

**FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
AUGUST 25, 2014
7:00 P.M.**

Present: Mayor Nat Robertson

Council Members Kathy Jensen (District 1); Kady-Ann Davy (District 2); H. Mitchell Colvin, Jr. (District 3); Chalmers McDougald (District 4); Robert T. Hurst, Jr. (District 5); William J. L. Crisp (District 6); Lawrence O. Wright, Sr. (District 7); Theodore Mohn (District 8); James W. Arp, Jr. (District 9)

Others Present:

Theodore Voorhees, City Manager
Kristoff Bauer, Deputy City Manager
Rochelle Small-Toney, Deputy City Manager
Jay Reinstein, Assistant City Manager
Karen McDonald, City Attorney
Harold Medlock, Police Chief
Lisa Smith, Chief Financial Officer
Scott Shuford, Development Services Director
Michael Gibson, Parks, Recreation and Maintenance Director
Karen Hilton, Planning and Zoning Manager
Craig Harmon, Planner II
David Nash, Planner II
Gloria Wrench, PWC Purchasing Manager
Pamela Megill, City Clerk
Members of the Press

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Robertson called the meeting to order.

2.0 INVOCATION

The invocation was offered by Pastor Verlon Anderson, Lock's Creek AME Zion Church.

3.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was led by Mayor Robertson and City Council.

4.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Council Member Crisp moved to approve the agenda.

SECOND: Council Member Hurst

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

5.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Mayor Robertson announced the City Council work session scheduled for September 2, 2014, will begin one hour earlier at 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Jodi Risacher, Cumberland County Library Director, provided a presentation on the services and programs available with the Cumberland County libraries, and stated the Cumberland County Library and Information Center is a dynamic, ever-growing public library system with the goal to serve an informed and progressive community. The County library system provides modern library resources and services necessary to satisfy the evolving informational needs and recreational pursuits of the community, thus enhancing the quality of life in Cumberland County.

6.0 REPORTS FROM BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

6.1 Joint Fayetteville-Cumberland County Senior Citizen Advisory Commission (JFCCSCAC)

Mr. Carey Berg, JFCCSCAC Chair, presented the JFCCSCAC annual report and stated the Joint Fayetteville-Cumberland County Senior Citizens Advisory Commission is dedicated to improving the quality of life for the senior citizens in Cumberland County. The Commission

strives to assist the senior population by advocating for seniors and informing them on issues and opportunities affecting them.

6.2 Planning Commission Annual Report FY 2014

Dr. William Fiden, Planning Commission Chair, presented the Planning Commission annual report and stated this annual report provides an overview of the Commission and highlights of the past year’s Planning Commission activities and number of items brought before them.

7.0 CONSENT

MOTION: Council Member Arp moved to approve the consent agenda with the exception of Item 7.02 (requested by Council Member Mohn) and Item 7.10 (requested by Council Member Colvin) for a separate vote.

SECOND: Council Member Crisp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS(10-0)

7.01 P14-18F. The rezoning of property from AR – Agricultural Residential to CC - Community Commercial Zoning District or to a more restrictive district, located at 7673 Raeford Road, and being the property of Margaret W. Newton Heirs.

7.02 Pulled by Council Member Mohn for a separate vote.

7.03 P14-21F. The initial zoning of property from M (P) County to LI/CZ - Light Industrial Conditional Zoning District or to a more restrictive district, located at 669 Snow Hill Road, and being the property of K T & C LTD (AKA - Southeastern Freight Lines).

7.04 P14-22F. The initial zoning of property from RR - Rural Residential County Zoning and CD - Conservancy District to AR - Agricultural Residential City Zoning District or to a more restrictive district, located at northeast quadrant of Stoney Point and Sykes Pond Roads, and being the property of Pelican Property Holdings LLC.

7.05 Resolution Authorizing Sealed Bid Sale for 1048 Progress Street

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY BY ADVERTISEMENT FOR SEALED BIDS. RESOLUTION NO. R2014-041

7.06 Special Revenue Fund Project Ordinance Amendment 2015-1 (Appropriation of Federal Forfeiture and State Controlled Substance Tax Funds for Law Enforcement Purposes).

This amendment will appropriate \$410,066.00 in controlled substance tax revenues and federal forfeiture funds to increase resources for law enforcement purposes. The City Manager's Office approves the specific use of these funds before the funds are expended. These funds must be used for law enforcement purposes.

7.07 Parks and Recreation - Local Landmark Nomination - SkyView on Hay

7.08 Approval of Meeting Minutes:

August 4, 2014 - Work Session

7.09 Adopt a Resolution Declaring Jointly Owned Real Property Surplus and Authorizing a Quitclaim Deed of the City’s Title to the County in Order to Expedite Sale of Land by Cumberland County.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE TO DECLARE CITY PROPERTY EXCESS AND QUITCLAIM CITY’S INTEREST IN JOINTLY HELD PROPERTY TO CUMBERLAND COUNTY. RESOLUTION NO. R2014-042

7.10 Pulled by Council Member Colvin for a separate vote.

7.11 Award Contract for Taxiway J & K Rehabilitation for the Fayetteville Regional Airport to Rifenburg Construction, Inc., the lowest responsive bidder in the amount of \$2,926,734.90.

Bids were received as follows:

Rifenburg Construction, Inc., Zebulon, NC.....	\$2,926,734.90
Barnhill Contracting Co., Fayetteville, NC.....	\$3,044,572.16
Triangle Grading & Paving, Inc., Burlington, NC.....	\$4,221,309.50

This project is a continuation of the program to rehabilitate the taxiways serving the air carrier apron, primary general aviation facilities, and the primary runway.

7.02 P14-20F. The rezoning of property from NC - Neighborhood Commercial to LC - Limited Commercial Zoning District or to a more restrictive district, located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Hoke Loop and Cliffdale Roads, and being the property of Harold Kidd.

This item was pulled for a separate vote by Council Member Mohn.

MOTION: Council Member Mohn moved to disapprove Item 7.02.

