

Regular Meeting of the Town Council  
10-20-15  
Civic Center  
6:30 pm

Minutes & General Account

Council Members Present: Mayor Volz, Council Members Thomas, Montgomery, Nixon-Roney & Ragsdale

Staff Present: Chuck Smith, Judy Gallman, Paul Blanchard, Carrie Spencer, Martha Wolfe and Beth Koonce, Town Attorney

Visitors Present: Teri Olson, James Clepper, Deputy J. L. Lovings, Jim & Julia Rayborn, Mike & Darlene Laurie, Larry McBride, Joanne & Buddy Mann, Herschel & Donna Turner, Nancy Dyer, Anne Petty, John Petty, Donald Parham, Mary Dalton, Hilda Dalton, Hugh & Judy Cates, Linda Gregory, Kathy Genic, Grace Smith, Chet Hodgin, Sterling Kelly, Rich Salyards, Louis & Victoria Panzer, Gary Thompson, L. C. Straughn, Carol Brooks of the Jamestown News, Mark & Marcia Scott, Mary Fay Bodenheimer, Alan Teichman, Sheree Crane, Cheryl Harvey, Linda Schumacher, Wes Cashwell, Patricia Anderson, Shawn Anderson, Kali Tritt, Charles Dowdy, Donny Barton, Cindy Barton, Lynne Putman, Allan & Debra Dewey, Jim Mooney, Linda & Leon Marsh, Tammy Marsh, Martha Harden, Keith Lackey, Sushmita Allen, MacEntyre Allen, Kay Sexton, Mike Bullock, Susan Joyner, Pam Harden, Sabrina Schumaker, Glen Kantziper, Wes Scott, Joyce Graverson, Jo Anne Hassell, Stanton Calvarese, Charity Campbell, Eddie & Jane Oakley, Carl Weekly, Natalie Teichman

1. Call to Order – Mayor Volz called the meeting to order.
2. Community Reflections – Mayor Volz announced the following community events:
  - 10-23-15 – Spooktacular Storytelling at Jamestown Library 6:30 pm
  - 10-26-15 – Loose Leaf Collection begins and runs through 2-26-16
  - 11-1-15 – Daylight savings time begins
  - 11-3-15 – Municipal Election – Civic Center polls open at 6:30 am – 7:30 pm
  - 11-13-15 – Deadline for Jamestown Rotary Club Christmas Parade
  - The Jamestown Public Library just celebrated its 100<sup>th</sup> birthday. Special commemorative ornaments are on sale at the Library.

The Mayor called for a moment of silence.

3. Approval of minutes from the September 15, 2015 Regular Council meeting and the October 7<sup>th</sup> 2015 Special Council meeting – Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to approve the September 15, 2015 regular meeting minutes and the October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015 special meeting minutes as presented. Council Member Thomas made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

4. Proclamation Fire Prevention Month October 2015 – Mayor Volz presented Derrick Carson, Pinecroft Sedgfield Fire Department with a Proclamation observing the month of October 2015 as Fire Prevention Month.

(Proclamation)

5. Public Hearing Continued Case # 2015-01 – Rezoning Request 202 R1 Ragsdale Rd from MS (Main Street) to CZ-MS (Conditional Zoning Main Street) – Mayor Volz called on Carrie Spencer, Town Planner, for the staff presentation. Spencer stated this is a continuation of a Public Hearing for case 2015-01 rezoning from Main Street (MS) to Conditional Zoning Main Street (CZ/MS) for the property located at 202 R1 Ragsdale Rd., situated at the intersection of Ragsdale Rd. & Gannaway St. Spencer stated the conditions offered by the applicant are as follows:
  1. Use limited to multifamily dwellings
  2. Number of dwellings not to exceed, original request was 60. The applicant now proposing a density of 52 units.
  3. Building height limited to three stories.
  4. Predominant proportion of building exterior will be brick & fiber cement siding.
  5. All dwellings will have individual, privately accessible patios or balconies.
  6. Applicant will work to establish Tree Conversation Areas.
  7. Applicant will extend brick sidewalk along the property’s frontage on Ragsdale Road and on Gannaway Street provided easements can be established. The original application did condition for a sidewalk all the way to Main Street on Gannaway Street. The applicant is now proposing the sidewalk just in front of the property.
  8. Buildings will front on Gannaway Street & Ragsdale Rd. with parking situated behind them.
  9. An additional condition to the original application. On-site parking will be provided for residents of the apartment complex so that the number of parking spaces will not be less than 110% of the number of bedrooms contained in the complex.

Spencer displayed the proposed site plan for the apartment complex project. The plan calls for 3 buildings; two 3-story buildings and one- 2-story building. The 2-story building being located at Ragsdale Rd. There will be a single driveway off of Gannaway Street and a single driveway off of Ragsdale Rd. with parking situated behind the buildings. The site includes landscaping buffers.

Spencer displayed elevation drawings. The applicant modified the original plans to add different proportion between brick & siding. The siding has been changed to run in a vertical orientation rather than horizontal.

Spencer stated this property is located in the Main St Zoning District and is adjacent to single family residential zoning district. Townhomes are located across from the property and a bank is located to the North.

The current property use is vacant. Land use of properties surrounding the subject property are:

- North – MS (Commercial & Single Family)
- East – MS (Post Office)
- West – Single Family Residential
- South – MS (Multifamily & Commercial)

The property is adjacent to the Town of Jamestown water & sewer. The property was previously zoned B1 (Business/Commercial) prior to the 2009 LDO. At that time, the property was zoned Main Street. In 2011 the property was rezoned to Conditional Main Street District for senior affordable housing. The project was not built and after 2 years the zoning reverted back to the MS zoning.

Spencer stated the existing zoning is Main Street. The requested zoning is Main Street/Conditional Zoning. The key elements of that requested zoning are residential density allowed by ordinance is 8 dwellings per acre. The request is to increase to 23 units per acre. The maximum housing units that are allowed per the ordinance is 18. The request is for a total of 52.

The 2020 LDP categorizes this area as the "Town Center". Goals & Policies that apply to this proposal area: i.) Growth Management ii) Community Appearance iii) Quality of life.

