

VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL
COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
WESLEY CHAPEL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH
120 Potter Road, Wesley Chapel, NC 28110
March 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
Concerned citizens: Carol Mullis, Julie Brown, Ray Davis, William Rodriguez, Shirley Wilson

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 - none

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

Bradford made a motion to adopt the agenda with the addition of “Discussion of Length of Council Meetings” as Item 7B, deletion of February 14, 2011 minutes from Item 4, deletion of Item 17 “Consider Approval of Ordinance 2011-04, An Ordinance to Extend The Corporate Limits of the Village of Wesley Chapel, North Carolina”, and tabling items 12 “Ordinance Codification” and 13 “Town Hall Building Committee Update” to the next meeting; Brotton seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES FOR:

Council Meeting February 22, 2011

Brotton made a motion to approve the minutes for the Council Meeting on February 22, 2011. Bradford seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. STAFF REPORTS

- a. Review and approve the Village Financial Reports dated February 28, 2011, submitted by Cheryl Bennett, Finance Officer

Bennett reported the cash balance at February 28, 2011 is \$1,597,513. This is the first report since the Capital Improvements Projects Fund amendment. CIP expenditures are on the third page of the budget report; \$774,703 has been spent on the Park and \$2,904 on the Town Hall.

Hess made a motion to approve the February 2011 financial reports; Ormiston seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

February 2011 Budget Report

	Feb 11	Jul '10 - Feb 11	YTD Budget	% of Budget
General Fund				
Revenues				
Appropriated Fund Balance				
Appropriated Fund Balance	1,293,000.00	1,293,000.00	1,293,000.00	100.0%
Total Appropriated Fund Balance	1,293,000.00	1,293,000.00	1,293,000.00	100.0%
Fees and Licenses				
Newsletter Sponsor	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
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	3,201.00	9,115.00	13,200.00	69.05%
Engineering Fees Reimbursement	-217.50	427.50	10,000.00	4.28%
Zoning Permit	640.00	4,001.50	7,000.00	57.16%
Privilege Licenses	509.00	24,616.65	24,000.00	102.57%
Annexation Exp Reimbursed	30.00	1,230.00	180.00	683.33%
Misc. Fees	5.90	45.70	140.00	32.64%
Total Fees and Licenses	4,168.40	97,440.35	112,520.00	86.6%
Interest Earned	201.15	14,731.66	14,000.00	105.23%
Property Tax Income				
Current Year Property Tax	17,846.74	146,732.26	135,274.00	108.47%
Delinquent Taxes	95.44	1,872.55	1,200.00	156.05%
Interest/Ad Fee on Taxes	39.71	384.80	294.00	130.88%
Utility Ad Valorem	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
Vehicle Registration	803.33	5,536.03	7,962.00	69.53%
Total Property Tax Income	18,785.22	154,525.64	145,730.00	106.04%
Revenue Sharing				
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	150,000.00	41.44%
Sales & Use Taxes	2,653.31	13,985.34	32,000.00	43.7%
Telecommunications Tax	0.00	2,985.00	13,000.00	22.96%
Total Revenue Sharing	2,653.31	102,068.83	316,000.00	32.3%
Total Revenues	1,318,808.08	1,661,766.48	1,881,250.00	88.33%
Expense				
Transfer to CIP	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	100.0%
Operating Expenditures				
Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	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	24.76	239.19	600.00	39.87%
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	1,300.00	97.6%
Electronic Commun (Tele/RR)	223.31	2,240.87	4,000.00	56.02%
Insurance - Liability	0.00	9,323.50	9,421.00	98.97%
Insurance - Workmen's Comp	0.00	500.00	500.00	100.0%
Land Maintenance	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	0.0%
Town office Maint.	75.00	617.30	985.00	62.67%
Misc town office	0.00	91.43	1,700.00	5.38%
Newsletter	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
Office Expense	11.25	1,011.47	2,000.00	50.57%
Postage and Delivery	66.00	1,303.71	2,500.00	52.15%
Rent	1,400.00	11,100.00	17,000.00	65.29%
Seminars	0.00	345.00	1,500.00	23.0%
Tax Collection Fee	281.84	2,163.91	2,620.00	82.59%
Travel & Entertainment	154.79	1,590.77	2,500.00	63.63%
Utilities- Temp. Town Hall	398.12	1,759.94	3,000.00	58.67%
Welcome Committee	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Total Operating Expenditures	2,635.07	40,584.72	70,826.00	57.3%
Gen. Govt. Salaries				
Admin. Assistant	397.50	2,980.00	4,705.00	63.34%
Allowance for Salary Adjustment	0.00	0.00	334.00	0.0%
Mayor	0.00	2,400.00	4,800.00	50.0%
Mayor Protem	0.00	1,500.00	3,000.00	50.0%
Council Salary	0.00	3,600.00	7,200.00	50.0%
Clerk Salary	3,331.25	27,031.25	46,875.00	57.67%
Finance Officer Salary	807.70	6,461.60	10,500.00	61.54%