Ms. Karen McDonald, City Attorney, stated this item needed to be either approved or scheduled for a public hearing.

Council Member Mohn withdrew his motion.

MOTION: Council Member McDougald moved to approve.

SECOND: Council Member Wright

VOTE: PASSED by a vote of 8 in favor to 2 in opposition (Council Members Mohn and Crisp)

7.10 Award Contract for Air Carrier Apron Rehabilitation Phase II for the Fayetteville Regional Airport.

This item was pulled for a separate vote by Council Member Colvin.

MOTION: Council Member Arp moved to approve.

SECOND: Council Member Crisp

VOTE: PASSED by a vote of 8 in favor to 2 in opposition (Council Members Colvin and Wright)

8.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

8.1 P14-14F. The issuing of a Special Use Permit for a Cellular Communications Tower to be located at 3227 Fort Bragg Road, and being the property of Pok Cha Lee Opel.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item and stated this property is located at the intersection of Fort Bragg Road and Bragg Boulevard. Former site of Lee's Lounge, currently the site is vacant. While the property is surrounded by CC Community Commercial zoning, there are SF-6 zoned single-family homes within the 500-foot notification area. Communications towers locating in commercial zoning districts are required to have a fall zone surrounding the site that is half the tower's height. The proposed 125-foot communications tower will be built as a stealth monopine. That means that the structure will be built as a monopole that is designed to mimic the look of a pine tree at the top where it is most visible from surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Harmon said there are technical issues that preclude the tower from appearing "tree-like" all the way to the ground. Faulk and Foster, the developers of this tower, have been instructed to revise their plans to bring the fencing surrounding this site up to the required 10 feet in height and to remove the 1 foot of barbed wire that they currently show (these changes have been made to the site plans). All other aspects of this plan are in compliance with the City of Fayetteville's standards. Mr. Harmon stated the freestanding telecommunications towers, whether as a principal or accessory use, shall comply with the following standards:

a. Safety

- i. Before obtaining a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit to the City Manager engineering drawings for the tower, sealed by a licensed engineer, that include a statement that the tower will meet all applicable local, State, and Federal building codes and structural standards.
- ii. Every two years after construction of a tower, the owner shall submit to the City Manager a statement on the tower's structural soundness that is signed and sealed by an engineer. Every sixth year, the statement shall be signed and sealed by an independent, registered, and licensed engineer.

b. Height

The height of a telecommunications tower, including any building or structure atop which the tower is located, shall not exceed 450 feet.

c. Aesthetics

- i. A monopole shall be used unless a different structure is explicitly approved by City Council.
- ii. Towers shall either maintain a galvanized steel finish or be painted.
- iii. Towers shall be camouflaged with the surrounding area, through paint, incorporation into architectural design/structure, or other means, to the maximum extent practicable.
- iv. The exterior appearance of ground-based accessory structures located within a residential zoning district shall be designed to look like a residential structure typical of the district (e.g., with a pitched roof and frame or brick siding).
- v. Photo imagery shall be used to illustrate the appearance of the facility and its visual impact on the area.

d. Lighting

If lighting is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), it shall comply with FAA standards. To the extent allowed by the FAA, strobe lights shall not be used for nighttime lighting and lighting shall be oriented so as not to project directly onto any surrounding residentially-zoned property. Documentation from the FAA that the lighting is the minimum lighting it requires shall be submitted to the City Manager before issuance of any building permit for the tower.

e. Setbacks

- i. Except as provided in subsection iii., telecommunications towers shall be set back from abutting property lines the distance equal to or exceeding that in Table 30-4.C.3, Freestanding Telecommunications Tower Setback Standards.
- ii. Buildings associated with a telecommunications facility shall meet the minimum setback requirements for the zoning district where located.
- iii. When a tower, building or other structure is being added to an existing telecommunications tower site that was in existence prior to the adoption of the setback requirements under subsection b.i. and ii. above and the existing site does not comply with the setback requirements of subsection b.i. and ii., the Council, upon good cause shown by the applicant and evidence provided by a North Carolina registered professional engineer regarding the safety of the proposed setback, may reduce the setback requirements for the tower, building or other structure to be added to the existing site.

f. Separation from Other Towers

New telecommunication towers shall not be located within 1,500 feet of an existing telecommunications tower. This standard shall not apply to a telecommunications tower placed out of view in a building or other structure. The 1,500-foot standard may be reduced or waived through the special use permit process based on mitigating circumstances which may include, but are not limited to, topographical or transportation facility barriers (such as rivers, railways, and major highways), degree or extent of separation from other such uses, and surrounding neighborhood characteristics.

g. Collocation

- i. No freestanding telecommunications tower shall be allowed unless it is demonstrated that no suitable existing tower, building, or other structure within the coverage area is available for the collocation of antennas.
- ii. New freestanding telecommunications towers shall be designed to accommodate the present and future needs of the owner and at least two comparable users. Unused space on an existing telecommunications tower shall be made available to other users at a fair market rental unless mechanical, structural, or regulatory factors prevent collocation. In determining fair market rental, the rent paid by a current colocator under a swapping agreement need not be considered.

h. Buffer and Screening

A Type D buffer shall be provided around the perimeter of a freestanding telecommunications tower facility (including equipment structures and guy anchor supports).

i. Security Fencing

Towers, guy anchor supports, and ground-based equipment buildings shall be enclosed by security fencing not less than ten feet in height.

j. Interference

No telecommunications tower, antenna, or supporting equipment shall disturb or diminish radio or television or similar reception on adjoining residentially zoned land.

k. Use of Associated Buildings

Building and structures associated with a telecommunications tower shall not be used as an employment center for any worker. This does not prevent the periodic maintenance, inspection, and monitoring of equipment and instruments, or renovation of the facility.

l. No Outdoor Storage

No outdoor storage shall be allowed on a telecommunications tower site.

m. Compliance with State or Federal Laws and Regulations

Towers and antennas shall meet or exceed current standards and regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and any other agency of the State or Federal government that regulates telecommunications towers and antennas.

n. Replacement of Existing Towers

Existing freestanding towers may be replaced with a new tower that increases the number of collocation opportunities, subject to the following standards:

- i. The height of the replacement tower shall not exceed 110 percent of the height of the replaced tower.
- ii. The replacement tower shall be located within 100 feet of the replaced tower, unless the City Manager determines that a farther distance furthers the purpose and intent of this Ordinance.
- iii. The replacement tower shall comply with all the standards of this section.

o. Nonconforming Telecommunications Towers

Nonconforming telecommunications towers shall be allowed to remain and be maintained in accordance with the standards in Article 30-7: Nonconformities. Additional equipment may be added to the tower provided that such additions do not increase the degree of nonconformity.

p. Discontinued Use

If a telecommunications tower is not used for a period of six consecutive months, the City Manager may send the tower owner notice indicating that the tower must be removed within 90 days from the date of notice.

