

VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL  
COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
WESLEY CHAPEL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH  
120 Potter Road, Wesley Chapel, NC 28110  
November 29, 2010 – 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:**

Village Clerk/Finance Officer: Cheryl Bennett  
Planning/Zoning Administrator: Joshua Langen  
Concerned citizens: Becky Plyler, Julie Brown

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. ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, AND / OR ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Hess requested an item be added to discuss the architect selection process. Hess made a motion to adopt the agenda with this change; Brotton seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. UPDATE ON BUILDING HEIGHT ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGE

Langen said the Planning Board had reservations regarding applying this to individual homes; in reviewing the text he also made some changes to the roofing language.

4. UPDATE ON FLOODING ISSUE

Mayor Horvath said he has calls in to MUMPO but has not yet met with them on the two properties. A further issue in Silver Creek came up, a section of the road was never turned over to DOT; the development was built under County regulations.

5A. DISCUSSION OF ARCHITECT SELECTION PROCESS

Hess said he feels that NC GS 143-64.31 requires identification of the best qualified architect without regard to price except for unit price, and the second phase is to talk to the best qualified regarding price. Hess went to the NC

Administrative Code which did not really provide any further guidance. He noted we should uniformly apply the selection process to all applicants if none are disqualified. He suggested all architects should be given an interview as part of their qualifications review at the Committee level. Hess also questioned whether architect interviews would be done at the committee level. Brotton said the Committee took a consensus of each member's top rated firms. Ormiston said she didn't think we had made a decision that the Committee would not interview them; she agreed we should evaluate all firms equally. Brotton said all firms had substantial resumes. Hess said we should make objective criteria to evaluate the firms on. Brotton said some of the things the committee looked at were distance to site, experience on municipal buildings and architecture. The Committee will come up with quantifiable criteria on which to review all the firms and document the results.

#### 5. TOWN HALL BUILDING COMMITTEE UPDATE

Brotton reported the Committee members brought back their top five choices, and eight firms made the voting list. Members' reasoning was discussed, and a list of six was agreed on. The Committee meets tomorrow night, and has architect interviews scheduled for December 15 and 16, 2010.

#### 6. PARKS AND REC COMMITTEE UPDATE

John Lepke did a presentation on evaluation of twenty potential park sites. They looked at whether the site has potential to accommodate the top ten desired amenities and whether the estimated cost to acquire and develop it fits the budget constraints of one million in current funds, plus a \$500,000 PARTF grant, plus \$500,000 in other grants and fund raising over the next five years. Points were assigned to each of twenty-eight criteria to evaluate if the sites satisfy the community amenity needs, consider the attributes that will influence cost to develop, and lead to the path of least resistance. Letters were sent to owners of all sites over fifteen acres. The number of points given to each criterion was averaged from committee member opinions. The evaluation model was applied to GIS images/conceptual designs. Hess noted on some sites the committee is more together, on others they are not. Lepke replied some is subjective, for example the criteria of being near a large subdivision – some committee members felt that would be good since residents can walk and they scored positive points for that; others felt it would be bad due to noise from an amphitheater so they scored negative points for that criteria. Ormiston asked if site 12 was only evaluated by one member; Lepke replied that the committee looked at all sites together and prioritized sites for everyone to focus on, then they individually assessed and he collected the data.

The top six sites were developed, and then they looked at price, and dropped off sites 15 and 17 because they were beyond the budget constraints.

The top four sites are:

1. Site 6, (avg. score 1439), 23 acres, provides paved walking trail, amphitheater, unpaved trail, existing fishing pond and multi-purpose field; land cost \$1.1 million.

2. Site 20 (avg. score 916), 20 acres, provides paved walking trail, amphitheater, unpaved trail (not all wooded), existing fishing pond, multi-purpose field, land cost \$800,000, (price based on average cost of all land, specific price not yet determined).
3. Site 8 (avg. score 778), 18 acres (12 donated), provides paved walking trail, unpaved trail (flat & short), existing fishing pond, land cost \$290,000.
4. Site 1, Plan A (avg. score 713), 40 acres, provides paved walking trail, amphitheater, unpaved trail, fishing pond (needs to be excavated), multi-purpose field, land cost \$800,000 based on owners comment that they were willing to sell some of their 176 acres for \$20,000 per acre.