Payroll Taxes	653.05	5,953.99	10,938.00	54.43%
Payroll exp - Unemployment	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.0%
Fringe Benefits - Insurance	1,292.24	8,395.92	13,648.00	61.52%
Fringe Benefits - Retirement	521.71	4,413.44	7,017.00	62.9%
Total Gen. Govt. Salaries	7,003.45	62,736.20	110,017.00	57.02%
Planning & Zoning				
P/Z Admin. Salary	4,000.00	32,541.44	52,075.00	62.49%
Planning & Zoning Board Salary	0.00	1,302.00	3,032.00	42.94%
Advertising	0.00	164.18	1,000.00	16.42%
P/Z Office Expense	23.02	152.57	1,200.00	12.71%
Planning/Zoning Expense	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
P/Z Seminars	0.00	199.00	900.00	22.11%
P/Z Travel	53.55	847.10	900.00	94.12%
P/Z Dues,Subscriptions	0.00	350.00	800.00	43.75%
Administration (COG)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Total Planning & Zoning	4,076.57	35,556.29	59,907.00	59.35%
Professional Fees				
Department of Transportation	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	100.0%
Codification	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.0%
Audit Fees	0.00	3,700.00	3,700.00	100.0%
Engr. Consulting	0.00	1,080.00	11,800.00	9.15%
Legal Fees	0.00	9,020.03	24,000.00	37.58%
Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Total Professional Fees	0.00	63,800.03	119,500.00	53.39%
Parks & Recreation				
Materials & Supplies	0.00	0.00	3,500.00	0.0%
Maintenance/Grounds	0.00	0.00	3,575.00	0.0%
Events	536.00	7,341.35	7,400.00	99.21%
Insurance	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.0%
Office Expense	0.00	0.00	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%
Total Parks & Recreation	536.00	30,916.35	40,400.00	76.53%
Public Safety	0.00	369.76	600.00	61.63%
Capital Outlay				
Reserve for Capital Outlay	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Computer Equip.	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.0%
Furniture & Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Software	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%

Total Capital Outlay	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.0%
Total Expense	1,489,251.09	1,708,963.35	1,881,250.00	90.84%
Net General Fund	-170,443.01	-47,196.87	0.00	100.0%
CIP Fund				
CIP Revenue				
Transfer from General Fund				
Appropriated for Dogwood Park	825,000.00	825,000.00	825,000.00	100.0%
Appropriated for Town Hall	650,000.00	650,000.00	650,000.00	100.0%
Total Transfer from General Fund	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	100.0%
Total CIP Revenue	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	100.0%
CIP Expense				
Capital Projects				
Dogwood Park Capital Outlay	746,987.25	774,702.66	825,000.00	93.9%
Town Hall Capital Outlay	410.91	2,903.51	650,000.00	0.45%
Total CIP Expense	747,398.16	777,606.17	1,475,000.00	52.72%
Net CIP Fund	727,601.84	697,393.83	0.00	100.0%
Net Excess of Revenues over Expense	557,158.83	650,196.96	0.00	100.0%