#### 1. Growth Management Goals

- Carefully manage growth, make smart growth decisions that maintain & enhance Jamestown's special characteristics & heritage
- Strategically locate new development in most appropriate places
- Use infrastructure investments efficiently
- Attract new businesses & jobs and a more diverse tax base
- As we grow, preserve our natural, cultural and historic resources and open space

#### Growth Management Policies:

- Revitalize downtown Jamestown to be the center of community life, provide opportunities for new retail, office & community service uses
- Rejuvenate & beautify Main Street to create a more inviting and pedestrian friendly atmosphere with a wide variety of services & retail
- Encourage design of new activity centers to provide a wider mixture of uses and pedestrian friendly destinations and gathering areas
- Continue to value, preserve & enhance existing residential uses and neighborhoods, to maintain the unique small town character of Jamestown
- Infill development is encouraged to efficiently use infrastructure, new buildings and renovation of existing buildings should fit the scale & character and add value to existing neighborhoods.
- Encourage new residential land uses and neighborhoods that strike a balance between quality & affordability, add to the character of Jamestown by providing mixed use, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, well connected to community via sidewalks & greenways with a mixture of appropriate uses and housing types in appropriate locations.
- Encourage adequate, affordable, attractive, quality housing through renovation of older homes, and building a balanced mixture of housing types for a range of lifestyles and income levels.
- Encourage open space, parks & squares in new neighborhoods, well connected by greenways, sidewalks, bike lanes and added to existing neighborhoods where possible.

- Carefully balance individual property rights for the good of the whole community by expecting new development to use best design features of our favorite existing areas & provide adequate buffers between incompatible uses
- Encourage everyone to use these land development plan goals and policies as guidelines to make smart growth decisions, strategically locate land development in most appropriate places, use infrastructure efficiently, to reduce costly sub-urban sprawl, help maintain & enhance the community assets that make Jamestown special.

## 2. Community Appearance Goal

- Carefully preserve & enhance Jamestown’s small-town character and community appearance as it grows.

### Community Appearance Policies

- Value & preserve small town feel
- Create downtown “village” feel on Main Street that enhances our character & used as a selling point to attract entrepreneurs & visitors. Use a market analysis study to determine what types of businesses & development would work in downtown & historic district.
- Carefully consider appearance & design of new buildings & site development, to insure a good fit, maintain & improve the appearance of our community, create a greater sense of harmony & compatibility among uses in our community.
- Beautify existing streetscapes, encourage creation of new streetscapes providing pedestrian friendly environment with sidewalks, street trees, attractive landscaping, signage and building facades.

## 3. Quality of Life Goal

- Carefully preserve the Town’s natural, cultural & historic resources as we grow.

### Quality of Life Policies

- Maintain & improve air quality by recruiting environmentally friendly industry & encourage pedestrian friendly mixed-use land use patterns, sidewalks, bike lanes and greenways, interconnected street patterns, open space development.

Spencer stated the Council had a copy of the permitted use table which shows uses permitted in the Main Street District.

Spencer reviewed the required statement of consistency which the Council will be required to use when making their decision describing how the zoning request is or is not consistent with the LDP and whether it is in the public interest (health, safety & welfare) of the community.

Spencer introduced Art Wise, Planning Board Chair, for the recommendation of the Planning Board. Wise stated that the Planning Board voted unanimously to deny the request. The Planning Board stated the rezoning request was not consistent with the Town’s adopted 2020 LDP because it does not meet the following Goals & Policies:

- The density of the project, 60 units (original request) does not preserve the unique small town character of the residential neighborhood.

- The 3 story building does not fit the scale and character or add value to the existing neighborhood.
- The appearance & design of the building & site does not insure a good fit, and maintain and improve the appearance of the community. It does not create a greater sense of harmony & compatibility with existing community.
- It is not in the public interest and not suitable for this particular use which does not add to the quality of life by preserving Jamestown's natural, cultural, and historic resources.

The Mayor called on the applicant, Sterling Kelly, Burkely Communities for his presentation. Mr. Kelly stated this proposal has changed over the course of their working on the proposal. They have been doing a lot of listening. Their plans have changed as a result, including what is before you tonight.

Burkley Communities overarching interest is to develop, own & operate and continue to build over time a high quality residential community, with ample on-site parking in the heart of Jamestown's Town Center. Kelly said Burkely has been guided from day 1 by the Goals & Policies of the LDP. They heard loudly and clearly at the Planning Board meeting the concerns that were expressed. They continued to work on the plan. He will try to make the case tonight that the plan has been modified these past weeks and months and that it does meet the Goals and Policies of the LDP.

They focus on the physical (building) and the people of their apartment complex. Three aspects of the development:

1. First he thinks most important is the right and best use of the property.
2. The proposed zoning's alignment with the Town's LDP.
3. The impact, as we see it, of the proposed development on the Town.

Kelly said there are a wide variety of commercial uses available on this property with no rezoning required. He sees a property that is situated one block from Main Street and fronts into a single family residential neighborhood. To him it calls for a transitional use. He feel the best use for the property is housing/residential use. He thinks multi-family would be a suitable transitional use. This property will be a high quality residential use. He has listened carefully to people that live in the neighborhood and they have expressed their concerns and fears about the impact of this apartment complex. He thinks this proposed development offers a unique housing alternative that is not presently offered in Jamestown. He feels the Goals and Policies in the LDP support this proposed project.

Kelly said at the first neighborhood meeting they heard concerns of: unit count/density, building height/scale/parking and traffic. They looked at modifying each of these aspects from the initial proposal. He would like to modify one of those aspects now. He has reduced the number of units to 48. Kelly said the site plan would not change. They modified to take the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor off the middle building to help reduce the number of units. He thinks the two-story middle building and building that fronts on Ragsdale Rd. would adhere to that basic approach.

The building elevation has been modified to increase the proportion of brick. They looked at the Mendenhall House for architectural detail examples. They modified their building to include arched windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. They modified porch railings to mimic what is on the Mendenhall House. They have gone from horizontal siding to board & batten siding in parts of the building that is not brick. The end of the building have significantly more brick than before. Collectively the changes make a big impact on the building elevations.

Kelly presented a rendering for the proposed development. It is from a view which is at Ragsdale Rd. & Gannaway St. The changes he made in the buildings he feels is a much better fit for Jamestown.

Kelly cited Goals & Policies from the Town's LDP that he feels aligns with this proposed project:

- Revitalize downtown Jamestown to be the center of community life.
- Continue to value, preserve & enhance existing residential uses in neighborhoods to maintain unique small town. Infill development concept is encouraged to efficiently use existing infrastructure. New buildings & renovation of existing building should fit the scale & character and add value to existing neighborhoods.
- Encourage new residential land uses and neighborhoods that strike a balance between quality & affordability, add to the livability and character of Jamestown by providing mixed use, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods that are well connected via sidewalks, etc.
- Encourage opportunities for adequate, affordable, attractive, quality housing
- Encourage everyone in our community to use these land development plans Goals & Policies as guideline for making smart growth decisions.
- Value & preserve Jamestown's small town feel
- Maintain a strong sense of place and community pride as each new land use fits into our vision for the future, adding quality & value and enhancing our community character & quality of life.

He thinks with the changes they have made, they are there; architecturally direct fit, scale is in line with surrounding properties.

