

REGULAR MEETING CITY COUNCIL

July 13, 2020

The City Council of the City of Albemarle met in a regular session on Monday, July 13, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Mayor Ronnie Michael presided, and the following Councilmembers were present, to-wit: Mayor Pro Tempore Martha Sue Hall, Bill Aldridge; Chris Bramlett; Martha E. Hughes; Dexter Townsend; Chris Whitley; and Shirley E. Lowder.

Mayor Michael called the meeting to order.

The Mayor gave the invocation.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Aldridge, unanimously carried, the minutes from the June 15, 2020 regular and closed meetings as submitted were approved.

The Mayor announced that due to the number of public hearings related to a new subdivision tonight, there is an overflow room to accommodate those wishing to speak. He asked that members of the public once they speak to move to the hallway or the overflow room in order to provide space in Council Chambers for others to speak.

The Mayor called on Planning and Development Services Director Kevin Robinson to provide an overview of the public hearings for the members of the public attending this evening for these agenda items. Mr. Robinson noted the following:

- The first hearing is for private developer Carolina Land Development LLC to request parcels of land to be annexed into the City of Albemarle corporate limits. This will include a legislative hearing where the public will be able to speak for or against the request for annexation of land. This request comes first because if City Council does not approve this request, all of the other public hearings will not occur.
- The second hearing is for rezoning the annexed property from R-20 to R-10 to include in the subdivision plat. This will include a legislative hearing where the public will be able to speak for or against the request for rezoning.
- The third hearing will be quasi-judicial, where only parties with interest (standing) will be permitted to speak under oath. This hearing is associated with a request by the aforementioned developer for a conditional use permit for a cluster subdivision. Cluster subdivisions have specific standards to be upheld as part of a conditional use permit request.
- The final hearing will be associated with a request for approval for a subdivision plat. This would be an administrative hearing where only Staff and Council would be permitted to speak.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ordinance 20-18 – To Consider Application Request for Annexation 20-01 of 40 Acres off Morgan Road

Applicants Michael Sandy and Carolina Development Services, LLC have submitted for petition of 40 acres across two tax parcels off of Morgan Road to annex into the corporate limits of the City of Albemarle for construction of a new cluster subdivision. Planning and Development Services Director Kevin Robinson presented an overview of the annexation request.

The Mayor called for the public hearing to be opened. The following members of the public came in front of Council to speak for or against the annexation request:

- Kim Faulkner, residing at 555 Marlbrook Drive, spoke against the annexation. She lives at the back side of the proposed subdivision. There is a dead end there at the end of Marlbrook Drive, and she does not want it connected to the proposed new subdivision. She lives in a nice, older neighborhood and believes that if the dead end opens up to connect to the new subdivision there would be a large increase in traffic flow through her neighborhood. She understands that as part of the new subdivision design a temporary opening of the dead end part of Marlbrook is required for emergency egress, but she would request that it be closed back up after the appropriate access roads are developed for the subdivision.
- Steven Story, residing at 28775 Little Bear Road, is against the annexation. He owns land along one of the subdivision property lines. He bought his land in order to recreate, and he is concerned that if the subdivision was built as per the plat map presented, future residents could end up trespassing on his property. He would not want people walking there.
- Terry Jones, residing at 850 Brevard Drive, spoke against the annexation. He lives at the corner of Brevard and Marlbrook in an older subdivision of 35 lots only. The subdivision he lives in designed the dead end street 40 years ago with the expectation that there would not be high volume traffic. He moved there because of the low density and the set up of the subdivision. He does not want construction vehicles going through there. He estimated that if 70 houses were built in the proposed subdivision that would equate to roughly 163 vehicles added to neighborhood traffic flow. He also noted that by constructing cluster subdivisions, it would take away opportunity for the land to be developed by businesses, and it is business which contributes more tax revenue than households. He was also wondering what effect the proposed subdivision would have on nearby schools – would they have the resources to handle children of families from 255 extra homes? The City needs businesses not homes. He requested that his neighborhood be left as it is.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Townsend, seconded by Councilmember Hall, unanimously carried, Council closed the public hearing.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Bramlett, seconded by Councilmember Hughes, unanimously carried, Council approved Ordinance 20-18 as follows:

(Ordinance 20-18 – To Approve Annexation 20-01 of 40 acres off Morgan Road)

Ordinance 20-19 – ZMA-20-04 to Consider Initial Zoning of Morgan Road Property

This is a request by Carolina Development Services, LLC for an initial zoning from County R-20 to City R-10 of 40.66 acres of tax records 28798 and portions of 6462 as shown in preliminary plat prepared by Dent H. Turner, Jr. Mr. Robinson provided a summary of the rezoning request to Council.

The location of the property in question is south of Morgan Road. The petitioner is requesting rezoning 40.66 acres that is currently R-20 county to R-10 residential as part of a subdivision plat. In its June meeting the Planning and Zoning Board unanimously approved the rezoning request.

The Mayor called for the public hearing to be opened. The following members of the public came in front of Council to speak for or against the rezoning request:

- Kim Faulkner, residing at 555 Marlbrook Drive, spoke against the rezoning request. She compared the proposed new subdivision, at 3-4 lots per acre in density, to her subdivision, Windsor Hills, which only constructed 35-38 houses for the entire subdivision with each lot about .5 acres. If a new subdivision with that many houses is going to be connected to her neighborhood, the resulting effect would make her neighborhood unliveable. Regarding the dead end on Marlbrook Drive, she requested that Council consider stubbing out that dead end temporarily as needed for the initial construction of the subdivision, but close it back off when construction is complete.
- Steven Story, residing at 28775 Little Bear Road, is against the rezoning. He requested that the City not connect the proposed subdivision with Windsor Hills.
- David Farmer, owner of one of the properties to be included in the proposed subdivision, is in support of the rezoning. He believes that the proposed subdivision will build efficient homes on manageable lots. His brother, who co-owns the property with him, also is in support of the rezoning of their land for future use as a subdivision.
- Gary Stewart, a lawyer representing the Farmer family, spoke in favor of the rezoning. He agrees with the proposed density of the subdivision with smaller lots. He noted that in the region, such as in Charlotte, there is a demand for this kind of housing development. It represents a second opportunity for homes to be built in Stanly County, which he predicts will see an influx of people looking for homes as industry relocates or develops here.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Townsend, unanimously carried, Council closed the public hearing.