Balance Sheet, February 28, 2011

ASSETS

Current Assets

Checking/Savings

Fifth Third Bank Checking	34,606.11
Fifth Third Bank Money Market	494,853.76
Citizens South CD Bldg 07.03.11	247,479.31
BB&T CD 10.23.2011-.4%	318,192.58
BB&T CD 04.21.11. .568	502,235.40
Target Gift Card for NNO	96.09
Petty Cash Fund	50.00

Total Checking/Savings 1,597,513.25

Other Current Assets

Prepaid Exp.	850.00
Property Tax Rec.	5,173.00
Allow. for Doubtful Accounts	-1,451.00
Sales Taxes to be Received	
Total Sales Taxes to be Received	452.15

Total Current Assets 1,602,537.40

Fixed Assets	
Land	816,913.51
Office Equipment	13,569.26
Accumulated Deprec.	<u>-13,569.26</u>
Total Fixed Assets	<u>816,913.51</u>
 TOTAL ASSETS	 <u>2,419,450.91</u>
 LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCE	
Other Current Liabilities	
Taxes payable on Dogwood Park	1,104.93
Escrow from Developers	45,076.00
Deferred Revenue	<u>3,722.20</u>
Total Other Current Liabilities	<u>49,903.13</u>
Total Current Liabilities	<u>49,903.13</u>
 Fund Balance	
Fund Bal. inv. in Fixed Assets	816,913.51
Fund Balance	902,437.31
Excess of Rev. over Exp.	<u>650,196.96</u>
Total Fund Balance	<u>2,369,547.78</u>
 TOTAL LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCE	 <u>2,419,450.91</u>

b. Presentation of Planning and Zoning Report by Joshua Langen
 Langen reported 11 permits were issued in February including one commercial upfit and one commercial zoning for Hess business Products and three residential zoning for houses in Wesley Chase. Langen reported on the status of various text amendments; Article 2 definitions will go to Planning Board in May, amendments regarding HOA's are under review by the attorney and Planning Board will review traffic management standards in March. Ormiston asked Langen what type of violation complaints he has received; he replied he compiled them for Planning Board and can send her a copy, they are mostly home occupation and nuisance, he does not record calls on signs as complaints he just pulls the signs.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ON QUESTION OF ANNEXATION PURSUANT TO G.S. 160A-58.2

The Public Hearing was opened. There being no speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

7. A. INTERVIEW APPLICANT FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
ALTERNATE POSITION

William (Bill) Rodriguez was interviewed; he has lived in Wesley Oaks for five years, and owns a masonry concrete company. He was on their HOA, and wants to serve the community; he is also involved with Civil Air Patrol, and helps the middle school teams. Mr. Rodriguez said he looks at things objectively, and has time to study the ordinances. He said he had learned not to take anything personal while on the HOA. Mr. Rodriguez said he had been looking at the minutes and would read our ordinance book. Brotton nominated Bill Rodriguez for the position of alternate on the Board of Adjustment; Ormiston seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. B. Discussion of Length of Council Meetings

Mayor Horvath said discussion on any one topic will be limited to fifteen to thirty minutes at most, and whatever item we are on at ten pm will be finished and the remaining items will be tabled to the next meeting.

8. DISCUSSION OF SECTIONS OF DOWNTOWN PROPOSAL:

- Exemplary Renderings of Mixed-Use Housing Types in Village Center
- Architectural Design Standard
- Summary Of Current Zoning Ordinance for the Village of Wesley Chapel

Langen provided a listing of the acreage in each of the zones shown on page 15 of the Downtown Proposal: Zone I = 38 acres; Zone II = 132 acres; Zone III = 3 acres; Zone IV = 163 acres; Zone V = 189 acres; Zone VI = 17 acres; Zone VII = 51 acres and Zone VIII = 13 acres.

