REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Mayor Pro Tem, Paul B. Woodson Jr., Presiding; Councilmen William (Bill) Burgin; William (Pete) Kennedy; Mark N. Lewis; City Manager, David W. Treme; City Attorney, F. Rivers Lawther, Jr.; and City Clerk, Myra B. Heard.

ABSENT: Mayor Susan W. Kluttz

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Pro Tem Woodson at 4:00 p.m. The invocation was given by Councilman Burgin.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Pro Tem Woodson led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States flag.

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Mayor Pro Tem Woodson recognized all visitors present.

RECOGNIZE STATEWIDE TITLE FOR THEIR SPONSORSHIP OF THE OVERTON ELEMENTARY/EAGLE HEIGHTS GREENWAY SECTION

Ms. Karen Wilkinson, Marketing and Community Relations Manager, announced that Salisbury Parks and Recreation has established a five (5) year partnership with Statewide Title to sponsor the Prescott section of the Greenway. Mayor Pro Tem Woodson presented a plaque of appreciation to Ms. Emily Harless and Ms. Allison Harrigan, who accepted it on behalf of Hap and Annette Roberts for Statewide Title. Mayor Pro Tem Woodson thanked Statewide Title for their outstanding support of the Salisbury Greenway.

RECOGNIZE RELAY FOR LIFE TEAM FOR THE CITY OF SALISBURY

Ms. Melissa Drye, Management Services, and Firefighter Chipper Thomas informed Council that the City of Salisbury’s Relay for Life Team raised $3,564.67 this year, which is above their $3,000 goal. Members of the Relay for Life Team are Ms. Melissa Drye, Ms. Linda Davis, Ms. Tammy Fike, Ms. Kelly King, Mr. Chipper Thom, Mr. Kenny Roberts, Mr. Chris Reed, Ms. Aggie Peninger, Ms. Melonie Thompson, Ms. Jewell Stokes and Ms. Beck Albrecht.

Mayor Pro Tem Woodson presented Mr. Thomas with two plaques for the Team’s First Place Site award and their First Place Bath Tub Race award and thanked them for their hard work.

PROCLAMATION

Mayor Pro Tem Woodson recognized Ms. Karen Wilkinson, Marketing and Community Relations Manager. Ms. Wilkinson, along with campers from the Parks and Recreation Day Camp, asked all citizens to celebrate July as Recreation and Parks Month in an effort to promote exercise and fitness. She noted that Parks and Recreation will have daily events throughout the month as part of the celebration. Mayor Pro Tem Woodson proclaimed the following:

RECREATION AND PARKS MONTH July, 2005

CONSENT AGENDA

(a) Minutes
Approve Minutes of the regular meeting of June 7, 2005.

(b) Group Development Site Plans

Approve the following Group Development Site Plans:
- G-08-05 - Mrs. Dora, 1815 East Innes Street
- G-04-99 - The Reserve, Old Mocksville Road

(c) Minor Plat S-03-05 - Timothy Deal

Approve minor plat S-03-05 for Timothy Deal to subdivide a 5.717 acre tract located at 2405 Old Concord Road into two (2) residential lots.

(d) Street Closing - West Bank Street

Approve closing West Bank Street from Grim Street to Messner Street Friday, June 10, 2005 from 9:00 a.m. until 12 Noon for the Salisbury-Rowan Community Service Council Summer Youth Employment Job Training Program.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson, voted AYE. (4-0)

GROUP DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN G-01-75 - SALISBURY HIGH SCHOOL

G-01-75 - Salisbury High School, 500 Lincolnton Road

Councilman Burgin indicated that he needed to be excused due to a conflict of interest.

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a motion to excuse Councilman Burgin. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson voted AYE (3-0)

(a) Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator, reviewed the site plan and aerial photographs of Salisbury High School and the proposed area in group development site plan G-01-75. He stated that this is a multi-phase project, with the first phase including the track and field and the subsequent phases addressing parking issues. He noted that this is an existing group development, therefore any changes must be approved by Council. Mr. Phillips reviewed the plan for the track and field which will be located adjacent to Thomas Street and Caldwell Street. He stated that it will have to meet all landscape requirements and there has been a recommendation from staff and the Planning Board to include a sidewalk along the south side of Thomas Street, beside the track. He informed Council that the Master Plan for Salisbury High School has been in place since before 1998 and the additions have been constructed as funds were raised. He stated that the track began construction in 2001 and noted that the contractor graded a slope of 2:1, which is the maximum slope allowed without other forms of remediation. Mr. Phillips stated that the people who will use the sidewalk are on the North Side across the street from the track.