Council discussed the following:

- For Brevard and Marlbrook Streets what is that zoned? That is zoned R-10.
- Is there a map overlay? What will the entire subdivision look like? Although there is no map overlay a map with the entire subdivision was displayed. Some of the parcels are already part of the City, and some of it was just annexed.
- Does Carolina Development Services, LLC own all of the parcels near Highway 52? Most of it but not all.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Townsend, unanimously carried, Council approved Ordinance 20-19 as follows:

(Ordinance 20-19 – ZMA-20-04 to Consider Initial Zoning of Morgan Road Property to R-10 Single Family Residential)

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Townsend, unanimously carried, Council approved the rezoning request with the following Statement of Zoning Consistency with Adopted Plan:

The Albemarle City Council finds the action to amend the City's Zoning Map of 40.66 acres of tax records 28798 and portions of 6462 from County R-20 to R-10/Single-Family Residential District to be consistent with the adopted 2028 Land Use Plan. The 2028 Land Use Plan calls for general residential on the land of interest. The City's R-10 zone will assist the lands of interest reach their intended goal of general residential and will achieve the public interest.

Consider Conditional Use Permit 20-02 for Morgan Street/Ridge Cluster Subdivision

This quasi-judicial public hearing is for a request for a conditional use permit CUP20-02 based on a request by Carolina Development Services LLC for a Cluster Subdivision of 255 lots off of Morgan Road (Tax Record Numbers 28797 (part), 28798, 6462 (part), 32971, 32951 (part), 139386, and 31804).

The Mayor swore in Michael Sandy and Andrew Eagle to provide testimony to Council related to this request.

Planning and Development Services Director Kevin Robinson summarized the conditional use permit request and Staff analysis. This request is for a cluster subdivision to be named Morgan Hills. The lots will conform to the cluster ordinance, and leftover space will be used as open space (i.e. walking trails, a larger park, etc.). Mayor Pro Tem Hall asked if there was only one way into the subdivision given the testimony received. Councilmember Aldridge added: is there an alternative plan for the proposed Windsor Hills entrance? Are there any other entrances proposed for the subdivision? Mr. Robinson stated that per the Code of Ordinances for subdivisions, there must be multiple entrances/exits to connect to other City streets. Other things could be done to mitigate traffic flow to the second entrance by Marlbrook.

Continuing with the conditional use permit request summary, Mr. Robinson noted that per NCDOT there are on-site and off-site improvements required in terms of access roads (i.e., turn lanes from subdivision onto Morgan Road), but in general NCDOT was amenable with the development of the proposed subdivision. There also is expert testimony available via a letter of support from a local real estate agent, which has been entered into evidentiary evidence.

Per the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and staff analysis, there are staff concerns about local traffic in the neighborhood with the construction of the cluster subdivision, but since less than one-half of the 600 units approved for the subdivision are currently being considered for development, staff

is amenable to the current request. The 600 total unit request is present in order to lock in place the ability to build future units.

Councilmember Townsend asked for clarification if the second access road is being recommended due to concerns about access to the site and access to Windsor Hills. Mr. Robinson replied that this is partly the reason. Per NCDOT's Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) study, turn lanes would be required to be installed to access Morgan Road. Mayor Pro Tem Hall asked if the TIA study (dated this year) is the document Mr. Robinson was referring to, not the one done for phase I subdivision consideration in 2019. That would be a question for the engineer to answer. She also wanted to clarify the source of staff analyses and recommendations. Mr. Robinson noted that there were staff recommendations in the CUP application, but also there is a separate staff recommendation document that he will go over with Council later in the presentation.

Staff are recommending the following additional conditions to be considered by Council:

- HOA covenants shall be amended to include clauses dedicating open space areas permanently and prohibiting their future development for anything other than recreational or similar functions in service of the neighborhood. This shall include restrictive easements of the same effect be placed on said properties in the event of sale or abandonment by the development or association.
- Amendments to sections 2.1, 2.5 and elsewhere in the covenants and restrictions document to include required city approval of final plat amendments for any changes by the developer or association to property lines, boundary changes and/or removal of designated common areas.
- Per the agreement of the applicant HOA covenants shall include a clause granting the City of Albemarle the option to assume ownership and maintenance of the southwestern most tract of open space as a public, passive use park once the 200th lot has been built upon.
- Plans shall include statements and typical location on lots of parking spaces, drives, any walls or fences, proposed approximate location and dimensions of typical residences within building envelope, planting areas, and statements for planned erosion and sedimentation control on site.
- Statement from DOT referencing and approving the recommendation of the updated TIA and the phasing of DOT required improvements. This shall conform to each final plat submitted.
- Morgan Ridge Road will be the primary access for this development, handling approximately 75% of traffic from the entire development. The intersection of Morgan Ridge Road and Morgan Rd, labeled Access A in the TIA, is expected to see upwards of 4,000 vehicle trips per day and between 156 and 240 vehicles per hours during peak times of day as currently proposed once this and future phases are constructed. While Morgan Rd is equipped to handle this increased traffic, Staff is concerned this will create a larger amount of both congestion and noise for residents near this intersection and far exceeds the normal vehicular activity common to most residential neighborhoods in Albemarle. While turn lanes required by DOT will also help, given the tight knit nature of this development, the increased focus on pedestrian accessibility and reduced congestion within the neighborhood, this development should be more in line with typical street networks seen throughout Albemarle neighborhoods. Staff highly recommends that an additional vehicular access point on Morgan Rd be required on this preliminary plat and spaced evenly along Morgan Rd with proposed and anticipated future access points to provide for dispersal of vehicles as they enter and exit the development to prevent any one area from becoming too heavily trafficked. Alternatively, that the applicant

make a formal agreement with the City that the stub out be extended to Highway 52 prior to future subdivision by the developer on adjacent property, in the immediate vicinity and/or any re-subdivision constituting a 256th lot.

- In order to minimize impacts on and preserve the quiet nature of the adjacent neighborhood both during construction and afterwards, Staff would recommend against grading adjacent to or on adjacent existing lots and preserving at least 15' of existing vegetation as a buffer and installing a minimum Type II buffer as provided for in the zoning ordinance where none exists.

Councilmember Bramlett asked if the Planning and Zoning Board approved staff's recommendations. Mr. Robinson confirmed that they did in their last meeting.