As he has studied the LDP over the past months, he thinks they did not have it right the first time, but now feels they are there. Kelly cited the contrasts between the last project approved by the Planning Board & the Town Council 3 years ago and this proposal. The previous project was a 3 story single building with 48 units. This proposed development breaks up to 3 buildings with multiple planes on the exterior of the building with a more residential feel. The 3 building configuration allows them to situate the complex more compatibly on the land. Visually appealing. They will build a complex with residents that are attracted to the qualities of small town living. This proposed complex will attract higher income residents. They expect to attract a mix of young professionals and empty nesters. Jamestown location will be their most important consideration in choosing where to live.

What he sees as being the impact on the Town. He sees this as an opportunity to enhance the vitality of community life and business in Jamestown by virtue of the people who will be drawn to this complex. Burkely Communities prides themselves on long term residents/tenants. As he sees it, it offers the town a significant opportunity to advance its LDP.

They have provided ample on-site parking. Knowing that parking is a problem in Jamestown, he met with Town staff. He expressed his interest in being part of the solution to improving the parking problem in downtown. Kelly said if Gannaway St. were to become a one-way street, they would be interested in granting an easement on Gannaway to permit the current parallel parking converted to diagonal parking to add 10-12 parking spaces along Gannaway.

Kelly said this will be approximately a 6 million dollar investment. The incremental revenue that the town would realize would be approximately \$25,000.00 annually in tax revenue.

He summarized in terms of use, he feels residential is the best use. He sees positives were others may not, in the impact this project will have on the Town. It would enhance the vitality of the community life and business. 60-75 new residents in the center of town.

Mayor Volz opened the Public Comment Period of the Public Hearing. He stated it had been rumored that there would be a limit of 5 speakers tonight. That is not true. He said anyone that wishes to speak has a 3 min. time limit. He asked as a matter of courtesy, if you find you are going to say the same thing as several others have said, please come forward, give your name & address and simply state, I agree with the others that spoke. The reason is to be sure all points are given. The Mayor then asked for anyone that was opposed to the rezoning request to please come forward. Give your name & address. Please adhere to the 3 min. time limit.

Jim Clepper – 608 Guilford Rd. – He opposes this rezoning. He thinks Council should deny the change in rezoning. He questions if this land is really zoned what it should be zoned. Main Street to him has always been Main Street not the side streets. He asked that this zoning should be looked at in the future. High density housing adjacent to neighborhoods, adjacent to school, plus traffic problems he anticipates being associated with this, will not be in the best interest of Jamestown.

Steve Smith – 506 Mendenhall Rd. – He has lived here over 20 years. He feels the drawing submitted by Burkely Communities is highly in error. The fact is the 3<sup>rd</sup> story building will be visible from the Town Hall all the way down to the Library. It will be the largest thing in Jamestown. It will be most visible. That is not in line with Jamestown's policy. Regarding occupancy and parking spaces, he went to the Burkely website and they specify occupancy & applicant standards. The apartments – 2 persons per BR. These apartments will not be for 1 person. There will be 2 cars, so there will not be enough parking spaces. Per Burkely website, apartment rents range \$450.00 - \$600.00 per month. They insist, at most, the tenants' income make equal or exceed 3 X the monthly rent. \$450.00 month rent, the tenant must make a little less than \$1500.00 a month. This is low income housing. This will affect the quality of Jamestown and the neighborhood. This does not meet the standards of Jamestown. It will not meet community standards. It will be an eyesore.

Wes Scott – 104 Ragsdale Ct. – We have a bedroom community. The developer said he had 30 + years of experience but those years were not in Jamestown. People in Jamestown have to drive to Greensboro or High Point to work. They will have 2 cars. Also will have to allow for handicapped spaces. They do not have enough parking spaces for the complex. The building will be a monstrosity to look at. Future generations will have to look at it. Consider you might have a white elephant sitting on a high hill for all to see. Why would they (Burkely) want to build where they are not wanted? He cannot understand their persistence.

Charles Dowdy – 214 Misty Waters Lane – He has been here over 60 years. He is against this project wholeheartedly. He has been president of Riverwalk HOA. They have 3 developments. They have problems in two of them with parking. A big problem. They made a mistake 15 years ago by not putting in their HO By-Laws "No Renters". We have renters coming in with 4 cars and there are only spaces for 2. The other problem is drugs.

Rich Salyards – 105 Potter Drive – He is against the apartments. It seems every time we have a rezoning issue it comes down to the LDP. He read the LDP. Pg. 61 – Community Meetings in May 2007 reads as follows:

A Town wide meeting was held in which nearly 20 participants were asked to identify issues and concerns of future development within the town and prioritize for the committee. This was done in small groups. Results were posted. The top 5 issues were:

- Continue to preserve & promote our historic resources. Salyards thought the town has done a good job of this.
- Start improving our downtown and other retail shopping experiences, appearances, variety & quality of shops. Salyards thought a good job has been done on this.
- Stop unplanned and haphazard development.
- Clean up downtown and other blighted area. Salyards again said, fine job.
- Stop multi-family uses that do not fit our town character.

That was #5 out of the 12 issues of the LDP. Everybody knew that multi-housing was not fitting in our community. Burkely took over Courtyard Manor. Mr. Salyards said he has lived on Potter Drive for over 18 years. He has had his fair share of difficulties with the apartments. At the last meeting, he talked with Mr. Kelly about this. Mr. Kelly said they are putting money in the apartments and cleaning it up. He said there is the point. The apartments were nice when originally built. But for various reasons years down the road, the building deteriorates and the value goes down. Eventually someone buys it at a reduced rate and puts a little money into it and makes some money. But in the meantime the citizens/residents are stuck with it. He does not want to be stuck with another apartment complex.

Hugh Cates – 105 Knollview Ct. – Cates said he moved here in 1969. They have seen a lot of development in town, most have been pretty good. They have been good to the point that Jamestown is now referred to as a destination. Keep that word – destination – in mind. He would like to talk about a possibility. We have heard the problems with parking/traffic. There is another possibility. That is 5 – 10 years away, this property is in need of repairs. Maybe Mr. Kelly decides to buy another property and sell this one. Maybe the new owner is not as quality conscious as Mr. Kelly. Then we have a rundown potentially bad neighborhood right in the heart of Jamestown. In his opinion, that is how you turn a destination into a disaster. A disaster for our town, a disaster for the neighbors, a disaster for our merchants. Our merchants have worked hard to make this a destination. I urge you to turn this proposal down. I think there are better uses for this property.