Mr. Phillips reviewed additional photographs of the area and pointed out a steep bank that was created during the grading for the track that encroaches into the right-of-way for Thomas Street. He also reviewed the existing parking area along Lincolnton Road and the area proposed for parking on Lincolnton Road and Caldwell Street. He informed Council that the Planning Board unanimously approved the plan with the recommendation that the sidewalk be included on Thomas Street on the School-owned side of the property.

Councilman Lewis asked Mr. Pete Bogle, Ramsey, Burgin, Smith, Architects, how much it would cost to install the sidewalk on Thomas Street beside the track. Mr. Bogle informed Council that the Master Plan for Salisbury High School has been in place since before 1998 and the additions have been constructed as funds were raised. He stated that the track began construction in 2001 and noted that the contractor graded a slope of 2:1, which is the maximum slope allowed without other forms of remediation. Mr. Bogle stated that the people who will use the sidewalk are on the North side where two (2) churches are located. He informed Council that the problem with putting the sidewalk on the south side (adjacent to the track) is the large sloping bank. He stated that it will need approximately two hundred (200) feet of a five (5) to six (6) foot retaining wall with a guard rail along the entire length. He estimated the cost to be $28,000 - $30,000 in addition to the cost of the sidewalk. He noted that this side also has telephone poles in the right-of-way and there will be a security fence installed at the top of the property. He stated that his firm is in favor of sidewalks and supports the 2020 Plan, but they would like to put the sidewalk where it will best serve the people. Mr. Lewis asked about the type of fencing used for the security fence. Mr. Bogle responded that it will be a six (6) foot chain link fence, however, they will plant Burford Hollies to try to mask the fence.

Councilman Kennedy asked who would pay for the sidewalk if it was installed on the opposite side of the street. Mr. Bogle responded that it would still be Salisbury High School's expense and still be part of the project.

Mr. Melvin Barnhardt, 527 Lincolnton Road, stated that he has lived directly in front of the high school for fifty-three (53) years. He stated that he is interested in the parking lot on Lincolnton Road and noted that a back-up is created as people traveling in both directions on Lincolnton Road try to enter the lot. He stated that he did not think the parking lot entrance on Lincolnton Road will work and should be moved to Caldwell Street. Mr. Barnhardt commented that there are no parking signs on the street and visitors do not know where to park.

Mr. Bogle responded to Mr. Barnhardt’s concerns and noted that the new parking area will be for teachers only and will be designated as a one-way drive-through.
Mr. Lewis stated that the master plan for the school was created before Council required sidewalks and while Council has consistently upheld sidewalk requirements near the high school to provide safe places to walk, he felt this situation is a little different. He noted that the grade of the property will cause additional expense for the School System. He stated that because of the nature of the property he feels the proposal to move the sidewalk across the street for functional purposes is a good suggestion, although he is concerned about setting a precedent. He commented that in his opinion the sidewalk is best across the street from the track, but Council may want to establish a Council Committee to review. Mr. Lewis commented on the parking issue and noted that there is a natural conflict created when people try to enter the lot from both directions on Lincolnton Road and he is not sure there is a resolution to the problem. He added that few schools have efficient traffic patterns thirty (30) minutes before or after school starts and stops.

Councilman Kennedy stated that he thinks the sidewalk is the issue, as the parking lots seem to be in place. He commented that he thinks putting the sidewalk on the north side of Thomas Street is a better fit and people walking to church will not have to walk in the street. He stated that he can support putting the sidewalk on the north side.

Mayor Pro Tem Woodson stated that he agrees that the slope of the property looks similar to an amphitheater and he is surprised that the sidewalk can be installed for $28,000-$30,000. He agreed that putting the sidewalk on the opposite side of Thomas Street is acceptable. He added that he feels it is Council’s job to be flexible.