The Mayor called for any members of the public with standing to come forward to provide their comments. He also asked Council members if there were any conflicts of interest or *ex parte* communications with the applicant to note. Mayor Pro Tem Hall noted that she did in fact speak with the applicant in the last few months via a phone call, but that she refused to discuss any aspects related to the proposed subdivision with him. Other Councilmembers noted that they also received calls from the applicant but did not discuss any aspect of the proposed subdivision with him. The Mayor asked the City Attorney Britt Burch if these statements from Council were adequate in meeting the statutory requirements in order to proceed with the quasi-judicial hearing. Ms. Burch noted that as long as all elements of today's hearing were not discussed beforehand with the applicant it would be ok to proceed.

Mr. Michael Sandy, President of Carolina Development Services LLC, gave a prepared presentation to Council and answered questions. The current subdivision request will produce 255 lots with 46 acres of open space. There will be community features added as part of the open space development. This proposed subdivision includes improvements from the phase I design approved by Council last year. They will build a stub out to Highway 52 to disperse neighborhood traffic. Buffers will be installed to minimize effects of noise. An engineering study was done as part of subdivision planning. Natural features would be developed, such as walking trails for example.

Councilmember Townsend asked what the estimated real estate property tax rate would be for these homes. Mr. Sandy replied that at an estimated 250 lots, the City could take in \$320,000 in property taxes annually.

Councilmember Bramlett asked why is the current subdivision request 255 homes but overall 600 homes in the subdivision design? Mr. Sandy replied that the overall subdivision called for 600 homes for possible future development, but that the current request in front of Council would be for development of 255 homes at this time. Mr. Sandy referred to a support letter offering a real estate analysis by Mr. C. Lee Allen, Jr., a local real estate agent. The Mayor asked if this letter was being submitted as testimony, and Mr. Sandy replied yes.

Mr. Sandy continued his presentation. He noted that there will be an open space near the main entrance of the subdivision which will be used as community space. Possible ideas for this space could be handicapped parking, or a dog park. A question was asked about whether there could be foot access to the proposed community feature instead of future residents having to navigate the entire subdivision to gain access to this space. Mr. Sandy replied that this could be worked into the design.

The Mayor asked Mr. Sandy if all recommendations by NCDOT in the Traffic Analysis Impact study have been addressed in the materials in front of Council. Mr. Sandy answered yes they have been included. A question was asked about the approximate distance of the proposed stub out to Highway 52. The stub out would be about 900 feet.

Mayor Pro Tem Hall asked about the proposed setbacks for the lots. Are they conditional for the cluster subdivision? Planning and Development Services Director Kevin Robinson replied that staff felt that since the subdivision was configuring proportionally smaller lots, the proportional reduction in the setbacks was ok.

Mr. Robinson fielded a question about the Marlbrook stub out. What would be the use of the stub out, and would it finally be paved? The stub out at the dead end of Marlbrook would be gravel only during construction of the first 255 units as an emergency access road. After 300 homes are built then a second access road would have to be opened for multiple access points.

Mr. Andrew Eagle, the applicant's engineer, came in front of Council to provide testimony on the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) study. Mr. Eagle stated that the TIA was done in full cooperation with NCDOT. Per the study, for Morgan Road, for a single driveway no more than 3 to 4 vehicles could be parked there, which was the estimate used to consider traffic flow in the area. Was the TIA just a traffic analysis? Mr. Eagle replied yes.

The Mayor asked the civil engineers who worked with Carolina Development Services LLC on this proposed subdivision to come in front of Council. Mr. Sam Smith and Ms. Heather Reynolds with Chambers Engineering were sworn in. The Mayor confirmed that they were hired to address water and sewer configurations. They responded yes.

The Mayor and Council members asked a variety of questions posed to the civil engineers. The Mayor asked if the proposed lots would have gravity feed water and sewer lines. The engineers said that all proposed lots would have this configuration. Would the pump station feed back on the sewer line? The gravity sewer lines would be 12' long, and the pump station was set to the lowest elevation possible. How would the proposed lines compare to the existing ones? They would be just below the existing lines. Is there a blue line issue? An environmental engineer checked that out and confirmed that water and sewer lines would not impact nearby streams. Will the electric lines be underground? Yes they will.

The discussion shifted to access road requirements/needs. Council, Mr. Robinson and Mr. Sandy all participated in the discussion, the main themes of which were:

- What if the applicant does not get past 255 houses constructed – would that mean that there would only be 1 entrance? The TIA reflects proposed access. For the access to Highway 52, the Farmer family is still settling, so it's not a done deal to guarantee access there. Per Mr. Sandy, they won't develop beyond 255 homes until a new access road is added.
- Per the maps it appears as though there is proposed access via Morgan Road, which might become an issue. Is it possible to ask for additional access points? Yes – the Phase III condition would be to have an access road leading to Highway 52.

The Mayor asked if there were any more members of the public with standing who would like to speak. Mr. Arthur Walters, a part owner of a masonry materials business, was sworn in. Mr. Walters spoke in favor of the proposed cluster subdivision. He stated that the City needs more businesses over in that area. He himself would be interested in moving his jalopy restoration/landscaping business over that way if it was developed.

The Mayor called for a motion to close the hearing when no other members of the public appeared to speak. Upon a motion by Councilmember Townsend, seconded by Councilmember Aldridge, unanimously carried, the public hearing was closed.

The Mayor called for Council to make a motion for the following findings of fact/conditions required to approve the conditional use permit:

- That the use will not materially endanger the public health or safety if located where proposed and developed according to the plan as submitted and approved. After Council discussion, it was decided that no additional conditions were required for this finding of fact.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Townsend, seconded by Councilmember Hall, unanimously carried, Council approved the finding for this condition.

- That the use meets all required conditions and specifications. After discussion with Mr. Robinson, Council decided to add the following conditions submitted by the Planning and Development Services Department and approved by the Planning and Zoning Board:
 - HOA covenants shall be amended to include clauses dedicating open space areas permanently and prohibiting their future development for anything other than recreational or similar functions in service of the neighborhood. This shall include restrictive easements of the same effect be placed on said properties in the event of sale or abandonment by the development or association.
 - Amendments to sections 2.1, 2.5 and elsewhere in the covenants and restrictions document to include required city approval of final plat amendments for any changes by the developer or association to property lines, boundary changes and/or removal of designated common areas.
 - Plans shall include statements and typical location on lots of parking spaces, drives, any walls or fences, proposed approximate location and dimensions of typical residences within building envelope, planting areas, and statements for planned erosion and sedimentation control on site.
 - Statement from DOT referencing and approving the recommendation of the updated TIA and the phasing of DOT required improvements. This shall conform to each final plat submitted.