Mark Scott – 120 Olde Salem Dr. – I have lived in Jamestown for the better part of the last 40 years. Communication is the key in both business and personal relationships. We paid professionals to look over our zoning ordinances within the past few years. Those zoning ordinances are communicated on line on the town website. Last month the gentleman communicated possible changes to the rezoning proposal. The masses that showed up that night wanted to be heard, but we were not allowed based on Town rules. That is fine. But it was miscommunicated in the Jamestown News that people could have been heard if they had stayed instead of leaving mad. That was incorrect communication. It was also miscommunication on the proposed rezoning across from the Jamestown Elementary School. When that was defeated it was written in the Jamestown News that Jamestown is telling businesses, we don't want them here. Mr. Scott said that is not right. Our zoning ordinances speak for themselves. We don't want businesses where it is not properly zoned for them. I studied the zoning laws and found that zoning laws exist to protect citizens & owners to protect the quality of life, their financial investments and more. Therefore, to rezone property you should make sure all possible properly zoned places have been exhausted. You should make sure that the good of the community by possible rezoning far outweighs any possible detriment incurred by neighboring property owners. There should be a great need for the business coming to the community. The visual communication evident by the masses that have been here at the past 2 meetings and all the communication made here tonight should show that



the masses do not believe there is a need for this business. Any supposed greater good is certainly not enough to outweigh the detriment of quality of life, loss of investment of the property owners and the community as a whole. To go against the professionals that zoned the property, to go against the Planning Board's unanimous recommendation and to go against the masses here tonight that elected you to speak for us with your votes, would be ridiculous in my estimation. In closing he would like to say, I thank the Council for the time they give to us. Thank you to the Planning Board for the time they have given to the city.

John Petty - 203 Ragsdale Rd. – Mr. Petty stated he lives across the street from the proposed apartments. He agrees with other comments. He has a unique problem in that the entrance to the apartments on Ragsdale Rd. will come out right near his driveway. He will be competing with about 100 cars every time he tries to get out of his driveway. Right now he has to look 2 ways because there is a dip in Ragsdale Rd. coming from Main Street. Cars are not visible until they reach the top of the hill. Just the other night his wife was backing out of the driveway. She stopped looked and listened, she pulled out. A car came flying up the hill and he beeped, beeped the horn. I know he was made. His wife was scared. This is what they call road rage. He is against the rezoning request.

Kay Sexton – 206 Ragsdale Rd. – She lives 2 doors down from this proposed site. I agree with everything that has been said tonight. We do not want this. We do not need this. The traffic is awful. Nobody stops at the stop signs. Eventually there will be a serious accident. It is not going to bring a unique feeling to the bedroom community as we have now. She does not see a 48 unit complex making it that more special. I see it as deteriorating.

Jim Rayborn – 404 Mendenhall Rd. – I have been a resident of Jamestown since 1973. He would like to go back to January 2014 Planning Board. Sterling Kelly went over his physical improvements they were to make to the property (Jamestown Village aka Courtyard Commons). Two buildings were to be demolished because of the foundation. It is almost 2 years and the buildings are still standing. What are we to believe?

Mr. Rayborn cited the Jamestown News of December 2014/January 2015 – “Topping the list for 2014 – is the 2.5 million project is demolishing of 2 existing structures in the 9 building complex.” He said the 2 units will be demolished. One fronted on Main Street and one perpendicular to Main Street facing the river.” They are still there. What can we believe? I do not want any more apartments.

Cheryl Harvey – 206 Knollwood Drive – She wanted to bring it to your attention, since we were here at the last meeting. There were at least 5 police cars on her street. They had their lights on traveling up and down the street. She asked them what was happening. They said they had tried to arrest some people at the apartments and they escaped. They were there along time trying to capture them. It was upsetting. No apartments are going to stay nice for long. They are pretty when they are brand new. But then end up being an eye sore, eventually let lower class people move in.

Teri Olson – 107 Knollwood Drive – The police were in her driveway because she backs up to the apartments. I have gone down very nicely on 2 occasions and listed her complaints with the Rental Manager. She has had a horrendous time living behind the apartment complex. There is fighting, screaming, yelling, and motorcycles revving engines. The 2 times she went to complain, she was promised things, but she has seen nothing. She was promised a wooden fence. She asked for an 8' wooden fence on 1 side of the property. This would be a buffer for sound. It would keep from trash

being thrown in her neighbor's yard on a weekly basis. They are tired of people cutting through and tired of all of it. She is not in favor of it.

Stan Calvarese – 103 Forestdale Drive – With humility, humbleness and prayerfulness, I come to you to agree with what the people want and ask you to vote against the rezoning. I am 100% against it. All the comments that have been made tonight, I agree 100%. Just the crime it is going to bring, just the traffic it will bring, just the way it look. I am not for it. It is a bad location. I hope you pray about this and make the right decision.

Eddie Oakley – 508 Mendenhall Rd. – Oakley said Sterling, I have to applaud you for making some changes even though they are not suitable for the neighborhood. His family is very much a part of Jamestown and they love Jamestown. However, the property that is being talked about for these apartments is plainly stated in our 2020 LDP, no more than 4 times “No more multi-family housing in Jamestown”. We don't want anymore. He supports no more apartments/multi-housing unless it is by ownership. (condos/townhomes) Oakley disclosed that he is a member of the Planning Board.

The Ragsdale Rd. property per our ordinance calls for maximum of 18 units. We, as a Planning Board, voted it down unanimously. I was against the previous elderly housing project and the government was against it because they could not get the government financing approval. In his opinion, it was probably because they could see the property was not big enough to support 48 units. Traffic is already a problem. (Potter Drive, Forestdale Drive, Ragsdale) He asked Council to deny this request.

Mac Allen - 509 Mendenhall Rd. - One thing you are forgetting about that he thinks is important is this development will be ½ block from party central. Jamestown is now known all over the county as the place to go on the weekend to drink. Lots of really nice people do that. But now you are going to put multifamily (big apartments complex) right down the corner from the 3 bars. It will either be a nuisance to the residents of this facility on the weekends or they are going to be here because that's where they want to be. (either conflict or animal house) afraid it will be animal house.

Pam Harden – 204 Ragsdale Rd. – I live right beside the proposed apartments. She said Jamestown is now known as the “Jamestown Crawl” because you can go from bar to bar. She said her privacy will be gone because there will be an apartment complex next to her. What type of people are going to be moving in; professional, school teachers, doctors/lawyers. She said there are no swimming pools, no tennis courts or amenities to bring those professionals here. These young professionals are not going to come to these apartment because they are not offering the amenities they are looking for.

Mayor Volz asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak in opposition to the proposed rezoning request. There was no one.

Mayor Volz then asked for anyone that was in favor of the rezoning request to please come forward, give your name & address. Please adhere to the 3 min. time limit.