Mr. Harmon stated the Special Use Permit must meet the following findings of fact:

- (1) The special use complies with all applicable standards in Section 30-4.C, Use-Specific Standards;
- (2) The special use is compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zoning districts(s) of surrounding lands;
- (3) The special use avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking, loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration;
- (4) The special use is configured to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands;
- (5) The special use avoids significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources;
- (6) The special use maintains safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site;
- (7) The special use allows for the protection of property values and the ability of neighboring lands to develop the uses permitted in the zoning district; and
- (8) The Special use complies with all other relevant City, State, and Federal laws and regulations.

Mr. Harmon stated on June 10, 2014, the Zoning Commission held a public hearing to hear evidence regarding this case. After hearing the evidence for and against, the Commission voted to table this item to their July 8, 2014, meeting. The Commission asked that the following items be provided prior to that meeting and then be presented as new evidence. Mr. Harmon presented the following items that were requested by the Zoning Commission:

1. Conduct a second balloon test, letting the neighbors know in advance the dates that it will take place. This was completed and a third test was done with several of the neighbors in attendance.
2. List of Pros and Cons to this tower and this site and what additional sites were studied. This was discussed at the Zoning Commission meeting.
3. Map of existing towers near this location. This was received.
4. Better details on what constitutes Verizon's search area for the placement of this tower. This was received.
5. Better showing of the need for this tower through a service area map. This was received.
6. If and how emergency services would be able to use this tower. This was received.
7. Documentation on whether the equipment used at this site would interfere with other electronic equipment in the area. This was received.

Mr. Harmon stated the City's staff gave the applicant until Monday, June 23, 2014, to respond to the Commission's requested information. A balloon test was conducted on June 23, 2014; however, the letters informing the neighbors did not go out in time, from the applicant, and the letters had the wrong day/date listed as the time for the test. The remaining information was not sent to the Planning Department until after the City's staff notified the applicant that they had missed the June 23, 2014, deadline that they had been given. On August 12, 2014, the Zoning Commission held a second public hearing to hear additional evidence regarding this case.

There were two speakers in favor and one in opposition (there were four speakers signed up but one spoke and presented evidence for the group). Those in opposition presented evidence that property values would be damaged by this tower and that there are more suitable locations available. The applicant presented evidence to the contrary, regarding both issues. After hearing the evidence for and against, the Commission voted 4 to 0 to recommend approval. Mr. Harmon stated the Zoning Commission and City staff recommend approval of the proposed Special Use Permit based on (1) The tower would be located in an area surrounded by commercial zoning, (2) This proposal meets all of the applicable standards of the City, (3) The conditions listed above, and (4) Changes to the proposed fencing to meet the City's requirements.

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Ivan Mousaw, 9915 Pin Oak Aires Way, Charlotte, NC 28277, appeared in favor and stated he is representing the property owner and Verizon Cell Tower Inc.

Mr. Lonnie Player, 400 Westwood Shopping Center, Suite 210, Fayetteville, NC 28314, appeared in opposition and stated he is the legal representative for the property owners in the Willow Bend neighborhood. Mr. Player stated a cell tower located in this area would have a negative effect on property values.

Mr. Jonathan Charleston, 201 Hay Street, Fayetteville, NC 28301, appeared in opposition and stated if this tower is allowed to be constructed in close proximity to this neighborhood, it is in violation of Goal #4 of the Strategic Plan, "A highly desirable place to live, work and recreate with thriving neighborhoods, and high quality of life for all residents".

Mr. Crawford MacKethan, 2814 Skye Drive, Fayetteville, NC, appeared in opposition and stated he is a State Certified Appraiser. Mr. MacKethan asked the Council to deny the request for the Special Use Permit and maintain the integrity of the neighborhood.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Mohn asked how you would quantify adverse effect on property values in a dollar amount. Mr. Player responded it was impossible to speculate without a full blown property valuation. Council Member Mohn stated he was hearing a lot of opinions but nothing quantifiable. Mr. Player stated the tower would be visible to 50 percent of the neighborhood.

Council Member Crisp asked what the distance would be from the proposed cell tower site to the closest property line of the Willow Bend neighborhood. Mr. Player responded the distance as the crow flies is approximately 500 feet.

Mayor Pro Tem Davy asked Mr. Harmon how many cell towers have been placed in residential areas. Mr. Harmon stated this Special Use Permit is a request for a commercial area. Mayor Pro Tem Davy asked what makes this request different from other areas we have placed towers. Mr. Harmon responded most of the time when they are placed in a residential area they are placed on a fairly large lot.

Council Member Colvin asked Mr. Mousaw if there was a site analysis as the opposing side had stated there was not. Mr. Mousaw responded that Mr. Graham Herring had prepared the Site Impact Analysis and it is included in the report labeled "Impact Statement".

Council Member Hurst asked if Mr. Herring, who is in attendance for another hearing, would be permitted to speak. Mayor Robertson stated Mr. Herring did not sign up to speak at this public hearing.

Council Member Wright asked Mr. Mousaw for an overview of the signal strengths in the area. Mr. Mousaw displayed a slide that color coded the varying strengths of signals.