Before calling for a motion, the Mayor asked Mr. Sandy if he was ok with these conditions. Mr. Sandy replied he was ok with them.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hughes, seconded by Councilmember Hall, unanimously carried, Council approved, with additional conditions as noted above, the finding for this condition.

- That the use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property, or that the use is a public necessity. After Council discussion, it was decided that no additional conditions were required for this finding of fact.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Whitley, seconded by Councilmember Bramlett, unanimously carried, Council approved the finding for this condition.

- That the proposed use is in harmony with adjacent uses in terms of location, scale, site design, hours of operation and operating characteristics. This finding of fact prompted discussion among Council, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Sandy around Planning and Development Service's condition (noted above) about access road(s) leading to Morgan Road and a potential third access road requirement. Discussion included:
 - Is Planning and Development Service's condition based on building code requirements? Per the City's streets ordinance, 2 access roads are required after 15 homes, and per the fire code, 2 access roads are required after 30 homes.
 - The Mayor asked Mr. Sandy if he had issues with this condition. Mr. Sandy replied by promising that a third access road be built after 255 homes are built. Mr. Robinson countered by asking how would the City know if this would actually happen. The Mayor replied that this would be up to a future Council to consider this.
 - Councilmember Bramlett stated that a third entrance requirement is ridiculous. Mayor Pro Tem Hall followed by saying that she thought all of Council was for two access roads into the subdivision, but per the discussion about the stub out on Marlbrook, goes through an existing neighborhood, which is potentially problematic.
 - Could Council approve this finding of fact without this condition? Mr. Robinson replied that it is Council's prerogative to include or not include that condition.
 - Mr. Sandy stated that two access roads leading to Morgan Road would be cost prohibitive. At this point Council debated the idea of placing two access roads leading to Morgan Road. They asked for testimony from Fire Marshal Michael Roark about whether two access roads leading onto Morgan Road would be in compliance with fire code. Mr. Roarke came in front of Council and was sworn in. Mr. Roark stated that per fire code, it was possible to have two access roads on Morgan Road but that they would have to be spaced far enough away from each other to meet code.
 - Mr. Sandy offered to add in two stop signs along the stub out of Marlbrook in order to deter traffic over there.
 - Councilmember Aldridge stated that regardless of the ultimate set up of access roads he does not want to negatively impact Windsor Hills and Marlbrook.
 - Andrew Eagle came in front of Council to propose the construction of 255 units using the stub out on Marlbrook, and asked whether that would satisfy the City's street ordinance? Mr. Robinson said no it would not. Then Mr. Eagle countered by asking if

installing gated streets were possible. Mr. Robinson replied that this recommendation would not satisfy the intent of the subdivision ordinance.

The Mayor called for a motion on this finding of fact. Council noted that the following conditions submitted by the Planning and Development Services Department and approved by the Planning and Zoning Board, would not include the access road condition, but would include the following:

- Per the agreement of the applicant HOA covenants shall include a clause granting the City of Albemarle the option to assume ownership and maintenance of the southwestern most tract of open space as a public, passive use park once the 200th lot has been built upon.
- Plans shall include statements and typical location on lots of parking spaces, drives, any walls or fences, proposed approximate location and dimensions of typical residences within building envelope, planting areas, and statements for planned erosion and sedimentation control on site.
- Statement from DOT referencing and approving the recommendation of the updated TIA and the phasing of DOT required improvements. This shall conform to each final plat submitted.
- In order to minimize impacts on and preserve the quiet nature of the adjacent neighborhood both during construction and afterwards, Staff would recommend against grading adjacent to or on adjacent exiting lots and preserving at least 15' of existing vegetation as a buffer and installing a minimum Type II buffer as provided for in the zoning ordinance where none exists.

A motion was called by Councilmember Bramlett, seconded by Councilmember Whitley, to approve this finding as noted above. Mayor Pro Tem Hall noted that this motion still did not address the access road issue. The Mayor called for a vote, and the motion passed with 5 votes for, and 2 votes against. Voting for the motion were Councilmembers Lowder, Bramlett, Whitley, Townsend, and Hughes. Voting against the motion were Mayor Pro Tem Hall and Councilmember Aldridge.

- That the use be in general conformed with adopted plans. It was decided that no additional conditions were required for this finding of fact.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Whitley, seconded by Councilmember Townsend, unanimously carried, Council approved the finding for this condition.

Consider Approval for Preliminary Plat for Morgan Road (aka Morgan Ridge) Major Subdivision 20-04

This is a request for Major Subdivision Review (MJSR20-04) by Carolina Development Services LLC (Michael Sandy) for a 255 unit Cluster Subdivision off of Morgan Road (Tax Record Numbers 139386, 31804, 32971, 28797 (part), 28798, and 6462 (part)).

Mr. Robinson noted that Planning and Development Services requested additional conditions to be considered as part of approving this preliminary subdivision plat, which were approved by the Planning and Zoning Board, and are as follows:

- Stub out to eastern boundary of property is acceptable per subdivision requirements, however in order to ensure better connectivity with the existing road network applicant shall make minor road realignment on preliminary plat to Road 5 and its stub out to maintain 4-way intersections with Freeman View Drive and provide for better 4-way intersection alignment with Aquadale and Henning Drive.
- Proposed open space near Marlbrook Drive is not exactly in the geographic center of the project, however it is more usable and considering the larger proposed neighborhood it may be acceptable as part of the centralized open space. Staff recommends that the applicant shall amend preliminary plat to show any areas not currently indicated which may require storm water improvements, floodplain and steep slopes not currently shown and how these calculations may affect overall usable open space requirements. Staff would also remind applicant that this cannot be used in calculations for future, un-approved subdivisions in this area.
- Preliminary plat shall show further details including the proposed use of each open space area, the broad scope of amenities or for each open area and how each area is to be made accessible to residents. As trails have been discussed by the applicant and partially shown on plans, staff would recommend the continuation of this system. While not required, staff would still encourage the coordination with the City Parks and Recreation Department.
- All on-site or site adjacent DOT required improvements shall be shown or indicated on the preliminary plat. Staff recommends deferral to DOT on timing of installation of improvements, but will recommend that they be shown on each phased final plat and civil set along with DOT agreed upon timing of phasing.
- Morgan Road Access A shall be widened through to the first internal intersection with landscaped median installed.
- Typical cross section of proposed street, sidewalk and planting strip width and placement in ROW shall be shown on plat with ROW being 60' in minimum width and total street widths with mountable curb being 26' minimum.
- Plat will be amended to show individual lot numbers conforming to dimensional table.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Bramlett, unanimously carried, Council approved the preliminary plat for the Morgan Ridge subdivision (Major Subdivision 20-04) with the conditions above and the conditions approved as part of the conditional use permit.