Images on page 21 show courtyards, live-work units, age restricted housing, and commercial facilities, as well as green space. The houses shown are on a quarter acre. The pinwheel homes shown are four units per acre. Hess noted rigid architectural design standards would come with the increase in density. Ormiston inquired regarding discussions the Committee had about areas that are already built out. Hess said this would also apply to upfits or rehabs. He noted if you look at the area behind the Harris Teeter, landscaping could be used to alleviate concerns and create barriers. Ormiston said a statement should be added on that. Mayor Horvath said from the Master Plan Committee work, shopping centers retrofit on average every fifteen years. Hess said at the Village Commons Phase II the barrier is a mound, and not very pretty. Standards can define how the structures will look and what type of barriers will be used. Carol Mullis noted that Aston met with the homeowners and that was what they wanted. Brotton asked if this is zone specific; with respect to Siler Church which is already there. Hess said the Committee did not discuss that. Ormiston said she is all for architectural standards; what is the process and how to get to specifics. Mayor Horvath said Langen and the Planning Board would do the legwork. Bradford noted on page 24 in the topic of "Space", that the word "considered" should be changed to "avoided" in the sentence on parking alternatives. Current zoning ordinance definitions were reviewed.

9. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO ZONING ORDINANCE FOR: ARTICLE 8 SIGNS RE-WRITE TEXT AMENDMENT; RELATED DEFINITIONS IN ARTICLE 2; AND ARTICLE 2 RECREATION/PARK RELATED DEFINITIONS

Langen noted that the size of temporary banner signs in Section 8.5-A. had been changed to twenty four square feet by Planning Board. Hess said he felt that some of the other square footages were ad hoc. Hess asked if internal signs were not banners; Langen replied that they are just signs stuck in the ground. Internal signs are not in the definitions. Bradford suggested we add to Section 8.5-K that "This does not include banner signs which require a temporary sign permit". Langen said sign sizes are a general conclusion by Planning Board, it is hard to be scientific and there is a whole range of allowable sizes in other municipalities. Ormiston noted, as discussed at the Advance, just sending the changes back to Planning Board is not working, we are going in circles, and she suggested we revisit the idea of an Ordinance Review Committee with Langen and a member of Planning Board and Council. We have been working on signs for six months. Bradford noted that is the nature of ordinances. Ormiston said items like definitions not being included had been noted previously. Carol Mullis said communications between Planning Board and Council are not going back and forth. Mayor Horvath said he agreed in principal we are spending too much time on these ordinance changes; also he had spotted a few things he is not comfortable with in the sign changes. Hess and Mayor Horvath recommended the signs text amendments be sent back to Planning Board. Ormiston asked Langen to make it very specific what the concerns are. Mayor Horvath asked Council members to send specific comments to Langen by the end of the week. Langen said he was trying not to be too comprehensive with definitions such as defining yard sale signs. Hess said it is better to be more detailed. Shirley Wilson from Planning Board said we have reviewed this over and over; and asked if discussion was held specifically with the Chairman, and maybe should be directed to all Planning Board members. Brotton suggested that it would be better to err on the side of more information in general. Article 8 Signs and the related definitions were sent back to Planning Board.

Article 2 Recreation/Park Related Definitions was discussed next. Langen said these terms can stand on their own; the definitions in Article 2 help clean up the uses in Article 5's Table of Uses. Bradford asked if the wording in the Article 2 definitions should be in line with the words in Section 9-1. Langen said he would change Article 9 to agree with Article 2, and Article 2 matches to the uses in the Table of Uses. Langen said he had taken the approach of writing good definitions and then specifying what is excluded. Bradford said motorized uses are excluded in passive recreation; is it assumed they are included in active recreation. It was noted that there may be an outdoor recreation facility that is not a park; it could be a private facility. Discussion of segways for police use and language on motorized uses was held. Ormiston suggested changes be sent to Langen and Planning Board. Bradford said we can adopt rules as needed for a public park, Langen noted private uses would also be covered by a CUP. Langen said Section 6.10.8 supplemental regulations would address specifics instead of these

definitions. Bradford said she was comfortable with the CUP process. Bradford made a motion to adopt the Article 2 definitions for Recreation uses, with the word “primarily” being removed in the definition of “Recreational Facility, Outdoor”. Ormiston seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The approved text is:

**ARTICLE 2
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THIS ORDINANCE**

Recreation, Active.