Council Member Arp asked if co-locating had been reviewed for increased service coverage. Mr. Mousaw responded there was not an existing tower in the vicinity that was suitable to collate with to off load the high volume of data usage.

Council Member Crisp asked about the statement in the report that reads there is no appreciable impact on property values, and asked what research the appraiser actually did to come to that conclusion, and asked if tax records had been looked at. Mr. Mousaw stated Verizon had contracted with a certified appraiser; Mr. Herring.

Council Member Jensen stated the land around the proposed tower is located in the gateway to Fayetteville Technical Community College. Mr. MacKethan stated this is not the image of the gateway we want, nor is it the image of the City that we all want.

Council Member McDougald stated it was interesting that the people that are opposed to this tower are probably the people that need this increase in service the most. Council Member McDougald referenced a letter that was received today from FTCC asking the Council to deny this request for a Special Use Permit.

MOTION: Council Member Arp moved to deny the request for a Special Use Permit based on the following findings of fact that are not in compliance: #2 - The special use is compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zoning districts(s) of surrounding lands, #4 - The special use is configured to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands; and #7 - The special use allows for the protection of property values and the ability of neighboring lands to develop the uses permitted in the zoning district.

SECOND: Council Member Crisp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

8.2 P14-17F. The issuing of a Special Use Permit for Communications Tower in an AR - Agricultural Residential District, to be located at 7037 Amarillo Drive and being the property of Trustees of New Bethel A.M.E. Zion Church.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item and stated this property is located on Amarillo Drive, just off of South Reilly Road. There are approximately 10 residents within 500 feet of this tower site. The proposed tower is 155 feet tall, with its entire fall zone on the church's property. The Land Use Plan calls for this area to be used as industrial property in the future. Mr. Harmon stated freestanding telecommunications towers, whether as a principal or accessory use, shall comply with the following standards:

a. Safety

- i. Before obtaining a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit to the City Manager engineering drawings for the tower, sealed by a licensed engineer, that include a statement that the tower will meet all applicable local, State, and Federal building codes and structural standards.
- ii. Every two years after construction of a tower, the owner shall submit to the City Manager a statement on the tower's structural soundness that is signed and sealed by an engineer. Every sixth year, the statement shall be signed and sealed by an independent, registered, and

licensed engineer.

b. Height

The height of a telecommunications tower, including any building or structure atop which the tower is located, shall not exceed 450 feet.

c. Aesthetics

- i. A monopole shall be used unless a different structure is explicitly approved by City Council.
- ii. Towers shall either maintain a galvanized steel finish or be painted.
- iii. Towers shall be camouflaged with the surrounding area, through paint, incorporation into architectural design/structure, or other means, to the maximum extent practicable.
- iv. The exterior appearance of ground-based accessory structures located within a residential zoning district shall be designed to look like a residential structure typical of the district (e.g., with a pitched roof and frame or brick siding).
- v. Photo imagery shall be used to illustrate the appearance of the facility and its visual impact on the area.

d. Lighting

If lighting is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), it shall comply with FAA standards. To the extent allowed by the FAA, strobe lights shall not be used for nighttime lighting and lighting shall be oriented so as not to project directly onto any surrounding residentially-zoned property. Documentation from the FAA that the lighting is the minimum lighting it requires shall be submitted to the City Manager before issuance of any building permit for the tower.

e. Setbacks

- i. Except as provided in subsection iii., telecommunications towers shall be set back from abutting property lines the distance equal to or exceeding that in Table 30-4.C.3, Freestanding Telecommunications Tower Setback Standards.
- ii. Buildings associated with a telecommunications facility shall meet the minimum setback requirements for the zoning district where located.
- iii. When a tower, building or other structure is being added to an existing telecommunications tower site that was in existence prior to the adoption of the setback requirements under subsection b.i. and ii. above and the existing site does not comply with the setback requirements of subsection b.i. and ii., the Council, upon good cause shown by the applicant and evidence provided by a North Carolina registered professional engineer regarding the safety of the proposed setback, may reduce the setback requirements for the tower, building or other structure to be added to the existing site.

f. Separation from Other Towers

New telecommunication towers shall not be located within 1,500 feet of an existing telecommunications tower. This standard shall not apply to a telecommunications tower placed out of view in a building or other structure. The 1,500-foot standard may be reduced or waived through the special use permit process based on mitigating circumstances which may include, but are not limited to, topographical or transportation facility barriers (such as rivers, railways, and major highways), degree or extent of separation from other such uses, and surrounding neighborhood characteristics.

g. Collocation

- i. No freestanding telecommunications tower shall be allowed unless it is demonstrated that no suitable existing tower, building, or other structure within the coverage area is available for the collocation of antennas.
- ii. New freestanding telecommunications towers shall be designed to accommodate the present and future needs of the owner and at least two comparable users. Unused space on an existing telecommunications tower shall be made available to other users at a fair market rental unless mechanical, structural, or regulatory factors prevent collocation. In determining fair market rental, the rent paid by a current colocator under a swapping agreement need not be considered.

h. Buffer and Screening

A Type D buffer shall be provided around the perimeter of a freestanding telecommunications tower facility (including equipment structures and guy anchor supports).

i. Security Fencing

Towers, guy anchor supports, and ground-based equipment buildings shall be enclosed by security fencing not less than ten feet in height.

j. Interference

No telecommunications tower, antenna, or supporting equipment shall disturb or diminish radio or television or similar reception on adjoining residentially zoned land.

k. Use of Associated Buildings

Building and structures associated with a telecommunications tower shall not be used as an employment center for any worker. This does not prevent the periodic maintenance, inspection, and monitoring of equipment and instruments, or renovation of the facility.

l. No Outdoor Storage

No outdoor storage shall be allowed on a telecommunications tower site.

m. Compliance with State or Federal Laws and Regulations

Towers and antennas shall meet or exceed current standards and regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and any other agency of the State or Federal government that regulates telecommunications towers and antennas.

n. Replacement of Existing Towers

Existing freestanding towers may be replaced with a new tower that increases the number of collocation opportunities, subject to the following standards:

- i. The height of the replacement tower shall not exceed 110 percent of the height of the replaced tower.
- ii. The replacement tower shall be located within 100 feet of the replaced tower, unless the City Manager determines that a farther distance furthers the purpose and intent of this Ordinance.
- iii. The replacement tower shall comply with all the standards of this section.

o. Nonconforming Telecommunications Towers

Nonconforming telecommunications towers shall be allowed to remain and be maintained in accordance with the standards in Article 30-7: Nonconformities. Additional equipment may be added to the tower provided that such additions do not increase the degree of nonconformity.

p. Discontinued Use

If a telecommunications tower is not used for a period of six consecutive months, the City Manager may send the tower owner notice indicating that the tower must be removed within 90 days from the date of notice.