ANNOUNCED DELEGATIONS

Ms. Rhonda Vinson – To Discuss Need for Speed Bumps

Ms. Vinson would like to discuss speed bumps for the following roads/streets: Avery, TE White, Summit, Elizabeth Avenue, South Bell and Inger Street, MLK and South Morrow. She distributed a petition to Council about installing speed bumps on these streets.

The Mayor and Council also received information regarding the criteria for speed bump installation prior to the meeting. Since these requests are made from time to time, the City has established minimum criteria that was based on established programs and best practices.

Ms. Vinson, who resides at 6132 Elizabeth Avenue, addressed Council with her request to place speed bumps or traffic cones in her neighborhood. Her community has concerns about the streets noted to Council (above). There are lots of children in these communities, having been a daycare provider there for 19 years. On these streets there is frequent speeding. She has witnessed this, particularly in some cases almost head-on collisions. She asked some community members to come with her tonight to speak to Council.

Mr. Tim McAuley came in front of Council to speak. Like Ms. Vinson, he has a concern about the speeding in these communities, especially because it occurs both day and night. Due to COVID19, more kids are at home, and they and the elderly are in danger due to the speeding. In addition these streets don't have sidewalks, which forces folks to walk in the street. It can be dangerous to walk or exercise on these streets. Speed bumps would save lives. He came here tonight to prevent something that could happen in the future. He believes that speed bumps will bring awareness to drivers to slow down. He along with Ms. Vinson, brought forth the petition to add speed bumps.

City Manager Michael J. Ferris addressed Council. He noted that Council received speed bump criteria which were enacted a few years back in relation to another speeding issue with which the city was dealing. In it, there is a requirement for the police to conduct a street assessment of the issue and collect data. He recommended that as a next step Council consider having Police Chief Dulin conduct that assessment and provide Council with the results of that assessment. The criteria also calls for 75% of a street's residents to sign a petition requesting a speed reduction device, such as a speed bump to be presented to Council.

The Mayor echoed Mr. Ferris's suggestion to let Chief Dulin to assess the streets in question and come back to Council to present his findings. Councilmember Townsend supports this approach, as he has witnessed excessive speeding on Gibson Street. However he has concerns with the criteria being used.

Councilmember Aldridge asked whether there was a posted sign speed limit on South Bell and Ingram. The Mayor responded that typically the City speed limit is 35 mph, but portions of the street Councilmember Aldridge noted are posted at 25 mph. Maybe Council should recommend "slow – children at play" signs?

A suggestion was made to use multiple avenues of speed control, such as signage and lowering the speed limit.

Mr. Tim Hill came in front of Council to speak. As a mentor to kids in the neighborhood he sees the speeding occur and is afraid for the kids. However signs won't make a difference in that they are ignored. He would like something done faster.

Planning and Development Services Director Kevin Robinson discussed the option of constructing slight lane shifts on some of the streets if possible in order to force drivers to slow down to adjust to the lane shift.

Councilmember Aldridge asked if certain streets were worse. Mr. Hill replied that they were all bad.

Councilmember Lowder asked if extra enforcement could be used until more permanent measures were in place. Chief Dulin replied that this would occur.

Mr. Derrick Hill came in front of Council to provide comments. He has two young sons, and is afraid for their safety due to this issue. The speeding goes on all night too, where noise as well as speeding is an issue. Drivers rev their engines and then fly through intersections. He believes that there is car racing too on the streets. He asked Council that whatever they can do to make the cars slow down he'd be appreciative.

Mr. Carlos Horne came in front of Council to provide comments. He lives on Gibson Street. There are two barber shops there with parking, with kids moving around the parked cars and into the street. He is worried that if the speeding continues, kids will get hit by drivers coming out of the barber shop lots.

The Mayor concluded this discussion by stating that the Police Department will move ahead with the street assessment and present its findings to Council.

Council thanked the residents presenting tonight for their presentation and time.

Mr. John Williams – To Request the Creation of a 3-Way Stop Intersection at North Second Street and Montgomery Avenue

Mr. John Williams, a resident of the neighborhood in question, came in front of Council to request the creation of a 3-way stop intersection at North Second Street and Montgomery Avenue due to concerns of safety. He distributed a series of photos to Council showing the current intersection. This is currently a one-way stop intersection with traffic on Montgomery Avenue stopping with North Second Street as the through street. Prior to the current configuration, this was a traffic signal controlled intersection.

There is a lot of activity in this part of the City, such as bikers and walkers, as well as a lot of businesses and related traffic. Since the 3-way traffic light was removed there has been an increase in speeding here. Also, coming from Montgomery Avenue on Saturdays and Sundays after church services, it is hard to see the light there due to illegally parked cars. The one crosswalk remaining spanning Montgomery Avenue was paved over. Also there is a bit of a drainage problem on the southeast corner of the intersection.

Both Ritchie Hearne and David Scarborough, who are property owners, support Mr. Williams's request. He also talked to Melissa Smith, principal of Central Elementary School, about his proposal and she loves the idea because of lot of her students walk to swimming lessons nearby and they typically have to call the police to escort them.

Mr. Williams requested that Council consider crosswalks across both streets in both directions, stop signs with flashing warning lights to alert drivers to an upcoming stop sign, removing the left turning lane turning onto Montgomery Avenue, parking spaces on both sides of the street, as well as removing the two entrances into the old Sinclair gas station.

The Mayor replied that a preliminary study would need to be completed and brought back to Council hopefully before the August or September meetings before a decision could be made.

Council thanked Mr. Williams for his presentation.

UNANNOUNCED DELEGATIONS

Ms. Sybil Apsaga, residing at 324 Park Road (Park Road and North Sixth Street), came in front of Council to talk about her personal experience with flooding. She lives near Melchor Creek and has been impacted by recent heavy rains and the resultant creek overflows. She sent a letter to Councilmember Bramlett about her flooding issues to be distributed to Council.

She had moved back to Albemarle at her current address eight years ago. Up to four years ago there was no flooding issues, but since then there has been continued flooding issues. Her entire yard, back over by Garrison, and over by the apartments recently flooded. She also had five inches of water in her house. Can the City do something about Melchor Creek? We need help.

The Mayor and Council thanked Ms. Apsaga for waiting so long and for telling them her experiences with flooding.