A very rough estimate of development costs was done. Assumptions include that all turn lanes on a main road would cost \$75,000, that a walking trail would be one half mile long, concrete, and cost \$4 per square foot, that unpaid trails would be one mile long and cost \$6 per linear foot, that new bathrooms would cost \$50,000 and upfits to existing buildings for bathrooms would cost \$20,000, and parking lots would be \$60,000. Hess asked if some qualities were not double weighted with the item getting points both in the points area and again in costs. John Lepke also noted that site A is larger than the rest at forty acres. The next step would be to prepare detailed costs for Site 1, Plan A and Site 6 which would involve costs to get the conceptual design and professional economic evaluations. Ormiston asked if Site 1 could be scaled down to thirty acres; that is possible if the owner doesn't mind being left with ten acres. Bradford suggested Council members go visit these four sites. Lepke will add the parcel tax ID numbers and send them to Council. Bradford said with any of the sites you could get part of the property now and an option contingent on a grant. We can also go through the waiver process to purchase the land now for the PARTF grant contingent on getting the grant. Bradford expects to get the price of Site 20 within a week. Hess said he feels site 6 is out based on the price. Bradford said the owners of site 6 said they are willing to keep some of the acreage on Highway 84 and split the price. Ormiston asked whether you would consider sites 13 and 10 now that 15 and 17 are out of our budget. Of the top four sites only Site 1, Plan A doesn't have an existing building.

At the December 13, 2010 meeting the sites will be discussed, and prices of land for site 20 and Site 1 are needed; Mayor Horvath will call the owner.

Site 1 is near Beulah Church Road and Potter Road, Site 20 is off Cuthbertson Road abutting Champion Forest; and the other two sites are Page Price and Dogwood Acres.

Mayor Horvath thanked the committee for their work.

## 7. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DOWNTOWN COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

Review of the proposal will begin in January and go in this order:  
Goals for Village Center, Zones Defining Village Center, Mixed Uses, Architectural Design Standards, Priority for Development of Each Zone of the Village Center, Summary, Recommendations, and Executive Summary.

8. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CHANGE TO COMMITTEE POLICY REGARDING PUBLICATIONS AND / OR USE OF A DISCLAIMER OR CODE OF CONDUCT

Ormiston and Bradford spoke with Fleming Bell today and he suggested instead of a disclaimer we should create wording like "This is approved by Council" to go on documents, and change the wording in our ethics policy from "shall" which is not enforceable to "should". Ormiston sent him our ethics policy to review. Wording will be brought back to council when it is ready.

9. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CHANGE TO ETHICS POLICY TO ADD COMMITTEES

See above item.

10. CHRISTMAS LUNCHEON

The luncheon will be on December 14, 2010 at 11:30 am at Hickory Tavern.

11. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON PARTNERING WITH WCVFD FOR FUND BOOK ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION FOR \$399 TOTAL  
Mayor Horvath said the Fundbook is okay with us sharing a subscription with the fire department; the price should be \$499 based on population, but they will honor the price they quoted of \$399. After discussion of whether the grants would pertain to us, and the other venues we have, Council decided not to pursue this subscription.

12. WCVFD GROUND BREAKING CEREMONY ON SATURDAY NOVEMBER 27, 2010

Mayor Horvath noted the groundbreaking ceremony was held Saturday, and the project is moving forward.

13. WCVFD/PROVIDENCE FD MEETING WITH WEDDINGTON TOWN COUNCIL AND SAFETY COMMITTEE NOVEMBER 30, 2010

Mayor Horvath and Ormiston will attend this meeting tomorrow night in Weddington; Providence is now on a flat fee and also they receive about \$250,000 annually from Weddington and \$50,000 from the County. The question of interest is the impact on the tax rate for Wesley Chapel residents.

14. DISCUSSION OF TOPICS FOR NEWSLETTER

Topics include a festival review and date of the festival for 2011, as well as Committee updates, and a citizen feature. An update on the Carolina Thread Trail will be included. The newsletter will be sent out in March, it will be back on our agenda for February. Ormiston asked if we would like to get a sponsor so that we might mail it out. Bennett said she would work on getting HOA contacts because we can get it out to a lot of the residents that way.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

Brotton said he spoke with Barry Moose and they will send out a crew to monitor the intersection at Antioch Church Road and Weddington Road. Mayor Horvath said there is also a problem with people leaving McDonalds and then u-turning. Ormiston said the Safety Committee wants to revisit the speed limits on Highway 84; they will do a presentation of Wesley Chapel crime statistics to Council February 22, 2010.

Nametags were discussed; Council members who attend outside meetings feel they should have name badges to wear; Hess said he didn't feel we should spend money on them. Bradford said she doesn't need one nor does Hess as they don't attend regular meetings with outside organizations; Hess said he is opposed to spending taxpayer money on this indulgence.

16. COUNCIL COMMENTS - none

17. ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Cheryl Bennett, Clerk

---

Mayor Brad Horvath