Recreation which is not passive recreation.

Passive Recreation, Passive.

~~Recreation activities that generally do not require a developed site or facilities. This generally includes such activities as hiking, horseback riding and picnicking.~~
Passive recreation is non-motorized activity which makes use of open space and natural amenities yet does not significantly impact the natural, cultural, scientific, or agricultural qualities of a site and requires only minimal visitor facilities and services directly related to safety. Passive recreation does not include organized/sponsored sporting activities, firearm-based activities or motorized uses.

Public Parks.

~~Recreational facilities owned by the public, or non-profit organizations.
Recreational facilities may include athletic fields, riding or jogging paths,
concession stands serving the recreational area, or tennis courts.~~

Recreation Center Facility, Indoor.

~~Permanent Ppublic or private health or exercise clubs, tennis or racquet ball courts, swimming pools, YMCA's, or YWCA's or similar uses which constitute where fifty percent (50%) or more of associated principal uses square footage and are is conducted within enclosed in buildings and are operated on a fee or membership basis primarily for the use of persons who do not reside on the same lot as that on which the recreational use is located. “Indoor recreation” structures may include accessory uses, such as snack bars, pro shops, and locker rooms, which are designed and intended primarily for the use of patrons of the principal recreational use. Indoor recreation facilities do not include facilities operated by homeowners’ associations for the exclusive use of homeowners’ association members and their guests. Indoor recreation facilities also do not include indoor firing ranges, theatrical/musical venues, or indoor sporting facilities which generate a simple majority of their income through sales of merchandise other than food and drink.~~

Recreational Facility, Outdoor.

Public or private outdoor recreation facilities ~~A tract of land, owned and operated by a public entity, designated and used by the general public for active and/or passive recreation, where fifty percent (50%) or more of associated principal use square footage is conducted primarily conducted outdoors. An example of such a facility shall include a public park.~~ The term shall not include the terms, "racetrack", "outdoor firing range", "stadiums", "amphitheaters", "amusement park", "baseball hitting ranges", "country club" or "golf course".

10. CALL FOR PUBLIC HEARING FOR MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2011 AT 7 PM
ON CHANGES TO ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 9.1.9 OFF-STREET
PARKING FOR PUBLIC OR PRIVATE ASSEMBLY AND/OR
RECREATION.

Bradford said this needs to be altered to reflect the language just passed; also regarding amphitheaters, there should be an exclusion for special events. If something occurs four or five times a year, it would go through a special event process rather than plan for the maximum capacity. She checked with other towns and this is what they do, because of impervious surfaces they try to limit it. Bradford suggested a trigger of more than X events might require parking requirements. Langen said we also need to address remote parking. Bradford said Indian Trail's ordinance addresses remote parking. Hess said we should consider remote or satellite parking, and might have provisions for safe access; he suggested this be kicked back to Planning Board. Bradford said Stallings' ordinance indicates maximum parking, and if you want more parking you have to go through an exception procedure; this relates to the stormwater impact. Langen noted these questions also applies to more than just parks, and if you look at Section 9.1 it addresses cooperative parking and remote parking; perhaps another use such as a school or Church might want to have an event and use remote parking. Bradford suggested separating active uses from passive uses versus events. Langen said he did try to do that by having language regarding trail uses. In the text amendment "organized/sponsored" will be changed to "active". Langen noted Planning Board did look at the numbers; he hesitated to give them new numbers when they were comfortable with the numbers they came up with. Hess said we need more latitude for how to have parking available. Bradford asked Langen to look at Matthew's ordinance also; she noted in Indian Trail their park of more than 150 acres is planned to have 150 parking spaces. Langen will also look at examples of passive parks. Langen said he applied the standards to Dogwood Park and it would require three to four hundred spaces, and Planning Board felt this was reasonable for the use. Hess said it may not be unreasonable if we can include remote parking for every day and special provisions for safety or busing. Langen said with remote parking in most ordinances they require you own it, or have a long term lease for the duration of the use; and you also need proper pedestrian connections. Hess said you won't get an easement to use others' parking. Bradford said Indian Trail has an open ended agreement for shared parking facilities. She also noted our suggested language requires one