David Brackett, 510 W. Main St. – He just moved into Courtyard Commons. He is a Jamestown native. He was asked by the Rental Manager of Courtyard Commons to come and speak on behalf of his experience he has had so far with the Courtyard Commons Apartments and its ownership. He can tell you he is not a drug dealer, he does not use drugs. He does not throw trash out. He moved to the apartments by choice. He has worked at property management before. He can tell you that apartment complexes decline because of poor management. He recently went through a divorce so he is going

through that transitional period. He is in favor of the apartments. He said he grew up on Hethwood Rd. it was all woods. Now that is a middle school. That's called progress. He loves this town. He is proud to be a native of it. To sum it up, he is for it. The apartment complex as far as the management is concerned has been great.

Rachael Caraveto – 516 H W. Main St. – She lives at the Courtyard Commons. She moved there after a divorce. She is very hurt by some of the things that were said tonight about people that rent apartments. As someone coming off of a divorce I needed a place where we could feel safe. I trust Burkely wholeheartedly. They are a good company. I am in shock over what I heard. I try to be the best I can for my family. I am not a drug dealer. I did not live in low income housing. I am actually proud of where I live. I am not afraid there. We love walking to the library. We do business locally. We love Jamestown. I am proud to be a resident. I just wish that you guys would consider having more families like us.

Charity Campbell – 514 H W. Main St. – She is a young professional from Greensboro. When she first heard of Jamestown, she thought no one goes there. I did not know it was so rich in community. But I also did not know that it was so rich in hate. I am the only minority in this place tonight. Can you imagine how I feel, hearing about low income people moving in. Never in my life have I been low income. When I came to Burkely Communities the outside was ugly. But when she saw the inside, she was sold. It is not always about the outside appearance. I understand you don't want this now. I appreciate all your stories. I am an innovative thinker, so I am thinking 50 years down the road. Is it that we are afraid of other ethnicities moving into Jamestown or fear of change? Think about other people's feelings. I understand you have your values, and want to continue to make Jamestown a great city that it is. You can't do that keeping it hidden.

Wes Cashwell – 101 & 103 Gannaway Street – As you listen to the remarks this evening it has come to me that the remarks are not about bricks & mortar. The remarks are about attitudes and fears. Fears about who might move into these proposed apartments. His son lives in an apartment. This community discussion has shifted more about income & misconceived perceptions about who might live in these apartments. He has the opportunity to work with the running team at JES. JES is a Title 1 school. Title 1 means the majority of the students is that school come from low income homes. For you to suggest that these young children are going to grow up and be hoodlums simply because their parents don't make a certain amount of money is extremely offensive.

One of the growth policies of the LDP was to look for a variety of housing opportunities at various incomes for people that may want to come to Jamestown. Mr. Kelly has offered to reduce the density, offered to put in sidewalks to enhance the look of the street, and additional parking. You may not favor his development and if you do not like this one another one is going to come along. We need to discuss whether the plan fits Jamestown in terms of growth. We are all neighbors. Do not discriminate against someone that wants to come live in Jamestown. Look at the development as it stands. It is about if the project meets the criteria not whose inside the apartments.

Linda Gregory, 516 C W. Main St. – She is a resident of Burkely organization for over a year. She understands what a lot of you are saying. She used to live in Jamestown but moved away. She moved back to Jamestown because she loves the Town. However, she was not ready to buy. She knew the reputation of Courtyard Commons. However, when she met the people representing the Burkely organization and she heard their plans she was impressed. While you might not tell from the exterior, a lot of interior work is being done. She fills safe there. Whatever your decision is on the complex, the

Burkely organization has a good reputation. Don't consider all of us that live there as nobodies. There are some fine people out there.

John Capes – 704 O'Neill Drive – He has lived here for 13 years. He and his wife plan to stay in Jamestown because they love it here. It is difficult when you do not live in the same neighborhood to come up and say what to do there. The thing that jumps out at him, something is going to happen with this piece of property. The Townhomes across the street were built and 1 proposal for this property was approved for something of similar size as this proposed complex. He thinks there are projects that could potentially go in this location which he feels would be far less attractive. Logically it should be of a more residential use. No one would buy the whole lot for a single home. It is not likely the owner would break up the property. He feels strongly that if you look at the amount of effort that Kelly has made to cut back from 60 to 48 units and the other amenities they added that were not there before, it makes sense if you weigh it out against the other possibilities. This will not stay a wooded lot forever. If you put a store or some other type of business, I think that would be less desirable in comparison. I think that if you look at it from the point of view from what is being offered now vs what was initially proposed to the Planning Board (Capes in full transparency disclosed he is a member of the Planning Board) it would not have been a unanimous vote against because he would have been in favor of the project as modified. The precedent has already been set. Originally the concern was of overall height and how it would dominate. But Burkely has modified the building to decrease the height. He thinks this is something you need to consider.

There was no one else that wished to speak in favor of the rezoning case. Mayor Volz closed the Public Comment Portion of the Public Hearing. The Mayor recognized Kelly for his 10 minute rebuttal period. Kelly stated the artist rendering is accurate and he handed out to the Council a statement from the artist to that effect. Kelly disagrees to anyone's analysis that there will be inadequate on-site parking. We are a long term owner/operator. They focus on the physical project and on the people. I think there has been some gross mischaracterization of what an apartment renter is. Anyone can be a renter. As for the schedule of the demolition at Courtyard Commons, we will be demolishing these buildings in the next 60 days. Guilford County has approved the plans. Improvements will continue.

Kelly stated the recent residents of Courtyard Commons chose to live there because they wanted to live in Jamestown. The lack of pools & other amenities will not be a factor because Jamestown is the draw for the tenants. The proposed apartment complex will be a different quality level and price point.

Kelly said they relied on the LDP for guidance on shaping the proposed development. The LDP states the design standards for revitalization and especially for new development efforts within the Town Center will encourage a pedestrian oriented mix of predominately 2 & 3 story buildings located close to the street containing an attractive mix of storefronts, 2 & 3 story office and residential uses. They reduced the scale of the buildings. He does not think that the 3 story building will dominate Jamestown. He thinks it will fit in. It is about his company and his business. Our business centers on the concept of community. They maintain their properties. People make the community. Kelly stated he would close by asking you (the Council) to weigh in your deliberations what serves the Town's overall long-term best interest. He thinks this will be a unique residential project. He thinks it will be a positive addition. They will be a community of responsible residents.

The Mayor turned the meeting to the Council for discussion.

Council Member Ragsdale thanked Mr. Kelly for investing in the Town. His presentation was good. He admires his persistence. However, looking at the subject property and our Town Center, there are some concerns that he has and many residents have. The whole issue of density in a very confined area (little over 2 acres) is a real concern. He has concern for the residents across the street and the traffic. I think the plan is a quality plan. But I do think as we look at developing Jamestown it is important for us to protect our Town Center. I think there is a place for this sort of development in Jamestown perhaps near the Koury property near the Ragsdale YMCA. He has tried to be objective. I have tried to listen and learn. He does worry about the parking, traffic and density. He does not feel there is enough space there to accommodate that many people. He does think many people will have more than 1 car and that will cause problems. He is not here to judge the character of apartment dwellers. He just thinks there is a property better suited for this project.