NEW BUSINESS

Update on Flood Activities

(NOTE: This item was moved by the Mayor due to the length of the meeting in order to accommodate Ms. Apsaga's wait to come in front of Council so that she can hear how the issue is being addressed).

City Manager Michael J. Ferris provided the update to Council. The City's response to flooding in 2020 has been hampered by the fact that the City has no dedicated department to address an issue like this, and the exceptional amount of rain that has fallen over the first six months of this year. Per the Council discussion on June 15th about flooding and storm water management, the City doesn't own the lakes, creeks, and streams surrounding and cutting through the City. So how does the City gain access to these waterways?

However, the City has been able to move forward with a series of activities to manage storm water and the local waterways. The Public Utilities Department has been able to gain access through the sewer lines. Along Melchor Branch to Moss Springs Road, and almost to Salisbury Road, Public Utilities has cleared 65 tons of vegetation along the waterways. They have had to temporarily cease this activity due to other issues coming to the fore. Also Public Works employees have been

regularly checking catch basins for debris and blockages. Finally, the City Attorney was able to get a response from the Army Corps of Engineers, who referred her to another entity, so the City is getting closer to getting a response on how to move forward.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Adam Kiker, LKC Engineering – To Provide Final Version of Special Order by Consent

Mr. Adam Kiker, LKC Engineering, discussed and provided information on the final version of the SOC (Special Order By Consent) for the Long Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. This agreement will establish mutually agreed upon goals and benchmarks for the sewer plant and collection system operations. The SOC creates a partnership with the State to work toward the goals and objectives by relaxing the sewer plant discharge limits until improvements can be made. The SOC requires the City continue with an established program for upgrades and improvements to our sewer system that have been in place and actively worked toward for the last several years. Projects such as Phase 1 and 2 inflow and infiltration, in-house inflow and infiltration projects, in-house sewer line replacement work, and the phase 1 electric rehabilitation at the WWTP are examples of projects already completed by the City. The SOC stipulates the completion of the Phase 3 Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation project, with compliance being reevaluated upon the Phase 3 completion. Additional projects may be necessary pending the efficacy of the Phase 3 Rehabilitation, and in such case the SOC will be modified to accommodate the future projects.

The document seeks the signature of the City Manager, but as this is an agreement between the City and the State, the City Manager is looking for City Council's concurrence. Upon Council's concurrence and the City Manager's signature, the State will facilitate the SOC being available for public notice and comment. Following the public input and potential modifications, the SOC will become final.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Townsend, unanimously carried, Council authorized the City Manager to sign the Special Order By Consent.

After the vote Council had questions for, and discussed related items with Mr. Kiker.

The Mayor asked: once the City settles, what kind of grant money could we get for future projects, including the fine bubbler system discussed at a meeting in June? Mr. Kiker responded by summarizing the grant application process. Should the City submit in the next round of funding, then they would know their grant status by next February. How much time would it take to get the grant application in? It would take one month to pull the application together.

Councilmember Lowder asked if there would be any impact on the budget. The City Manager replied that it would not impact the budget until next year.

Councilmember Bramlett requested data from cities our size to see what has been done to fix this kind of issue. Mr. Kiker stated that LKC can do this.

Mr. Kiker will be present at the August 10th meeting to continue the discussion regarding next steps in our system improvement plan.

Lee Staton – Director of Public Housing – To Provide an Update on CARES Act Funding Received by the Department

Public Housing Director Lee Staton came in front of Council to provide an update on what has been received to date and potential eligible uses for the funds. In May, the Public Housing Department received \$150,000 in CARES Act funds. Of that amount, \$61,000 was drawn down to date. Right now the City is not sure if any of the funds can be used for Section 8 because it is uncertain if that program is eligible.

Departmental Monthly Reports

The Mayor and Council received June 2020 monthly departmental reports prior to the meeting. The Mayor asked if any Council members had any questions or comments about the reports.

In the Economic Development report there was mention of a need to fix the Courthouse Square clock. The Mayor sent out a plea for anyone listening to the meeting if they were handy with old-fashioned clocks to come forward. It is very difficult to find people with these specialized skills anymore.

Mayor Pro Tem Hall noted in the Human Resources (HR) report that data on employees' use of COVID19 time to date as granted by Council was provided and she thanked HR Director Dana Chaney for this information. Mayor Pro Tem Hall noted that 80 hours was open for all employees to use for COVID19-related coverage and asked Ms. Chaney what percentage of employees have used this time to date. Ms. Chaney replied that only a small percentage of employees have used time due to exposure or childcare needs. Mayor Pro Tem Hall then asked about whether there would be additional or other time for an employee to use in a case where they used up their allotted hours for daycare then get exposed. Ms. Chaney replied that HR and supervisors are trying as much as possible to avoid charging sick time in these types of circumstances.

MUNICIPAL CALENDAR

Mayor Michael and Councilmembers received the municipal calendar prior to the meeting. The Mayor asked if Council had any questions or comments about the calendar.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Mayor asked if Council wanted to move any remaining items on the consent agenda down to New Business.

Ordinance 20-17 – Budget Amendment for Items not Received in FY

FY19/20

There were items from fiscal year 2020 that were not complete or not received by June 30. This was mostly due to COVID-19 shutdown. We must amend the 2021 budget with unspent Funds from 2020 to complete these purchases that we ordered.

(Ordinance 20-17 – Budget Amendment for Items not Received in FY 19/20)

Proclamation for July as National Parks and Recreation Month

July is designated as National Parks and Recreation Month. This year's theme for Parks and Recreation Month is We are Parks and Recreation. This theme will highlight the hard work and dedication of the staff that keep our parks cleaned and maintained and our community connected with quality programming.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, everyone has seen the value of parks and recreation in maintaining physical, mental, and emotional health.

(Proclamation - July as National Parks and Recreation Month)

Consider Re-Scheduling the September 7, 2020 Council Meeting to Tuesday, September 8, 2020

The September 7th regular Council meeting falls on Labor Day. As is customary, regular Council meetings falling on a holiday are re-scheduled to the following Tuesday. Council should consider re-scheduling the 1st regular Council meeting for September to Tuesday, September 8, 2020. This would also return the meeting start time to 7 pm unless Council would like to take action to continue with 6 pm starting times.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Aldridge, seconded by Councilmember Bramlett, unanimously carried, Council approved the following:

- Ordinance 20-17 authorizing a budget amendment to cover expenses in FY19/20 that were billed in FY 20/21;
- The Proclamation of July as National Parks and Recreation Month; and
- Re-scheduling the first regular Council meeting of September to Tuesday, September 8, 2020 at 7:00 pm.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discussion of Holiday Events

At the previous meeting, Council asked that Main Street Manager Joy Almond survey business owners regarding preferences for days and times to conduct the Christmas Parade and Downtown Open House on the same day. Ms. Almond came in front of Council to summarize her second

survey of downtown businesses. After looking other localities' Christmas event schedules so as to avoid scheduling conflicts, she surveyed downtown businesses again with a few specific date/time options. Businesses selected Saturday, November 28th with the parade starting at 4pm, the Downtown Open House beginning at 5:30 pm running until 8:30 pm. Twenty businesses agreed to participate in the Downtown Open House event. Ms. Almond is planning a preview event the weekend before to build interest and participation for the following weekend.