Mr. Harmon stated the Special Use Permit must meet the following findings of fact:

- (1) The special use complies with all applicable standards in Section 30-4.C, Use-Specific Standards;
- (2) The special use is compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zoning districts(s) of surrounding lands;
- (3) The special use avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking, loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration;
- (4) The special use is configured to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands;
- (5) The special use avoids significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources;
- (6) The special use maintains safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site;
- (7) The special use allows for the protection of property values and the ability of neighboring lands to develop the uses permitted in the zoning district; and
- (8) The Special use complies with all other relevant City, State, and Federal laws and regulations.

MOTION: Council Member Crisp moved to recuse Council Member McDougald from participating and voting on this item.

SECOND: Council Member Arp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (9-0) (Council Member McDougald recused)

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Tom Johnson, 4141 Parklake Avenue, Suite 200, Raleigh, NC 27612, appeared in favor and stated he is the attorney representing American Tower and AT & T, the tenant on this tower. Mr. Johnson requested Council approve the Special Use Permit, citing the request does meet all of the requirements.

Mr. Graham Herring, 8052 Grey Oak Drive, Raleigh, NC 27615, appeared in favor and stated he is the licensed appraiser for this application and stated it is his opinion there would be no significant adverse effects to the property values in the vicinity should the tower be installed.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Hurst noted this area is mostly a wooded area and zoned industrial in anticipation of future demand.

Council Member Mohn asked Mr. Harmon if the south parcel (expansion of Fayetteville Technical Community College) will provide excellent service. Mr. Harmon responded the additional coverage will also provide capability to draw more industrial development.

MOTION: Council Member Wright moved to approve the Special Use Permit as presented by staff, with the conditions as stated and based on the findings of fact.

SECOND: Council Member Crisp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (9-0) (Council Member McDougald recused)

8.3 Annexation of Estates at Sykes Pond-Cumberland Part

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item with the aid of PowerPoint presentation and stated the property requested for annexation is located on the western side of the City, along the Cumberland County-Hoke County boundary. It is on the western side of Sykes Pond Road, north of Stoney Point Road, and south of Raeford Road. This area was not annexed as part of the Phase 5 annexation area in 2005. The property is contiguous to the City, and it is in the Fayetteville MIA. The property consists of approximately 43.76 acres. The land is currently undeveloped, but it is proposed to be developed as a new residential subdivision to be named Estates at Sykes Pond. This new subdivision will straddle the county boundary. The owner has requested that the Cumberland County part of the proposed subdivision be annexed. The property is currently in one tax parcel. The latest site plan for the proposed new development shows that the Cumberland part will have 54 lots. It is expected that one single-family housing unit will be built on each lot. The owner/developer wishes to install PWC water and sewer in the new subdivision. Since the Cumberland part of the proposed subdivision is in the Fayetteville MIA and contiguous to the City, annexation is required before PWC utilities will be provided, pursuant to City Council Policy No. 150.2. The City staff received an annexation petition for the area on May 14, 2014. The petition was signed by Sharlene R. Williams of Pelican Property Holdings, LLC, and David B. Frazelle of Great Oaks Property Holdings, LLC. On August 12, 2014, the Zoning Commission held its initial zoning public hearing on this area. On August 25, 2014, the City Council will have the initial zoning on its agenda. Also on August 25, 2014, the City Council will hold a public hearing on the requested annexation.

Council Member Arp asked Mr. Nash which company provides electricity to the area. Mr. Nash responded it is Lumbee River Company.

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Lori Epler (no address provided) appeared in favor and stated she is representing Larry King and Associates, a Land Surveying and Engineering Company, located in Fayetteville, representing the property owners.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

AN ORDINANCE TO EXTEND THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA [ESTATES AT SYKES POND (9476-64-9280). ANNEXATION ORDINANCE NO. 2014-08-555

MOTION: Council Member Colvin moved to adopt the proposed ordinance annexing the area effective August 25, 2014, and establish the initial zoning consistent with the prior action on the zoning case.

SECOND: Council Member Arp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

8.4 Annexation of Southeastern Freight Lines Property - 669 Snow Hill Road

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and stated Southeastern Freight Lines is an existing truck terminal business located at 669 Snow Hill Road, south of the Fayetteville Regional Airport. The property is not contiguous to the City. The owner of Southeastern Freight Lines (KT&C, LTD) wants to expand its building in the rear, add some parking on the eastern side of the building, add a new water fire line, and hook on to a nearby sewer line. As the property is in the Fayetteville MIA, the owner has submitted an annexation petition, pursuant to City Council Policy No. 150.2. The City received the petition on June 3, 2014. The property requested for annexation consists of around 16.01 acres. On July 8, 2014, the Zoning Commission held a public hearing regarding the initial zoning of the property.

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Michael Newman, 5136 Greenmeadow Drive, Rock Hill, SC 29732, appeared in favor and stated he is the civil engineer for the project and is representing the property owner.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

AN ORDINANCE TO EXTEND THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA [SOUTHEASTERN FREIGHT LINES, 669 SNOW HILL ROAD (0434-15-5205]. ANNEXATION ORDINANCE NO. 2014-08-556

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Davy moved to adopt the proposed ordinance annexing the area effective August 25, 2014, and establish the initial zoning consistent with the prior action on the zoning case.