space for 600 square feet of passive recreation, but Matthews requires one space per 10,000 square feet of passive recreation. Hess said lets kick this back to Planning Board. Mayor Horvath asked Council members to provide information and examples to Langen. Mayor Horvath noted Section 9.1.4 (b) needs to be addressed; it provides for remote cooperative parking. Brotton asked what the difference is between public and private uses, and could we have different requirements for each. Langen said you would start at the Table of Uses, and come up with definitions that match, and then come up with supplemental regulations. There will also be public/private partnerships and non-profits. Brotton felt the text was directed more at private uses. Carol Mullis noted Planning Board's concerns was that if the use is provided, then adequate parking should be provided. Bradford noted we are new at this, we should look to other towns, and if one space per 10,000 square feet works, we should look to them. Langen will take this text amendment back to Planning Board.

11. MUMPO PRESENTATION DATES – INCLUDING SIDEWALK FUNDING ALTERNATIVES

Bradford made a motion to have a special meeting on connectivity and funding on April 13, 2011 at 7 pm at Wesley Chapel United Methodist Church; Brotton seconded the motion. Our MUMPO representative Bob Cook will be present to discuss sidewalks and funding alternatives.

The motion passed unanimously.

A quorum of all committees may be present at the meeting, so notice will be given.

12. PARKS AND REC UPDATE INCLUDING WATER BASED RECREATION GRANT AND DOGWOOD PARK BUDGET

Bradford reported on the water based grant; a new map will be obtained. Ormiston asked if signing this Resolution obligates us to take the grant; Bradford assured her it does not. We could possibly apply \$100,000 for the land around the lake, and they might reimburse us for expenses already made. Another grant cycle occurs later this year; they will keep our application on file. Hess made a motion to approve Resolution 2011-05; Bradford seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Resolution 2011-05
Resolution to Apply for North Carolina Department of Natural Resources
Water Resources Development Project Grant
Wesley Chapel, North Carolina

WHEREAS, the Village of Wesley Chapel desires to build the proposed Dogwood Park, and

WHEREAS, 83% of Village respondents to the Council's Master Plan survey of 2007 indicated a strong preference for parks and recreation facilities in the Village, and

2011.03.14 minutes

WHEREAS, respondents to the Parks & Recreation Committee survey of 2009 indicated a strong preference for a fishing pond, walking trails, and other park amenities, and

WHEREAS, outdoor recreation promotes the health, wellness, and desirability of the entire community, and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Natural Resources offers matching grants for water based recreation opportunities,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- 1) The Village Council of Wesley Chapel requests the State of North Carolina to provide financial assistance to the Village of Wesley Chapel for Dogwood Park in the amount of \$186,059 or 50% percent of project construction cost, whichever is the lesser amount;
- 2) The Council assumes full obligation for payment of the balance of project costs;
- 3) The Council will obtain all necessary State and Federal permits;
- 4) The Council will comply with all applicable laws governing the award of contracts and the expenditure of public funds by local governments.
- 5) The Council will supervise construction of the project to assure compliance with permit conditions and to assure safe and proper construction according to approved plans and specifications;
- 6) The Council will obtain suitable spoil disposal areas as needed and all other easements or rights-of-way that may be necessary for the construction and operation of the project without cost or obligation to the State;
- 7) The Council will assure that the project is open for use by the public on an equal basis with no restrictions;
- 8) The Council will hold the State harmless from any damages that may result from the construction, operation and maintenance of the project;
- 9) The Council accepts responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the completed project.

Adopted by the Village of Wesley Chapel this 14th day of March, 2011.

Clerk to the Council

Mayor

Bradford reported there is a recycling bin grant from Coca-Cola; she checked with garbage companies and they will pick up if it is adjacent to the parking lot. Julie Brown reported on a partnership program at SPCC for recycling where the proceeds go to Habitat for Humanity. Bradford can apply for four to six bins and no outlay is required; Council consensus was to apply for the grant; she will send the grant application to Council members. Bradford also reported on the Carolina Thread Trail, the tentative path is through Wesley Chapel, and they would like to present the plan and get approval from Council, Parks and Rec and Planning Board. A public hearing will also be held on it.

