organics could be concerns; also with the economy the Town Hall may be lonely there for a while. Brent Green said they like to lift public buildings up a little. David Creech noted we have sufficient area and shared parking may be possible. They have not worked with Aston Properties before. Mr. Creech suggested being conservative in the budget, Albemarle is their last major town hall, and the estimator price and all five bids were within 5% of each other and all below budget; the total cost is \$7.5 to \$8 million. The time frame to bid the project, refine the program and then begin design work is 30-45 days; to preliminary design is 90-120 days, and could be built in 6-8 months. They noted Huntersville’s town hall is a one story building but has a tower in the lobby that gives prominence, and siting can add prominence. A two story building involves two sets of stairs, with 200 square feet on each floor, and elevator and toilets on both floors which can add up to 1200 square feet, or 20% of the building; only minimal cost efficiencies are achieved. They were asked about their cost estimates; Creech replied unless we are very different from a lot of other councils the estimates should be accurate. Their contingency is typically 4-5% for the bid; owners make 2.5% changes, and 2.5% changes for the drawings. If you use a construction manager at risk you can lessen that. They were asked if building a one story building would commit us to one story in the future; they said if you anticipate expansion then a move toward a two story to start with makes sense. Public input could be done in different ways; Creech said you could invite stakeholders and spend 2-3 days. The public often wants to weigh in on appearance and whether there is a community room. Another way is to have a series of workshops. You need the program first in working with the committee and Council, and it is up to us how much we involve the public. They were asked how the Waxhaw project could affect us if they are chosen as the architect; David Creech noted they just finished a half a billion square feet of buildings designed and built in two years. They have no shortage of staff and no project is less important.

ADW architects presented second; Jim Powell, Bob Lauer and Christal Bostian were present. They were established in 1977 and have 28 staff in Charlotte. They create a team for every project, and in that way are a large firm and small firm in one. Certain people stay with the project from start to end. The structural engineer is Stewart Engineering, site/civil/landscape is Cole Jenest and Stone and McCracken & Lopez is the mechanical, electrical and plumbing engineers. ADW’s approach and philosophy is interactive, participatory and consensus building. They said they like to work collaboratively and involve the engineers

from the beginning. They customize design for each project and work to fit the budget. They can go from sustainable to LEED certifiable. McCracken & Lopez is well versed in LEED; most savings are in the systems. Christal Bostian noted we would probably want a durable and low maintenance interior and furnishings, and they can use NC purchasing contracts. ADW's experience includes town halls, parks, police and fire buildings; they concentrate on small/medium size community projects. Often grants or loans are involved, such as USDA. They noted the community involvement and awareness makes it fun. They do not have one aesthetic style, they showed pictures of projects they did such as the Hamlet Town Hall (8500 square feet), and the unbuilt Elkin town hall. The Troy Town Hall (5200 square feet) has a transitional style; the Jonesville town Hall (5330 square feet) is a cross between a mountain lodge and a winery feel; it also serves as a welcome center for the Yadkin valley. The Waynesville town Hall (20,000 square feet) is a mix of historic and modern as they did a renovation and addition. Other projects such as the Marion police department and Hamlet library and Charlotte fire stations also were influenced by the community they are in. Bob Lauer spoke of their mixed use project work at Ayrley where they focused on a theater and some two story buildings, and the coordination of needs with other buildings. Jim Powell spoke of town hall issues including civic presence, timeless architecture, being easy to use, durability, community center and the context of a mixed use and the adjacent residential area. Renderings to be used as a starting point were shown, with a building flanked by two future buildings; he also noted there are opportunities to enhance the site with trails and a formal outdoor space around the town hall. With a one story building you would probably expand to the back. He spoke of a traditional/classic form, with cast stone, cupola, and brick accents. Even with a one story he suggested building it higher for presence. The two story option moves it back a bit with more public courtyard in front; probably the second story would be expansion space; you could build 5,000 feet on the first floor and 5,000 for expansion. He introduced a curved glass window which is welcoming and inviting and connects to the outside, and adds light. Jim Powell suggested having a meeting with the public before designing to find out what is important. He noted a second story could be built as a shell for future use or could be rented out, but you would need two stairwells and an elevator, and you need a certain size to be cost effective. Asked about site challenges, he replied the grading can be worked with, but the challenge is thinking about the future, and that you will be there before buildings are beside you, design to be there alone and set the tone for development around it. They were asked about the two story concept and whether it is within budget, Mr. Powell noted you could get cost estimates and test, and not put in all systems, or even finished sheetrock. Bill Meyer, Town Hall Building Committee Chairman noted we asked for one story and two story perspectives from all the firms since one thing everyone brought up is prominence. Mr. Powell noted if it doesn't fit the budget it doesn't work, but for prominence you might want to build a taller one story. The Troy Town Hall had a grant and loan; the USDA rules have changed a bit and are now all loans. To get a traditional image and character, and with a one and one half story building, Jim

Powell suggested costs would be about \$175-\$250 per square foot. Contingency would be about 5% for a smaller project and maybe more due to the site. They have not worked with Aston Properties.