SECOND: Council Member McDougald

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

9.0 OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

9.1 Annexation of U-Haul Property-2346 Gillespie Street

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and stated the property requested for annexation is located at 2346 Gillespie Street, across from the Crown Auditorium/Arena. The property is contiguous to the City, and it is in the Fayetteville MIA. Amerco Real Estate Company of Phoenix, Arizona, bought the property in 2012 and opened a U-Haul rental and storage facility on the property. Previously, the property was used as a manufactured home sales lot. When the U-Haul facility opened, the existing buildings were already served by PWC water and sewer. When the process to expand began (December 2012), Amerco did not anticipate the need for additional PWC services. In February 2014, the City staff learned PWC utilities were going to be used for the new buildings. Pursuant to City Council Policy No. 150.2, staff provided an annexation petition on February 11, 2014. City staff received the annexation petition on May 5, 2014. The area requested for annexation consists of one tax parcel containing around 9.90 acres. The land in the area was previously developed and used as a U-Haul rental and storage facility. Storage facilities include mini-storage buildings and sheds for the parking of RVs. There is currently a street closure process underway with the County to close Joseph Street, along the rear of the property. If this street is closed, it is possible that the size of the property will increase and another annexation petition will be initiated. On June 10, 2014, the Zoning Commission held its initial zoning public hearing on this area. On August 11, 2014, the City Council approved the initial zoning of this property. Also on August 11, 2014, the City Council held a public hearing on the requested annexation. When the City Council held its public hearing on August 11, 2014, two officials from U-Haul spoke. This

item was continued to allow staff to work with the property owner to resolve development standard issues. These issues have all been resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

**AN ORDINANCE TO EXTEND THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA [U-HAUL PROPERTY, 2346 GILLESPIE STREET (0436-01-5023)].
ANNEXATION ORDINANCE NO. 2014-08-557.**

MOTION: Council Member McDougald moved to adopt the proposed ordinance annexing the area effective August 25, 2014, and establish the initial zoning consistent with the August 11, 2014, action on the zoning case.

SECOND: Council Member Arp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

9.2 Uninhabitable Structures Demolition Recommendations

Mr. Scott Shuford, Development Services Director, presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and multiple photographs of the property. He stated staff recommends adoption of the ordinances authorizing the demolition of the structures. He reviewed the following demolition recommendation:

225 S. Eastern Boulevard

Mr. Shuford stated the structure is a vacant commercial structure that was the subject of a fire in December 2012. As a result of the fire, the structure was inspected and condemned as a dangerous structure on December 18, 2012. A hearing on the condition of the structure was conducted on January 9, 2013, in which the owner attended. A subsequent Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 120 days was issued and mailed to the owner on January 10, 2013. As of September 23, 2013, the owner had not repaired or demolished the structure. On September 23, 2013, the matter was presented to the City Council for the adoption of an ordinance to demolish the structure. The owner had stated that his intent was to repair the structure. The Council approved demolition Ordinance No. NS2013-031 with a provision that the owner shall have until October 23, 2013, to submit plans to the City's Inspection Department, and should the owner fail to comply, the structure shall be demolished. Since the approval date of the ordinance, the owner has submitted repair plans to the City's Inspection Department that were non-compliant with the Building Code and in need of correction. To date, the owner has not submitted approved plans to obtain the necessary building permits to repair the structure. The utilities on this structure have been disconnected since November 27, 2012. In the past 24 months prior to the building fire there have been 142 calls for 911 service to the property. There have been 6 code violations cases with no pending assessments. The owner has also initiated construction work on the structure without required building permits and enclosed the building with attached plywood. As such, bidding to award a demolition contract will take place after the adoption of a demolition ordinance and receipt of an inspection warrant to allow interested bidding contractors access to the building.

1301 Hillsboro Street (Education Building)

Mr. Shuford stated the City Inspector is required to correct conditions that are found to be in violation of the Dwellings and Buildings Minimum Standards. The structure is a vacant commercial building that was inspected and condemned as a blighted structure on November 14, 2013. A hearing on the condition of the structure was conducted on December 4, 2013, in which the owner attended indicating that the property was for sale. A subsequent Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 120 days was issued and mailed to the owner on December 5, 2013. To date there have been no repairs to the structure. The utilities on this structure have been disconnected since September 19, 2011. In the past 24 months there has been 1 call for 911 service to the property. There have been 3 code violation cases with \$99,840.79 pending assessments for demolition of the church building on the same property in 2011. The low bid for demolition has yet to be determined and will be subject to a formal bidding process.

606 Link Street

Mr. Shuford stated the structure is a vacant residential home that was inspected and condemned as a blighted structure on March 7, 2014. A hearing on the condition of the

structure was conducted on April 2, 2014, in which a representative of the owner attended. A notice of the hearing was published in The Fayetteville Observer newspaper. A subsequent Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 60 days was issued and mailed to the owner on April 3, 2014. To date there have been no repairs to the structure. The utilities on this structure have been disconnected since September 27, 2013. In the past 24 months there have been 38 calls for 911 service to the property. There have been 9 code violations cases with no pending assessments. The low bid for demolition is \$2,245.00

135 Person Street

Mr. Shuford stated the structure is a vacant two-story commercial structure located in the Downtown Historical District that was inspected and condemned as a dangerous structure on October 7, 2011. The structure has structural defects in the roof system, flooring system, and the façade. The Development Services Department retained a structural engineer to inspect the façade due to concerns about stability. The subsequent engineer's report stated that the façade is unstable and could fall onto the sidewalk unexpectedly. In response, the public sidewalk area in front of the sidewalk was barricaded. A hearing on the condition of the structure was conducted on October 19, 2011, in which the owner did not attend. The property owner's representative had contacted the Housing and Code Enforcement Division on October 18, 2011, to discuss what repairs were needed to bring the structure into compliance. A subsequent Hearing Order to submit repair plans within 60 days, obtain all related permits within 10 days of plan approval, and to complete the repairs within 90 days of permit issuance was issued and mailed to the owner on October 31, 2011.