The Dogwood Park budget was discussed next. Bradford noted adjustments had been made so that it nets out to fall within the budgeted amount, and Haden Stanziale made changes to numbers based on what they thought realistic costs would be. The total cost is \$1,515,165 less the fishing pier grant amount.

Bradford made a motion to adjust the costs in the PARTF grant for: overflow parking/ play field from \$40,000 to 30,000; site furnishings from \$12,000 to \$7,000; contingency from \$18,000 to \$19,262; planning and engineering from \$56,770 to \$60,674; the cost of the paved loop (\$85,000) was split to paved trail \$54,000 and accessible routes \$21,000; the entrance gates (\$2,000) and furnishings (\$10,000) were combined and reduced to site furnishings (\$7,000); parking lot/drive and wheel stops were combined into parking lot & drive; bathrooms (\$45,000) was split into water and sewer \$15,000, and rest room renovation \$30,000; and storm drain, erosion control and earthwork and clearing was combined to site preparation (\$35,000). Hess seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Hess made a motion to add the fishing pier for \$25,000 to the PARTF budget; Bradford seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Horvath noted that the swim club is being auctioned off on March 21, 2011.

13. ADVANCE RECAP/FOLLOW-UP

Mayor Horvath thanked everyone for their interaction and input at the Advance. Ormiston noted the space set up at the dinner did not work well; she also requested agendas be provided at each seat for both Friday and Saturday so the public could provide their input on items.

14. RECEIVE RESIGNATIONS FROM TWO FESTIVAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ONE SAFETY COMMITTEE MEMBER AND CONSIDER NEW APPOINTMENTS

Mayor Horvath noted Sharon Mainero and Butch Byrum had resigned from the Fall Heritage Festival Committee and Donna Pasciuta resigned from the Safety Committee. Mayor Horvath appointed Julie Brown to the Fall Heritage Festival Committee. Julie Brown said her eleven year old daughter was interested in joining the committee as a youth member; she helped with the pet contest last year and wants to take ownership of the pet contest. Issues like minimum age for committee membership, how many committees one person can be a member of,

and family members being on the same committee were brought up. Brotton asked if enough people were members of both Parks and Rec and the Festival Committee that attending one would create a quorum of another committee. There are three, so they don't yet constitute a quorum. The openings in the Festival and Safety Committees will be put on the website.

15. CONSIDER POSITION ON COUNTY TAX ASSESSMENT RE-VALUATION

Mayor Horvath reported re-valuations are required every eight years by state law, the last one was done on a four year cycle, and this year the Board of County Commissioners has already decided to go back to an eight year cycle. If the value of appraised property went down, they would have had to raise the tax rate. At the last re-valuation Wesley Chapel lowered our rate so we would be revenue neutral.

16. CALL FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUND BUDGET FOR MONDAY APRIL 11, 2011 AT 7 PM AT WESLEY CHAPEL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Bennett reported she had seen some discussion on the list serv indicating we might need a public hearing for the CIP budget, but she checked with the School of Government and none was required.

17. OTHER BUSINESS

Mayor Horvath suggested after the Advance he thought we might want to have a town hall meeting with questions and answers from the public periodically. Bradford reported Anytime Fitness offered to organize a 5K run in conjunction with our Festival; also she would like to send a letter to the local businesses regarding the two events coming up. Ormiston and Bradford will draft the letter. Ormiston reported the newsletter is in the mail, it is printed in color and looks great. Mayor Horvath reported the MUMPO meeting is Wednesday evening, and there is a controversial item on the Charlotte streetcar project. Generally if a project doesn't take away from other funding and the governing body (Charlotte) approved it, it is voted favorable, so he plans to vote for it.

18. COUNCIL COMMENTS - none

19. ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Bennett, Clerk

Mayor Brad Horvath