The Mayor called for a motion to close the required streets down on November 28th for the Christmas events. Upon a motion by Councilmember Aldridge, seconded by Councilmember Hall, unanimously carried, Council approved street closures on Saturday, November 28th for the parade and downtown open house.

NEW BUSINESS

Consider Alleyway Project Recommendation

Recently staff and Council have discussed alleyway improvements to support downtown development. Alleyways are crucial pedestrian connections in our downtown. They link parking and retail, improve walkability, address safety concerns, and provide opportunities for place-making. The alleyway that was determined most feasible for improvement is the alleyway beside the old Davis Drug building on W. Main Street.

In 2019 the City acquired this alleyway from Stanly County, executed an agreement with property owners along the adjoining alleyway that extends to South First Street, executed an agreement with the King family to lease and improve the parking lots in this area, and we made parking lot improvements to the parking lot near the Albemarle Sweet Shop, at the corner of South First Street and King Avenue.

In 2020 a project team was formed to manage the alleyway project. We have had our electric staff, County building inspector and an electrical engineer onsite and in the buildings along the alleyway to determine what should be done with overhead power lines and meter bases inside of the buildings facing South Second Street. We have received advisement from street maintenance and water and sewer distribution regarding the possibility of hitting private water and sewer lines in the alleyway and repaving this area. Due to this analysis, we are moving with a plan to remain overhead with electric service, but still make significant improvements to the alleyway.

We are now at the point that before we can move forward, we need Council to make decisions based on our recommendation on how we believe this project can move forward in a fiscally responsible, safe, and more expeditious manner. Jonathan Misenheimer is the project manager for this project and presented the recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Misenheimer gave a presentation to Council on the project. He then asked for Police Chief Dulin and Fire Chief Brewton to make statements about their respective assessments of the proposed project in terms of safety concerns. Chief Dulin noted that the concerns that the police would have about a pedestrian only area would be public safety. Since the plan in front of Council includes controlled lighting and is being proposed approximate to the opening of the downtown Pfeiffer campus, he sees this project as a positive one.

Councilmember Bramlett opined that since the original Courthouse stood in that area, and there is much history in that location, it might be nice if the project team remembered the history of the area when developing its theme.

Chief Brewton then came in front of Council to present the Fire Department's assessment. His department had two questions about safety that the team ultimately addressed: access to upper windows in buildings lining the alleyway; and obstruction of pathways coming out of upper stories.

Mr. Misenheimer noted that 45-50 new parking spots connecting 3 lots in the proposed area will be developed. They would move the current inner parking lot by the surrounding businesses down slightly. The parking spots in the alley will be relocated to the King lot and spots added beside the Mark Lowder law office.

Two of the lots have not been resurfaced, and so would need to be done, as well as striping. Some of the proposed lots are private lots.

The Mayor asked if additional lighting would be added. Mr. Misenheimer replied that the group is looking into additional lighting but the width of the alleyway might create issues with light installation.

A follow up question was asked whether businesses entered into an agreement that the City would pave that area. The City Manager replied that yes an agreement was executed and that the City has site control of the pedestrian alleyway and two of the lots currently.

A question was asked about how trucks would unload for those affected businesses? Staff replied that typically those businesses rely on box trucks for deliveries, and that these trucks back up from Second Street.

Councilmember Bramlett requested that handicapped parking spaces be considered in the design.

Both Mayor Pro Tem Hall and Mayor Michael advised that the project team should reach out to the affected business about the proposed project before proceeding. Assistant City Manager Nyki Hardy replied that the team intended to do this, but wanted to flesh out the details of how it could work first and present to Council before receiving local business input based on past experience with other downtown projects.

The Mayor called for a motion to approve the Alleyway Project contingent on soliciting input from all affected businesses first. Upon a motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Lowder, unanimously carried, Council approved the motion.

Consider Bid for SCBA Equipment in the Fire Department

Fire Department Chief Pierre Brewton presented an overview of the process leading up to the equipment bid and the department committee's decision to recommend the equipment of the highest bidder to Council. Bids were received for the Self-Container Breathing Apparatus in the Fire Department and the bid tabulation was distributed to Council prior to the meeting. Chief Brewton also distributed additional information as handouts to Council. Fire Marshal Roark and Battalion Chief Jenkins then summarized the elements of the equipment and safety considerations for Council.

Background: The Fire Department established an evaluation committee to develop minimum standards for the SCBA equipment to meet. Committee members included Fire Marshal Roark, Captain Plowman, and Engineer Rummage. These standards were eventually incorporated into a bid document. When evaluating the bids, the evaluation committee did prefer some of the features of a system that was not the low bid. On behalf of the committee, Chief Brewton presented the process and rationale behind the bid recommendation to Council to consider.

Considerations/Rationale for APD Committee Highest Bidder SCBA Equipment: The Committee looked at features which would allow them better inter-personal communication during a firefighting event, and provide for the most efficient, least cumbersome buddy breathing system in cases where a firefighter might have low oxygen tank reserves. The highest bidder, MSA, has manufactured SCBA equipment which provides the optimal performance in both of these areas. Committee members tested all of the equipment from the bidders as part of the evaluation process.

Statutory Review and City Attorney Recommendation: The bid process is established by NC General Statutes, and the City must follow the procurement laws for this process. To aid in determining if the preferences were legally justifiable reasons to consider a bid that was not the low bid, City Attorney Britt Burch was asked to review the bid laws as it relates to this matter. Based on her opinion (below), the low bid is a responsive bid that should be accepted.