Mr. Lewis commented that he feels the sidewalk should be extended the short distance to connect with the sidewalk at Hood Seminary.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a motion to adopt G-01-75 as presented with the sidewalks on the north side of Thomas Street to continue from Caldwell Street down to the perpendicular sidewalk at Hood Seminary. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion stating that this is also an issue of tax dollars and since the schools are supported by tax dollars he would not want them to have to pay additional dollars. Messrs. Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson voted AYE. (3-0)

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a motion to bring Councilman Burgin back. Mr. Kennedy seconded. Messrs. Kennedy, Lewis and Woodson voted AYE (3-0)

GROUP DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN G-03-05 - GREYSTONE VILLAGE

G-03-05 - Greystone Village, 3000 Block of West Innes Street

(a) Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator, reviewed the site plan and aerial photographs of the proposed development located in the 3000 block of West Innes Street. He noted that the property is zoned R-6AS, which is a special multi-family district. He explained that the conditions put on the property during the rezoning were that there could be a maximum of one hundred ninety-five (195) condominiums, and of the twenty-nine (29) acres, twenty-five (25) percent of it be left for common open space. Mr. Phillips informed Council that the developer is proposing one hundred sixty-six (166) units, less than the allowable maximum, and also includes the twenty-five (25) percent open space as requested.

Mr. Phillips stated that the developer is extending water along Innes Street to the development. He noted that the development is not considered a subdivision, but similar to an apartment complex. The streets will be private, as well as the water and sewer system. He noted that the developer is meeting the landscape requirements, including a buffer around the property. Additional parking for recreational vehicles will also be provided. Mr. Phillips stated that the developer, at the request of the fire department, is also considering no parking along the streets. He explained that each unit will have a double driveway with the potential for four (4) parking spaces per unit, pointing out that the City only requires two (2) spaces.

Mr. Phillips stated that when the plan was reviewed by the Planning Board there were comments that although the complex meets the zoning requirements it is not consistent with the 2020 Vision, and while staff would like to see additional amenities included, these can not be required. He informed Council that the Planning Board recommended approval of the site by a vote of 7-2, contingent upon the resolution of a utility issue. He explained that under the Salisbury-Rowan Utility extension policy it requires both water and sewer be extended along the length of the property. The developer has extended water but proposes to extend the sewer line from North Hills Christian School into a private sewer system in the complex, while providing a utility easement along the length of the property. He noted that the developer feels this meets the intent of Policy by reserving the property for future sewer expansion.

Mr. Phillips informed Council that during discussions with the Planning Board there were comments concerning the requirement for internal sidewalks and a better use of the open space. Mr. Lewis noted that Mr. Phillips indicated these issues could not be required. Mr. Phillips stated that these issues could be recommended but since this is not considered a subdivision it does not fall under the same requirements. He added that the Ordinance for this type of development does not require open space, but the developer was willing to do this. Mr. Lewis noted that the Ordinance allows Council to approve, deny or modify and he feels this suggests Council can modify the site plan. Mr. Phillips agreed with Mr. Lewis.

(b) Mayor Pro Tem Woodson opened the floor to receive public comments.

Mr. Rodney Queen, 101 Polo Drive, stated that he is the developer of this project and he feels the requirement for a sewer line running the length of the property is a burden in this particular area. He stated that he feels it is highly unlikely that this sewer line would ever be used, however if this should happen he has extended a thirty (30) foot sewer easement along the full length of the property. Mr. Queen stated that when he sought rezoning of this property he offered twenty-five (25) percent open space because he knew he did not want to develop a high-density project. He noted that this development is geared toward the retirement community and he thinks Council will feel he has done a great job when it is completed. He stated that he confirmed with City staff that the infrastructure for condominiums in R-6A is the same as for apartments, which means that the infrastructure is privately owned and maintained by the owner’s association. He stated that the streets will be private but they will be built to City standards and pointed out that sidewalks are not required in R-6A zoning. He added that he followed the Ordinance to the letter and asked for Council’s support for approval.
There being no one else to speak to Council, Mayor Pro Tem Woodson closed the public comment session.

Mr. Matt Bernhardt, Assistant City Manager for Utilities, stated that Salisbury-Rowan Utilities (SRU) is mindful of the number of additional customers this development would bring to the system, but there are still concerns about interconnectivity. He stated that SRU’s policy has worked well to require developers to extend sewer from property line to property line so that future developments can connect. He noted that it is the private internal sewer system for Mr. Queen’s development that makes the easement along the property necessary. Mr. Bernhardt commented that if some portion, or all, of Mr. Queen’s system were public it would be simple to connect and stub-out to the property line making the easement for the line below unnecessary. Councilman Lewis asked how long the SRU policy had been in place. Mr. Bernhardt responded that it predates his employment with the City. He pointed out that this development is in a potential growth area and that having the sewer line will open it up for future development.