Fuller Architecture presented next; John Fuller and Kevin Marion were present. Their office is in Mocksville; they have been in business 19 years and have 7 staff. They have experience with a variety of community buildings, a lot of churches, educational buildings, and are the corporate architects for SunTrust Banks. The East Bend public library (6800 square feet) is 30% complete, they did the Troutman library, Town Hall, and master planned their downtown. They designed the Yadkinville police department which has 6000 square feet, with half on each floor; it cost about \$85-90 per square foot six to seven years ago. They designed the Davie County Senior Center. A current project is the Yadkin Cultural Arts Center which was an old car dealership, and was turned into a plaza, artist studios, and art center. The Yadkinville Town Hall (6200 square feet) built ten years ago includes multi-use council chambers. The Troutman Town Hall reflects a needs assessment and has a campus plan. The Wallburg Town Hall is 90% complete; it has one story in front, and two stories in back. They designed to tie in to the community and committee desires; it is based on a local historic building. Fuller Architecture also did town master planning for Troutman and Bermuda Run. John Fuller would be involved throughout; Kevin Marion would be the design architect. Their team includes Miller Landscape Architecture as the landscape/civil engineer; Chris Stroupe as the mechanical/electrical and plumbing engineers, and Bill Nance from W.T.N. Structural Engineering. John Fuller noted the feasibility study, program, and budget is foremost. The Site Design involves the master plan, keeping in mind the mixed use, and land characteristics. Sustainability is important, and they have 3 LEED accredited individuals. The design development and construction documents phase will focus on sustainability, detailed and comprehensive drawings would be produced, and budget kept in mind throughout. They have experience in the public bidding process, and would pre-qualify contractors as they did in Wallburg. The Construction administration phase involves on-site visits, and working with the contractors. References were provided, as they feel strongly about that. John Fuller presented a board with renderings; they looked at the site and found how closely it followed the original plan. They presented two different looks of a building they already designed as they did not yet know our program or desires. The Wallburg Town Hall cost \$111 per square foot, including site work; our costs would probably be a little higher as the economy is coming up. Given the two constraints of cost and no more than 6500 square feet, they said a lot has to do with the site and program needs; two floors drives up the cost with stairs and elevator. Fuller noted we might want two floors for future needs; the Wallburg site was conducive to the two stories. Kevin Marion noted Troutman is an existing one story and they are designing an expansion to two stories. John Fuller said an elevator is needed for a sloped site with two floors. He also said the public involvement is up to the Council and Committee, but they relish involving the public through charrettes, where the public can offer exciting ideas. John Fuller said the site was fantastic; they would get the engineers involved, and noted

some grade changes are present. They have not worked with Aston Properties before.

Item 15 was discussed next. 15. UPDATE ON NEWSLETTER

Ormiston reported she added the volunteer spotlight and Hess had done the CIP write-up.

Council returned to discussion of the architects. The Committee recommendation is Creech & Associates. Bradford asked why the first scoring had ADW first; Butch Plyler noted the different criteria and design process had some weight. Brotton explained we set up criteria with scores of 1-3-5 points; the top six architects were asked to interview and standard questions were asked. They were asked to bring both a one story and two story rendering. Hess said he had a concern about using the renderings as criteria, we should have had two limits, budget and size; he felt 6500 square feet is the key constraint. Brotton noted we also looked at references. Bradford said she liked Creech's public involvement, their high profile projects, and conservative cost estimates. She felt ADW had unique designs for each community, and were sensitive to the residential area behind the site, and their costs are soup to nuts. Ormiston said she agreed with Bradford, she also spoke to a Charlotte fire chief where ADW involved the adjacent residential area in their design process. Gayla Adams from the Town Hall Building Committee reported she checked references on all the firms and they were all very thorough.

Brotton made a motion to recommend we use Creech & Associates as our town hall architect. Bradford seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Brotton made a motion if fee negotiations with Creech fail, we next go to ADW, and then to Fuller Architecture. Bradford seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Brotton said due to the expertise on the committee he moved that negotiations be done by the Committee and come to Council for approval. Ormiston noted that was part of the purpose of the Committee, and seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Bradford said there was a possibility of public/private partnerships, and when can we explore that. Brotton said we would have to know upfront who would be involved. Mayor Horvath said he followed up with Dean Sandbo and Aston Properties, they had a discussion on how to make things more viable, possibly functions could be held at the gazebo; and Dean thought he could get retail owners to partner. Also Carolina Courts wants to be by a major thoroughfare, but is also interested in a hub and spokes concept. Also a decision on shared detention needs to be done before master planning the six acres can be done, so he looks to Aston Properties to come back to us on that.

8. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLE 8  
SIGNS RE-WRITE TEXT AMENDMENT AND RELATED  
DEFINITIONS IN ARTICLE 2

Tabled to the next meeting.

9. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE ARTICLE  
4 TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR RETENTION OF EXISTING  
VEGETATION AND MARGINAL ACCESS STREETS

Tabled to the next meeting.

10. DISCUSSION OF SECTIONS OF DOWNTOWN PROPOSAL:

- Purpose Of The Downtown Committee
- Definition Of Village Center
- Definition Of Terms
- Summary Of Master Plan Recommendations For The Village Center
- Summary Of Master Plan Survey Results
- Economic Environment
- Key Demographic Information For Wesley Chapel

Grammatical/typographical changes were made to page 2, 3, 5, 6 and 11.

Ormiston asked if the definitions on page 4 were from what the Committee thought was possible; Hess said one concept is age restricted housing and aging in place; the goal is to leverage the downtown area and change demographics.

Ormiston asked how Rehabilitation Center came up. Hess said in looking at catering to the demographic changes, we don't have room for a large hospital campus, but this could provide services like knee rehabilitation. Ormiston said we don't have definitions for hospital, and bread and breakfast. Hess said some were already defined in the ordinance, some needed definitions further expanded.

Brotton asked what vocational training under Rehabilitation Center would be. Hess said it would be cases where someone loses ability and needs to be retrained.

Langen suggested we add exclusionary language to exclude alcohol and drug rehabilitation. Hess pointed out the last line that it is not a permanent housing alternative. Bradford asked what Neighborhood Commercial Retail would look like; Hess said Blakeney would qualify but borders on highway commercial.

Brotton suggested it might be more like Waxhaw. Langen noted in the Table of Uses we can pick specifically what uses would be allowed. Ormiston said she had concerns with Live-Work and Mixed Use Development; should they be addressed in the definitions or later; the conclusion was later. On page 9, rental apartments were added to the sixth bullet as being things respondents strongly opposed. Ormiston asked if we could add in census results on this page.

11. PARKS AND REC UPDATE INCLUDING PARTF SUBMISSION / NC  
BUDGET DISCUSSIONS AND MODIFICATION TO DRAFT PARK  
BUDGET ON AMENITY ADDED

Bradford reported the grant application was submitted and the grant budget modifications had been made. Mayor Horvath noted Haden Stanziale had talked

to the grant administrators, and they only considered us having two amenities, so we added in a pier. The allocation of funds needs to be addressed in the next meeting. Ormiston stressed we don't want to go over the overall budget, and today we can't quantify volunteer labor although we support volunteer help. Bradford said if someone donates a shelter we can request an amendment to the grant. Carol Mullis asked if there was a chart on what has been spent; Bennett said she could provide detail information each month.

12. ADVANCE UPDATE AND DISCUSSION

The Advance will start on Friday March 4, 2011 at The Stone Table at 6:30 pm with a dinner meeting, and continue on Saturday March 5, 2011 at 9 am at the Lake Park Community Center. Friday's session will be about developing the downtown center, and include an update on the Town Hall and Park.

13. RECEIVE CERTIFICATE OF SUFFICIENCY FROM CLERK ON ANNEXATION OF WINDING CREEK

Bradford made a motion to approve the Certificate of Sufficiency from the Clerk on the annexation of Winding Creek; Ormiston seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Certificate of Sufficiency**

To the Wesley Chapel, North Carolina Village Council:

I, Cheryl Bennett, Village Clerk, do hereby certify that I have investigated the petition attached hereto and have found as a fact that said petition is signed by all the owners of real property lying in the area described therein, in accordance with G.S. 160A-58.1.

In witness whereof, I have here unto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Village of Wesley Chapel, this 14<sup>st</sup> day of February, 2011.

SEAL

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl Bennett, - Village Clerk

Attached: Petition for Winding Creek Lots 1, 2, 8-11, 13-14, 16-21, 23, 31, 33-37, 39-42, 44-46, 49, 51-52, 54, 56, 58-59, 61, 63-67.

14. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION FIXING DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON QUESTION OF ANNEXATION PURSUANT TO G.S. 160A-58.2

Bradford made a motion to approve the Resolution Fixing the Date of the Public Hearing on the Question of Annexation Pursuant to G.S. 160A-58.2. Brotton seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The Public Hearing is set for March 14, 2011 at 7 pm at Wesley Chapel United Methodist Church.

15. UPDATE ON NEWSLETTER – discussed earlier in the meeting.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

Ormiston reported there had been a suspicious vehicle report in Potters Bluff but the investigation came back clean. She also had an e-mail report of pit bulls in the cul-de-sac closest to Wesley Chapel Elementary School; she will let the School know. She reported that DOT crews have gone from 3 to 2 as far as picking up litter along streets; they don't offer vests any more, but do have garbage bags.

Brotton reported on the idea of Sister City International; the fee would be about \$250, and they match you with an international city.

17. COUNCIL COMMENTS - none

18. ADJOURNMENT

Brotton made a motion to adjourn; Bradford seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Cheryl Bennett, Clerk

---

Mayor Brad Horvath