Council Member Montgomery stated her office is on Gannaway St. and faces the property. She has taken the personal issue out of it. We have to look down Main Street and realize we have one shot to get this right. This property will be developed one time. I am glad we have the LDP to guide us. The policies under the Growth Management Goal Policy – 1.11 & 1.17 are very key to what we want our town to be. It stated that we want to maintain that character. She looked at the footprint of this project and compared the square footage to other buildings in Jamestown. The first floor of this building will be 16,000 sq. ft. and the other two, now reduced, to a total of 38,000 sq. ft. on 2.28 acres. The closest thing she could find to compare was the Jamestown United Methodist Church at 46,000 sq. ft. but it is situated on 7 ½ acres. High Point Bank which is situated on 2.88 acres has only 4700 sq. ft. She brings this up so one can get a feel for the scale of the buildings. She feels this is a great idea, but I believe that the property at 2.28 acres is too small to accommodate.

Council Member Nixon-Roney stated she has been on the Council since 2009 and helped write the LDO. In full disclosure she has gotten a lot of calls and emails on this rezoning case. She met with Mr. Kelly and others on a least 2 occasions. She will say as she listened to the people that spoke it started out with very specific points. However, I was almost ashamed to be a Jamestown resident toward the end. What makes Jamestown a great town is that we are eclectic. Our goal is to have all socio-economic levels living in this town, not to think one level is better than another. She was horrified that it was going in that direction. I was appreciative of the ones that came and spoke from the Courtyard Commons. I also appreciate of what Burkley has done with the Courtyard Commons. I think you made some promises that you kept. I appreciate that you have listened to the Town's people and did all the extra work to try to take all into consideration. But I do think we have a very limited amount of space. We have 3 sq. miles. Considering the makeup of the Town and points my fellow Council Members have made, I do take into consideration the density, the other neighborhoods, and the other multifamily uses. I do think the best use for the land would be no to rezone it at this time.

Council Member Thomas said when he came into the meeting tonight, he was little torn on which way to go until we got all the information. It was a personal dilemma. 3 of the 4 Council Members that serve now were also part of the Council that served several years ago that approved the prior project of a similar use. He thought if that land use was approved then, what am I missing, why so much negativity and opposition now. He commends the citizens for standing up and pointing out things that we did not see before. Personally, he thinks this project looks better than was proposed before. However, hearing the comments tonight brought out inconsistencies that were missed before. He appreciates everyone coming & speaking.

Mayor Volz commented that he has been on the Council for 14 years. If you look at where there is property for development in Jamestown, Gannaway St. is one of the few. The bottom line is what would best fit in there to make the majority of the citizens happy. Maybe combination of residential, combination of specialty stores, combination of restaurant; something to take advantage of the sidewalks. Eventually something is going in there.

Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to deny the rezoning request for case #2015-01 from MS to CZ-MS for the property located at 202 R1 Ragsdale Rd. Council Member Ragsdale made a second to the motion. On a roll call vote:

Council Member Ragsdale voted aye

Council Member Montgomery voted aye

Council Member Nixon-Roney voted aye

Council Member Thomas voted aye

The motion to deny the rezoning was approved by unanimous vote.

Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to adopt the following Statement of Inconsistency.

Rezoning Case #2015-01 from MS to CZ-MS is inconsistent with Jamestown's 2020 Land Development Plan and is unreasonable and not in the public interest for the following reasons: Density of the project, even at 48 units, does not preserve the unique small town character of the residential neighborhood. It is not in the public interest and not suitable for this particular use which does not add to the quality of life preserving Jamestown's natural cultural and historic resources and inconsistent with the Land Development mandate that we try to limit the multi-family housing.

Council Member Montgomery made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

6. Public Hearing to consider changing the traffic pattern of Gannaway St. to a one-way street – The Town Manager presented a Resolution for consideration to make Gannaway St a one-way street from Main St. to Ragsdale Rd. In the Resolution is also an amendment to our General Code of Ordinances for Traffic Control Article V Ordinance #1997-5-1 to add the definition of a one-way street.

The Town Manager gave an overview of the area consisting of Gannaway St., Ragsdale Rd. and Main St. The proposal is for Gannaway St. to be made a one-way street from E. Main Street toward Ragsdale Rd. Smith said there are many driveways along Main St. It is a busy intersection. Motorists generally trying to turn left onto Main St. from Gannaway at peak times of the day have difficulty. There is some congestion that occurs at the entrance of the Post Office and Main Street.

The Town Planner contacted NCDOT & HPMPO to help us with data as we did not have funds to pay for a study. We did have a traffic count on Wed. 9-23-15 from 7-8:00 am and 5-6:00 pm. The Post Master said peak times for the PO is probably Monday or Friday. We gathered information from 2 studies that were done on Main St. HPMPO traffic count done the end of June from 6:00 am-6:00 pm. NCDOT did a turning count study. They produced an accident report, speed summary report from 7:00am-8:00 am & 5:00pm -6:00 pm. Both sources showed the majority of traffic along Main Street is actually through traffic. MPO study revealed the majority of turns occur at Guilford Rd., Ragsdale and then Scientific St followed by Oakdale. Gannaway has very little left turn movement. A total of 46 turns from Main St.

onto Gannaway and 57 vehicles turn left & right from Gannaway onto Main St. Very little traffic on and off Gannaway on this particular day.

NCDOT provided a 5 year traffic accident report from 2010-2015. The report included 30 accidents along Main Street between Gannaway and Oakdale about half of the accidents were rear end accidents. These accidents occurred during the day during dry weather. Accidents included 2 pedestrians and 1 bicycle accident. Smith said a lot of traffic comes through the Main Street corridor. There was over 1200 vehicles traveling through Main St. Very little traffic coming onto Gannaway.

NCDOT studied vehicle traffic coming along Main St. on September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015 7:00 am to 7:00 am on September 30, 2015. The study concluded that the average speed for all vehicles was 26 mph northbound and 28 mph southbound. 11 vehicles exceeded the speed limit.

Council Member Montgomery questioned how people get into the Post Office during the day. Smith said this information was not in the report. Smith said the Post Master is in favor of the one-way street for Gannaway. One reason because it might help stop motorists coming into the Post Office by way of Gannaway. The Post Office parking lot is a one way enter from Main St and exit onto Gannaway St.

Smith said the Town staff held a Public Open House and got some good information from the citizens. The open house was held on October 15, 2015. 15 people attended. There was a lot of concern from the neighborhood as to where traffic would go if you are driving from Main St. Some worried traffic that could no longer use Gannaway to Main would use the Forestdale neighborhood road instead. Some concern traffic would use Jamestown Engineering parking lot as a cut through.