The owner filed an application for a certificate of Appropriateness with the Historic Resources Commission requesting approval to demolish the structure. On January 22, 2013, the Historic Resources Commission approved the demolition by the owner with the condition that the demolition be delayed 365 days to provide the owner the option to sell or repair the structure.

As of May 27, 2013, there were no repairs or demolition of the building. The structure is one building located at 133 and 135 Person Street. A subsequent Ordinance No. NS2014-011 for the demolition of the structure was adopted by the City Council. At the time of adoption, it was staff's belief that the structure was located on one parcel. Shortly after adoption, it was found that 133 Person Street is located on the parcel for which Ordinance No. NS2014-011 was adopted, and 135 Person Street is on a separate parcel.

A hearing on the condition of the structure at 135 Person Street was conducted on June 18, 2014, in which a representative of the owner appeared. A subsequent Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 30 days was issued and mailed to the owner on June 19, 2014. To date there have been no repairs to or demolition of the structure. The owner has applied for the City's Acquisition and Demolition grant which is being processed. Due to a need to protect the neighboring buildings during the demolition, the grant may not cover the total demolition costs. The low bid for demolition has yet to be determined and will be subject to a formal bidding process and related report from a structural engineer. The utilities on this structure have been disconnected since August 2008. In the past 24 months there have been no calls for 911 service to the property. There have been no code violations cases with no pending assessments.

1921 Powell Street

Mr. Shuford stated the structure is a vacant residential home that was inspected and condemned as a blighted structure on June 27, 2012. A hearing on the condition of the structure was conducted on July 18, 2012, in which an heir of the owner failed to attend but had responded prior to the hearing indicating that all required repairs would be completed. A notice of the hearing was published in The Fayetteville Observer newspaper. A subsequent Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 90 days was issued and mailed to the owner on July 19, 2012. To date there have been no repairs to the structure. There is no record of disconnected utilities on this structure. In the past 24 months there have been no calls for 911 service to the property. There have been 8 code violations cases and an outstanding lot cleaning assessment of \$1,356.30. The low bid for demolition is \$1,600.00

Mr. Shuford stated the City Inspector is required to correct conditions that are found to be in violation of the Dwellings and Buildings Minimum Standards. The structure is a vacant residential home that was inspected and condemned as a blighted structure on March 22, 2012.

A hearing on the condition of the structure was conducted on April 11, 2012, in which the owner attended indicating that all required repairs would be completed. A subsequent Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 90 days was issued and mailed to the owner on April 12, 2012. The owner filed an appeal of the Hearing Order and a subsequent appeal hearing before the Board of Appeals on Dwellings and Buildings was conducted on June 7, 2012. The Board modified the Hearing Order to repair or demolish the structure within 150 days of the date of the issuance of the Hearing Order. To date there have been no repairs to the structure.

There is no record of utilities disconnection on this structure. In the past 24 months there have been no calls for 911 service to the property. There have been no code violation cases, and no assessments. The low bid for demolition is \$1,745.00.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, REQUIRING THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR TO CORRECT CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OR TO DEMOLISH AND REMOVE A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO THE DWELLINGS AND BUILDINGS MINIMUM STANDARDS CODE OF THE CITY (225 S. Eastern Boulevard, PIN # 0447-01-3000). ORDINANCE NO. NS2014-017

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, REQUIRING THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR TO CORRECT CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OR TO DEMOLISH AND REMOVE A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO THE DWELLINGS AND BUILDINGS MINIMUM STANDARDS CODE OF THE CITY (1301 Hillsboro, PIN # 0438-42-9846). ORDINANCE NO. NS2014-018

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, REQUIRING THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR TO CORRECT CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OR TO DEMOLISH AND REMOVE A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO THE DWELLINGS AND BUILDINGS MINIMUM STANDARDS CODE OF THE CITY (606 Link Street, PIN # 0447-03-0584). ORDINANCE NO. NS2014-019

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, REQUIRING THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR TO CORRECT CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OR TO DEMOLISH AND REMOVE A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO THE DWELLINGS AND BUILDINGS MINIMUM STANDARDS CODE OF THE CITY (135 Person Street, PIN # 0437-63-8978). ORDINANCE NO. NS2014-020

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, REQUIRING THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR TO CORRECT CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OR TO DEMOLISH AND REMOVE A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO THE DWELLINGS AND BUILDINGS MINIMUM STANDARDS CODE OF THE CITY (1921 Powell Street, PIN # 046-13-2532). ORDINANCE NO. NS2014-021

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, REQUIRING THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR TO CORRECT CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OR TO DEMOLISH AND REMOVE A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO THE DWELLINGS AND BUILDINGS MINIMUM STANDARDS CODE OF THE CITY (423 School Street, PIN # 0437-93-0943). ORDINANCE NO. NS2014-022

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE RESCINDING DEMOLITION ORDINANCE NO. NS2013-031. RESOLUTION NO. R2014-043

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Davy moved to approve the demolition ordinances and rescind Ordinance No. NS2013-031.

SECOND: Council Member Wright

Council Member Colvin stated he understands the correlation between blighted areas and crime, and asked if the demolition process was the same for residential and commercial properties. Mr. Shuford responded in the affirmative, and stated that allowances are made for property owners making good faith efforts to come into compliance; it is basically an incentive,

staff goes to a lot of effort to clearly define what needs to happen to comply.

Council Member Crisp asked what improvements had taken place to the property located at 225 S. Eastern Boulevard. Mr. Shuford responded that unpermitted repairs had taken place, and so he is unable to list what repairs might have been made. Council Member Crisp made comments to the boarding up of the property.

MOTION: Council Member Arp moved to call for the question.

SECOND: Council Member Mohn

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Davy moved to adopt the ordinances authorizing demolition of the structures and adopt the resolution that rescinds Ordinance No. NS2013-031.