Councilman Burgin noted that he has spoken with Mr. Queen and the utility staff and he feels they have yet to reach an agreement for how to deal with the sewer line. Mr. Burgin noted that in terms of sidewalks and open space, the City, as a community, is still trying to determine what it means and what is wanted. He suggested a Council Committee to review the issues for this development to find a solution suitable for everyone involved. He pointed out that the new Code will have more definition regarding open space and sidewalk and perhaps those issues can be further addressed in the future.

Councilman Burgin agreed with Mr. Burgin adding he felt it is a worthwhile project and would also serve on the Committee.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Burgin and Mr. Kennedy if they felt the sidewalk issue is off of the table for this review. Mr. Burgin responded that in looking at priorities he feels the water and sewer is more important at this point. Mr. Lewis commented that if a sidewalk is required the cars parked in the driveways will block it. He added that there needs to be predictability in the City's Ordinances and this project has been designed for the current Ordinance.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a motion to refer G-03-05 to a Committee comprised of Mr. Burgin and Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson voted AYE. (4-0)

**AUTHORIZE THE DONATION OF A 1988 MACK/GRUMMAN FIRE TANKER TO ROWAN COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES**

Mr. Dewey Peck, Purchasing Manager, and Fire Chief Bob Parnell spoke to Council concerning a 1988 fire tanker that has been retired from service. Mr. Peck stated that this is a three thousand (3,000) gallon unit that has been scheduled for replacement. Rowan County has indicated they have a use for the unit to serve as a foam supplier for the Rowan County Airport. Chief Parnell commented that the City is part of the County Emergency Response System and will still derive benefit from the truck.

Councilman Burgin asked if the County will modify the unit. Chief Parnell responded that it will not require a lot of modification but will be stripped of it current equipment.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a motion to adopt the Resolution declaring the 1988 Mack/Grumman tanker/pumper surplus and direct its transfer to the Rowan County Emergency Services for public use. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson voted AYE. (4-0)

**RESOLUTION DECLARING A 1988 MACK/GRUMMAN FIRE TANKER/PUMPER SURPLUS AND DIRECTING ITS TRANSFER TO ROWAN COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES FOR PUBLIC USE.**

(The above Resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book No. 12, Page No. 22, and is known as Resolution No. 2005-18.)

Mr. Burgin commented that the City is part of the County and he feels this is a wonderful way for the City to gain use of something that would have been declared surplus.

**REPORT REGARDING ANNUAL SURPLUS SALE**

Mr. Dewey Peck, Purchasing Manager, informed Council that the annual surplus sale was held on June 3, 2005 and was the second largest ever held, raising $75,422.50. He stated that there will be $70,001.91 put back into the City’s funds. $52,976.91 will go back to the General Fund, $15,175.00 into the Water/Sewer Fund, and $1,850.00 into the Transit Fund.

Mr. Peck noted that the City pays a six (6) percent auctioneer’s fee while most auctioneers request eight (8) to ten (10) percent, and he feels the City is getting a very good deal.

**SUMMIT PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WATER AND SEWER EXTENSION PROJECT**

Mr. Matt Bernhardt, Assistant City Manager for Utilities, stated that this project represents a partnership between Salisbury-Rowan Utilities (SRU) and the Rowan-Salisbury School System for the Summit Park Elementary School water and sewer extension. He explained that it will extend approximately five hundred (500) linear feet of six (6) inch water main and one thousand one hundred (1,100) feet of eight (8) inch sewer main. Mr. Bernhardt noted that this project will be funded one hundred (100) percent by the School System.

Councilman Burgin asked if this will help with the dead-end in Summit Park. Mr. Bernhardt responded that it will be a benefit to have additional use in that area.
He noted that the Chief Parnell the minimum four (4) person staff standard for the Station 50 is opened. He also reviewed response time for structure fires assignment within an eight minute response time and/or the initial full alarm in Chapter 4. The City of Salisbury’s average response time for structure fires is 4.9 minutes; however, Chief Parnell noted that the response time requirement of four (4) minutes should be met when Station 50 is opened. He also reviewed page 12 of the SAFER grant program guidance which states, “Applicants who will come into compliance with the minimum four (4) person staff standard for the first arriving engine or vehicle capable of initiating suppression activities with the fewest requested additional personnel will receive higher consideration than applicants seeking a larger number of additional personnel in order to comply.”