Smith said part of the reason we are looking at this is safety of Main St. and Gannaway St. Eliminate that left turn movement. Also, if Gannaway St. were converted to a one-way street we could add some additional on-street parking.

Paul Blanchard, Public Services Director, reported that we have 20 spaces now on Gannaway St. If we changed the on-street parking to diagonal parking we could add an additional 15 spaces for a total of 35 spaces. Blanchard stated assuming that the Gannaway & Ragsdale Rd. property is developed someday, if a driveway of 30" is built, we would lose 6 spaces, meaning the gain would decrease to 9 spaces.

Council discussed the amount of space for vehicular movement and pedestrian safety, fire/emergency vehicles.

Blanchard said a rough cost estimate to re-stripe the parking would be approximately \$5,000.00. Smith said if the Council does elect to move forward we would need to fund the striping & signage. They would add a directional sign at the intersection of Ragsdale & Gannaway directing traffic back to Main St. If the Council does approve this request, the ordinance should become effective January 1, 2016 to allow for funding of the striping & signage. (striping & signage approximately \$6,000.00)

Smith reported the water line replacement for Gannaway is budgeted for replacement in about 2 years.

Mayor Volz opened the Public Comment Portion of the Public Hearing. He asked for anyone in opposition to changing Gannaway to a one way street to please come forward. Give your name & address. Please adhere to the 3 min. time limit.

Stan Calvarese, 103 Forestdale Drive – He is opposed to this because it will hurt the Townhomes parking spaces. Also, it will hurt those people by taking away their ability to turn. Just leave it along.

Leon Marsh, 108 Mendenhall Rd. – The problem he sees is people turning left out of Gannaway onto Main St. It causes problems at the Bank and it backs up traffic on Gannaway. He suggested a “no left turn” off of Gannaway onto Main. That would solve the problem. We do not need any more traffic coming into the neighborhood. At the corner of Ragsdale & Mendenhall no one uses the stop signs. The cars are speeding. He is against the one way street.

Jim Rayborn – 404 Mendenhall Rd. – Mr. Rayborn said he and his wife counted the traffic coming out of the Post Office onto Gannaway on Friday October 16, 2015 from 10:00 am – 1:00 pm and 3:30 pm – 4:30 pm. There were 304 cars coming out of the Post Office. Of that 158 turned toward Main St. 146 turned toward Ragsdale Rd. He agrees with Mr. Marsh the best solution is a “No Left Turn” onto Gannaway from Main Street. If it is made a one-way street that will throw a lot of cars going toward Ragsdale Rd. People do not stop at the stop signs.

Farren Dawson - 204 Ragsdale Rd., He was concerned about the length & width of the parking spaces and ability to back out of the spaces. Seems a lot to add 15 spaces. He too was concerned if the diagonal spaces would interfere with the existing Townhomes parking spaces.

Buddy Mann - 100 Ragsdale Ct. – He does not personally like one way streets because it directs people a certain way. It will be a shorter distance to use Gannaway then force people to go to Main St. Most of the day it is not a problem. It is at night when parking spaces are sparse. He prefers we keep what we have.

Julie Rayborn – 404 Mendenhall Rd. – I helped my husband count traffic at the Post Office. To me 300 cars in 4 hours is quite a bit. I would hate to live on Gannaway and have that much traffic come by my house. Plus, the traffic would use the Forestdale neighborhood too. That is a lot of cars.

Sheree Crane – 404 Ragsdale Rd. – I am opposed to this. We have enough traffic coming down Ragsdale Rd. already. By the time motorists come down Ragsdale Rd. and don't stop at the stop signs, they are going fast when they get to her house. I agree that there should be a “no left turn” at Gannaway onto Main.

Pam Harden, 204 Ragsdale Rd, – If you are going to send 300 cars through a residential neighborhood with children. I don't think that is a good idea. There will be more traffic during the weekend. She does not know if this is the best solution.

Mayor Volz called for any one in favor of changing Gannaway St. to a one way street.

John Capes, 704 O'Neill Drive – He said provisional he is in favor of it. If we could have a sign at the end of Gannaway forcing people to go left and have the Sheriff's office to reinforce the behavior would be helpful. It seems a left turn to Food Lion would help make this thing work. He thinks the additional parking would be good.

Mayor Volz closed the Public Comment Portion of the Public Hearing. He turned to the Council for discussion.



Council Member Nixon-Roney said she is not sold on the idea. The DOT traffic report we heard earlier did not seem to suggest that a one way is recommended. She said I don't think we have a parking problem. People just don't want to walk a few blocks. She does not think to gain 15 spaces and spend Town money and possibly direct traffic back into Forestdale Subdivision is the thing to do. I would like to maybe consider this at another time, but not now. Council Member Nixon-Roney voiced a concern about pedestrians walking on Gannaway St.

Council Member Montgomery stated the data is not consistent from what she sees. She would like to know how many people are coming to the Post Office and how the cars are entering each day. If we are looking at replacing the water line in 2 years, we should look at this at that time. Do it all at one time.

Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to deny the request for Gannaway St. to be made into a one way street at this time, possibly review in the future. Council Member Thomas made a second to the motion. On a roll call vote:

Council Member Ragsdale voted aye  
Council Member Montgomery voted aye  
Council Member Nixon-Roney voted aye  
Council Member Thomas voted aye

The motion to deny the one- way street request for Gannaway passed by unanimous vote.

7. Public Hearing to consider an amendment to the Town of Jamestown General Code of Ordinances Article V Traffic Control Ordinance #1990-01 – The Town Clerk stated that NCDOT requested the Town Council amend our General Ordinance for traffic control within the area of the school speed zone in front of Jamestown Elementary School. The Town's Ordinance states the school speed zone of 25 mph is in effect 60 minutes before and 60 minutes after school begins & ends. However, the NCDOT signage states the school speed zone of 25 mph is in effect 30 minutes before and 30 minutes after school begins & ends on school days only. In order to be consistent with NCDOT signage and the school zone speed limit the Council needs to approve this amendment.

The Mayor stated this is a Public Hearing to consider this amendment to the school speed zone in front of JES to 30 minutes before & 30 minutes after the school begins and ends. The Mayor opened the Public Comment Portion of the Public Hearing. The Mayor asked for anyone that is opposed to the amendment, please come forward. Give your name & address. Please adhere to the 3 minute time limit. No one wished to speak. The Mayor asked for anyone in favor of the amendment to please come forward, give your name & address. Please adhere to the 3 minute time limit. No one wished to speak.