SECOND: Council Member Wright

VOTE: PASSED by a vote of 8 in favor to 2 in opposition (Council Members Colvin and McDougald)

9.3 Crime Statistics and Internal Affairs Bi-annual Report

Police Chief Harold Medlock presented this item; with an overview of recent crime statistics and the Internal Affairs Bi-annual Report. Chief Medlock stated the information in the report compares data from the first half of the year and compares it to the same time frame last year. Highlights from the presentation, all data is preliminary and for the first half of the year, include January through June and compared to the same time frame last year:

- Total Violent Crime is down 4.4%
- Total Property Crime is down 11.9%
- Total Part 1 Crime (Property Crimes and Violent Crimes) is down 11.3%
- Total Use of Force is down 62%
- 54% decrease in injuries to suspect
- 33% decrease in injuries to the officer

Chief Medlock stated staff with the Internal Affairs Unit attributes the reduction in the Use of Force incidents by Fayetteville Police Officers because of an increase in de-escalation training for officers, increase in reality based training, and a continued emphasis on Crisis Intervention Training in dealing with subjects who may have mental disabilities.

Discussion ensued.

This item was for information only; no action was taken on this item.

9.4 Proposed Resolution Making Cumberland County Prohibited Activity Ordinance Applicable within the Municipal Limits of the City of Fayetteville.

Ms. Karen McDonald, City Attorney, presented this item and stated the Legal Advisor for the Cumberland County Sheriff, Ronnie Mitchell, drafted the ordinance at the request of the Cumberland County Superintendent, Dr. Frank Till. On November 18, 2013, the Cumberland County Board of Commissioners adopted the ordinance. The Superintendent has asked the City to also adopt this ordinance. Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 153A-122, this resolution is being proposed for the purpose of making the Cumberland County Prohibited Activity Ordinance applicable within the incorporated limits of the City of Fayetteville.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, PURSUANT TO N.C.G.S. § 153A-122, MAKING THE PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ORDINANCE IN CHAPTER 9.5 OF THE CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA, CODE OF ORDINANCES ADOPTED BY THE CUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON NOVEMBER 18, 2013, APPLICABLE WITHIN THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE. RESOLUTION NO. R2014-044

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Davy moved to adopt the resolution.

SECOND: Council Member Arp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

10.0 ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

10.1 Monthly Statement of Taxes - July 2014

2014 Taxes.....	\$205,010.83
2014 Vehicle.....	442.28
2014 Taxes Revit.....	1,635.36

2014 Vehicle Revit.....	121.33
2014 FVT.....	75.00
2014 FTT.....	75.00
2014 Storm Water.....	9,190.58
2014 Fay Storm Water.....	16,542.98
2014 Fay Solid Waste Fee.....	19,707.85
2014 Annex.....	0.00
2013 Taxes.....	59,979.04
2013 Vehicle.....	58,446.11
2013 Taxes Revit.....	230.77
2013 Vehicle Revit.....	0.00
2013 FVT.....	7,123.96
2013 FTT.....	7,124.00
2013 Storm Water.....	1,686.76
2013 Fay Storm Water.....	3,373.48
2013 Fay Recycle Fee.....	3,979.97
2013 Annex.....	0.00
2011 Taxes.....	5,692.61
2011 Vehicle.....	5,685.05
2011 Taxes Revit.....	0.00
2011 Vehicle Revit.....	0.00
2011 FVT.....	921.13
2011 FTT.....	921.13
2011 Storm Water.....	273.74
2011 Fay Storm Water.....	547.47
2011 Fay Recycle Fee.....	486.84
2011 Annex.....	0.00
2011 Taxes.....	906.82
2011 Vehicle.....	1,025.21
2011 Taxes Revit.....	0.00
2011 Vehicle Revit.....	0.00
2011 FVT.....	209.01
2011 FTT.....	209.00
2011 Storm Water.....	88.91
2011 Fay Storm Water.....	177.83
2011 Fay Recycle.....	90.47
2011 Annex.....	0.00
2010 and Prior Taxes.....	658.86
2010 and Prior Vehicle.....	2,079.64
2010 and Prior Taxes Revit.....	0.00
2010 and Prior Vehicle Revit.....	0.00
2010 and Prior FVT.....	427.70
2010 and Prior FTT.....	295.49
2010 and Prior Storm Water.....	6.23
2010 and Prior Fay Storm Water.....	12.45
2010 and Prior Fay Recycle Fee.....	7.82
2010 and Prior Annex.....	263.14
Interest.....	14,504.40
Revit Interest.....	3.84
Storm Water Interest.....	193.51
Fay Storm Water Interest.....	384.32
Annex Interest.....	124.44
Solid Waste Interest.....	724.97

Fay Transit Interest..... 1,103.54
Total Tax and Interest..... \$430,767.48

10.2 Levy for 2014-2015 Fiscal Year

	No. of Accts.	Real Value	Personal Value	**Exempt Value	Taxa
with	88,013	12,097,832,950	598,792,814	210,756,390	1
	0	0	0	0	
	88,013	12,097,832,950	598,792,814	210,756,390	1
	Rate	Taxes	Late List	Total:	
with	0.486	60,681,330.47	29,878.42	60,711,208.89	
		0.00	0.00	0.00	
		60,681,330.47	29,878.42	60,711,208.89	
tion	No. of Accts	Real Value	Personal Value	***Exempt Value	Taxa
with	828	110,596,046	12,489,063	45,000	
	0	0	0	0	
	828	11,596,046	12,489,063	45,000	
	Rate	Taxes	Late List	Total	
with	0.10	123,040.54	154.99	123,195.53	
		0.00	0.00	0.00	
		123,040.54	154.99	123,195.53	
	Exempt Value:			Revit Exempt Value:	
	Real	209,378,587		Real	45,000
	Personal	1,377,803		Personal	0
	Total:	210,756,390		Total:	45,000
	Fayetteville Storm Water:		3,988,510.20		
	Fayetteville Recycling:		2,433,960.00		
	Storm Water:		2,215,839.00		

11.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.