Chief Parnell explained what it would mean for the City of Salisbury if awarded a SAFER Grant:

- $1,228,146 – Cost to the City for six (6) firefighters for five (5) years including benefits and merit
- $990,108 – Cost to the City for nine (9) firefighters with SAFER Grant

He noted that the City could hire nine (9) firefighters instead of the six (6) approved for Station 50 at a savings of $238,038 over five (5) years if
Salisbury is awarded the SAFER grant. He stated that he projects that nine (9) firefighters will put Salisbury in compliance with NFPA 1710 ninety (90) percent of the time. Chief Parnell pointed out that the six (6) firefighters that have been approved for Station 50 will not put Salisbury in compliance as the manning average will remain at three (3) firefighters for the first arriving company.

Chief Parnell indicated that nine (9) firefighters would increase the City's ability to meet ISO manning requirements for a Class 2 rating. The six (6) firefighters that are now approved are projected to put the City at the minimum level for the ISO Class 2 rating. He noted that the City would receive additional points for the three (3) additional firefighters. He stated that the six (6) firefighters approved for Station 50 are the minimum amount required to operate the new station and by having the positions funded through the Grant it would save additional funds later as it would put the City in a better position for compliance for future annexations and growth by having “added capacity” for future growth. Chief Parnell stated that most importantly, having nine (9) firefighters will increase the safety factor for fellow firefighters and citizens by increasing the number of personnel responding to an emergency.

City Manager David Treme indicated that this is a real opportunity to provide for the future growth and development of the City. He applauded the Fire Department, Human Resources, and Management Services for seeking this opportunity to maintain the City’s Class 2 rating and to provide for future growth. He added that if awarded the grant the savings from personnel can be used to help with equipment needs, noting that this is the best chance to accomplish City Council’s goals at the least expense.

Thereupon, Mr. Burgin made a motion to authorize the signing by the Mayor of the grant proposal for this particular SAFER project. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson voted AYE. (4-0)

**BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

- **Zoning Board of Adjustment**

  This item was delayed until the next meeting.

**COMMENTS FROM THE CITY MANAGER**

(a) **Planning Board Recommendations**

  Council received the Planning Board recommendations and comments from their June 14, 2005 meeting.

(b) **Presentation of Idle Policy**

  Mr. Ted Phillips, Fleet Division Manager, reviewed an Idle Policy that has been adopted by the City. He noted that staff researched idle policies for other cities to write the policy for Salisbury in an effort to provide for cleaner air, reduce fuel consumption, and to extend the life of the City’s equipment. Mr. Phillips stated that during research staff found that diesel trucks burn one (1) gallon to five (5) quarts per hour when idling, where Police Cars only burn one pint an hour.

  City Manager David Treme stated that his has been included in the Personnel Policy but he wanted to share it with Council because of concerns with the cost of fuel.

  Councilman Burgin commented that the City is setting a leadership precedence which demonstrates to the public a trend that needs attention and hopefully others will address it within their personnel policies.

(c) **Temporary Loan to Transit Fund**

  Management Services Director John Sofley informed Council that the Transit Fund is primarily funded through Federal and State grants. The City must file for reimbursements after expense is incurred. He noted that the City has an outstanding receivable it hopes to receive prior to June 30; however, the State occasionally holds reimbursements past June 30. He asked Council to approve a temporary loan from the General Fund to the Transit Fund of up to $40,000, if needed, until the reimbursement is paid by the State.

  Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a motion to approve the transfer. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Woodson voted AYE. (4-0)

**MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) **City Water**

  Mayor Pro Tem Woodson commented on an email from Assistant City Manager for Utilities Matt Bernhardt noting an article that City water contains fluoride and many children and adults are not getting the fluoride they need when they drink bottled water.

(b) **Appropriation for Rowan Business Alliance**
Mayor Pro Tem Woodson clarified that the City approved $5,000 as part of a $50,000 project for credit counseling services provided by the Rowan Business Alliance. He noted that the Salisbury Post reported Council approved $50,000 but it was only $5,000.

(c) Bicycle Trails

Mayor Pro Tem Woodson stated that he has received several requests for bicycle trails in conjunction with the Greenway.

(d) Freedman’s Cemetery Groundbreaking

Councilman Bill Burgin noted that he attended the groundbreaking ceremony for the Freedman’s Cemetery on June 19, 2005, and the project is now well underway. He stated that it was a great recognition and appreciation for the unity and diversity in the community.

(e) Planning Board Meetings

Councilman Kennedy commented that there have been comments from the Planning Board regarding lack of activity and noted that since the City is in the process of rewriting the Ordinance they may want to consider meeting only once a month.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Burgin, seconded by Mr. Lewis. All council members agreed unanimously to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
City Clerk