The Mayor closed the Public Comment Portion of the Public Hearing. He turned to the Council for discussion. Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to approve the amendment to the Town's General Ordinances to reflect the standards requested by NCDOT to 30 minutes before and 30 minutes after school begins and ends on school days only at Jamestown Elementary School. Council Member Montgomery made a second to the motion. On a roll call vote:

Council Member Ragsdale voted aye  
Council Member Montgomery voted aye  
Council Member Nixon-Roney voted aye  
Council Member Thomas voted aye

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

8. Public Comment Period –

Pam Harden, 204 Ragsdale Rd. She said she was sorry everyone was gone. She wanted to say that we, in Jamestown, don't think we are above anyone. I just wanted to publicly state we in Jamestown are not negative people. We just know what we want and don't want. 48 people is a lot to go next door to me.

Stan Calvarese – 103 Forestdale Dr – He just wanted to say that the Council did a real good job tonight. He respects every one of you sitting at the table. Whatever you would have decided I would have accepted 100%. The people here were not talking against people. They were talking about how the building would be and where it was. They didn't like the location of it. It wasn't directed against people. We don't want to keep anybody from moving here. I think Kelly in general is an honest man. Maybe he could do this project somewhere else, a better location. Again, he thanked the Mayor & Council for being on the Board.

9. Presentation of Comprehensive Annual Financial Report – Gallman introduced Brian Flinchum, Auditor with Dixon-Hughes Goodman to report the final audit. He thanked the Town for allowing them to work with the Town. He stated that Gallman and the staff are great to work with. They do a good job preparing for the audit. The Town received a clean audit. They did not identify any material weaknesses. Compared to last year, the Town's cash is up roughly 20% due to the performance of the general fund and the water/sewer fund and some deferred capital items. Other items highlighted were:

- The General Fund Balance is up this year
- Overall the total revenue only fluctuated \$46,000.00
- Expenses are similar to last year
- The percentage of fund balance available is higher than last year
- Water/Sewer is up roughly \$400,000.00 primarily due to fees, rate increases and less capital expenditures
- Property tax receivables are down/the collection rate is up

Gallman said if the Council would like to go over the Financial Statement at a future meeting, they would be glad to do so. The financial statement will be on the Town website for the public to view.

10. Approval of Guilford County Supplemental Library Funding – The Town Manager presented the supplemental agreement from Guilford County for the Jamestown Library. He stated we are granted funds by the County Commissioners based on our population in the amount of \$11,707.00. The agreement presented tonight allows us to bridge that gap with additional funding of \$43,793.00. We must approve this agreement on an annual bases. This is the same agreement as in previous years only the amounts and dates have changed.

Council Member Thomas made a motion to approve the Guilford County contract for supplemental library funding for fiscal year 7/1/15 – 6/30/16 in the amount of \$43,793.00. Council Member Nixon-Roney made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

11. Presentation of the Solid Waste Materials Management Annual Report – Blanchard reported this is a great program to run. It runs very smoothly with Town Staff consisting of 2 full time employees on the garbage truck and the driver. We do struggle to get to the Kersey Valley Landfill on Tuesdays. We are pretty close to capacity on the number of residents we can serve with our current set-up.

North Davidson serves our curb-side recycling and that is going well. The recycling is on an upward trend. Loose leaf collection begins on October 26, 2016 and runs through February 26, 2016. Blanchard thanked the Council for the new garbage truck.

12. Consider approval of Special Event Permit for the Jamestown Rotary Club – The Town Clerk stated that the Jamestown Rotary Club is requesting the Council approve a special event permit for the annual Christmas Parade. The Rotary Club is requesting the Town waive the fees, which is approximately \$500.00 for law enforcement and \$150.00 for postage & staff time. Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to approve the special event permit and to waive the fees as requested. Council Member Ragsdale made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

13. Consideration of budget amendment – Gallman presented budget amendment # 4 as follows:

- **General Fund**

- a) To include principal & interest payments on approved financing \$42,910.00
- b) Rental of port-a-johns & trailer for construction period at Golf Course \$ 6,500.00

- **Water/Sewer Fund**

- a) Amend to include principal & interested payment on approved financing \$32,187.00

Council Member Montgomery made a motion to approve budget amendment #4 as presented. Council Member Ragsdale made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

14. Analysis of financial position of the Town of Jamestown – Gallman presented the financial report for the month ending 9/30/15. The summary reported reflected the Town has cash balances of approximately 11 million dollars. Of that a little over 2 million is reserved for specific uses.

The debt balance is \$154,475.00 to be paid off in 2020.

Gallman presented the detailed report for period ending 9/30/15. Mostly reoccurring expenses. There were no questions for Gallman.

15. Public Comment Period – No one registered to speak.

16. Other business – Council Member Montgomery asked the status of the Retirement Community Certification program that was presented at last month’s meeting. Council Member Nixon-Roney said she spoke with Mr. Morgan. He met with the next level of personnel in Raleigh. The High Point Committee is raising the money. They will contact us when they have more to report.

The Town Manager reported the following items:

- Seeking sponsorships for the table & chairs in front of Triad Trophy Shop. Scheduled to extend that brick sidewalk within a month and create a patio look.
- Charles P. Turner Community Park & Sports Complex Sign – Seeking sponsorships. He has 3 of the 4 sponsors committed. It is a 5 year term for \$750.00. The sponsors to date are: Sheetz, Pepsi, and Triad Flag Football.
- Pre-construction meeting for the Public Service Facility and Clubhouse to occur within 2 weeks.
- We have authorization to construction E. Main St. sidewalk
- Working on some NCDOT comments. Anticipate authorization to construction on E. Fork Rd. project in the next week.
- At the Oct. 12, 2015 Planning Board meeting, the Planning Board recommended to ask the Town Council to consider support of lowering the speed limit on Main Street from Teague Drive to Wade Street from 35 mph to 25 mph. This was studied by NCDOT in 2006/07. NCDOT did not recommend it. However, there was never a formal request by the Town Council. The Town Manager said we can ask NCDOT to look at it again, if the Town Council were to support it that may make a difference. Council Member Nixon-Roney stated from the earlier reports we heard, it seems vehicles on Main Street average 26 mph. Is there really a need to request this?

The Town Manger said the Planning Board also requested establishing a more consistent speed on E. Fork Rd. for the entire length of the road to 35 mph. (Penny to Guilford Rd.) We would need to request NCDOT for a feasibility study.

Council discussed the request by Planning Board. Council Member Nixon-Roney did not feel Main Street was warranted. The Town Manager said the studies are at no cost to the Town. After discussion, Council Member Ragsdale made a motion to request NCDOT study the speed limit on Main Street and E. Fork Rd. as recommended by the Planning Board. Council Member Montgomery made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

17. Adjournment – Council Member Nixon-Roney made a motion to adjourn. Council Member Thomas made a second to the motion. The meeting ended at 10:10 pm.