City Attorney opinion:

Pursuant to North Carolina's bidding laws and guidance provided by NC School of Government, competitively bid contracts must be awarded to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder. A responsive bid means that the bid meets all applicable legal requirements and conforms substantially to the bid specifications. A responsible bidder is the lowest bidder when considering the quality, performance and the time constraints specified for performance. When considering whether a bidder is responsible, several factors can be reviewed: (1) Whether the bidder has the skill, judgment and integrity to perform the contract; (2) Whether the bidder has sufficient financial resources to perform the contract; and (3) Whether the bidder has the ability to perform the contract (i.e. adherence to time constraints, proper staffing, etc.).

In the case at hand, American Blaze Masters' ("ABM") bid met all applicable legal requirements and conforms to specifications outlined therein. Moreover, the quality and performance

of ABM's equipment meets the vital, operational needs of the Albemarle Fire Department. Due to the longevity of operations and established customer base of ABM, there is tangible evidence that the company has the skill, integrity and ability to successfully perform this contract; therefore making ABM a responsible bidder. Although other bidders may offer enhanced features that would provide additional conveniences, such features were not detailed in the specifications as requisite items needed to secure the bid. When contracts are not awarded to a bidder, there needs to be a significant justification for doing so that extends beyond mere preferences that were not included in the bid specifications. So long as a company is the lowest responsive, responsible bidder it should receive the bid each time. The equipment offered by ABM is consistent with industry standards and will be sufficient to accomplish the vital task of the firefighters while also ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements for proper bidding.

Council debated the issue before them: to go with the lowest bid as is customary, or seek guidance to see if there are regulatory exceptions which might allow Council to approve MSA equipment (the highest bidder).

Councilmember Aldridge asked: when the bids were submitted, was the equipment request all the same? Chief Brewton replied yes. However Chief Brewton added that for the bid they had to input generic information for equivalency or exception which was documented and verified by procurement. Mayor Pro Tem Hall clarified with Chief Brewton that the bid and specs asked for the same information from all potential bidders, but when the bids came in, the highest bidder, MSA, provided equipment that contained all of the elements requested but that the equipment is of higher quality than the others.

City Manager Michael J. Ferris further explained that for a bid, bidders need to respond to purpose and what a bidder should accomplish, and avoid "directing" the bid with other information.

Councilmember Townsend noted that the accreditation standards for equipment were updated in 2018, but the equipment is being acquired in 2020. Is there risk that equipment acquired through this process this year may not meet future standards? Chief Brewton replied that equipment standards are updated every five years. Then he deferred to Chief Jenkins. Chief Jenkins replied that they have to meet the current standard until the next standard comes along.

Mayor Pro Tem Hall asked about the timeline of events for the SCBA bid development process. The process started under Chief Oke, but he left last year –who was in charge of moving the process forward after that until Chief Brewton came onboard? The Committee was appointed under interim Chief Hier's tenure. Was the process and documentation shared with Chief Brewton? Chief Brewton responded that it was handed over to him when he came onboard earlier this year, and that he first asked the committee to show him the bidding process. When it was apparent that staff were not familiar he moved the process forward, thus creating a bit of a time lag from when the process started to where it is now.

Councilmember Hughes asked which of the bids did a large percentage of AFD members want. Chief Brewton replied the highest bidder, MSA. He then recounted that 4 bids came in but one was disqualified, so of the three remaining bids, MSA scored highest with a ranking of 362.

Chief Brewton, Chief Jenkins and Fire Marshal Roark answered further questions from Council.

Councilmember Lowder asked why Council is debating this when there are staff who have reviewed this already and have provided input to Council. The Mayor then asked in meeting what Ms. Burch's recommendation would be. She again noted that she reviewed this bidding process against a number of bidding regulations. Since the lowest bidder provided a legitimate bid with equipment that met the "skill, integrity and ability" regulatory criteria, she would again recommend that Council choose the lowest bidder.

Due to unresolved questions about this item and the lengthy duration of tonight's meeting, the Mayor requested that further action be tabled until tomorrow's adjourned meeting.

Consider Re-appointments and Appointments to Boards and Commissions

Staff requests that Council consider the following re-appointments and appointments to the following Boards and Commissions of the City of Albemarle:

Planning & Zoning Board

- *Seat 2*, Rev. Harold McDonald, first term expired July 1, 2020. Rev. McDonald is eligible for, but not interested in re-appointment. Please consider 1st alternate Chuck Horne for this seat.
- *Seat 5*, Benny Bowers, first term expires July 1, 2020. Mr. Bowers is eligible for, and interested in, re-appointment.
- *Seat 8*, Cavin Holbrook, first term expires July 1, 2020. Mr. Holbrook is eligible for, and interested in, re-appointment.
- *3rd Alternate*, Vacant: Please consider Ms. Emily James (please see volunteer form).

Historic Resources Commission

- *Seat 4*, John Crawford, currently serving a partial term that expires July 1, 2020. Mr. Crawford is eligible for, and interested in, re-appointment.
- *Seat 5*, Ms. Sheila Simpson, currently serving a full term that expires July 1, 2020. She is not eligible for re-appointment. Please consider Anna Christian Harkey (see volunteer form).
- *Seat 6*, Mr. Gene Starnes, currently serving a full term that expires July 1, 2020. He is not eligible for re-appointment. Please consider Melanie Holles (see volunteer form).

Parks and Recreation Advisory Board:

- *At Large seat*. Mr. Lawrence Durett, currently serving a full term which expires on July 1, 2020. He is eligible for, and interested in re-appointment.
- *At Large seat*. Mr. John Lipcsak, currently serving a full term which expires on July 1, 2020. He is eligible for, and interested in re-appointment.
- *District 2 seat*. Ms. Julie Curtis, currently serving a full term which expires on July 1, 2020. She is eligible for, and interested in re-appointment.

Tree Commission:

- Ms. Hannah Hearne, currently serving a full term which expires on July 1, 2020. She is eligible for, and interested in re-appointment.
- Ms. Sandra Rushing, currently serving a full term which expires on July 1, 2020. She is eligible for, and interested in re-appointment.

The Mayor noted that due to the length of the Council meeting tonight, he would entertain a motion for re-appointments only. Upon a motion by Councilmember Bramlett, seconded by Councilmember Hall, unanimously carried, Council approved all recommended re-appointments for members across the boards and commissions noted above. Appointments for vacancies on these boards and commissions will be taken up by Council at its August 10th meeting.

Due to the length of the meeting tonight, and the nature of the business to be discussed in closed session, the Mayor requested that closed session be tabled tonight and convened after the adjourned meeting tomorrow night.

Upon a motion by Councilmember Aldridge, seconded by Councilmember Lowder, unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned to Tuesday, July 14, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers for a personnel policy meeting.