### FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA BRIEFING MINUTES LAFAYETTE ROOM SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

#### 4:00 P.M.

Present: Mayor Anthony G. Chavonne

Council Members Keith Bates, Sr. (District 1); Kady-Ann Davy (District 2); Robert A. Massey, Jr.

(District 3); Bobby Hurst (District 5); William J. L. Crisp (District 6) Valencia A. Applewhite

(District 7); James W. Arp, Jr. (District 9)

Absent: Council Members Darrell J. Haire (District 4); Theodore W. Mohn (District 8) Others Present:

> Kristoff Bauer, Assistant City Manager Karen M. McDonald, City Attorney Scott Shuford, Development Services Director Craig Harmon, Planner II David Nash, Planner II Bart Swanson, Housing and Code Enforcement Division Manager Frank Lewis, Senior Code Enforcement Administrator Members of the Press

Mayor Chavonne called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

City staff presented the following items scheduled for the Fayetteville City Council's September 26, 2011, agenda:

## Uninhabitable Structures Demolition Recommendations: 806 Eugene Street, 516 Link Street, and 1639 Rudolph Street

Mr. Bart Swanson, Housing and Code Enforcement Division Manager, presented this item and briefly reviewed the history and condition of each structure. He stated the recommendation was adoption of the ordinances authorizing demolition of the structures.

### Consideration of a Planned Neighborhood District (PND) detailed development plan application for property located on the southeast side of Bingham Drive across from Lakeridge Drive. Containing 56.22 acres more or less and being the property of Edgar L. Maness and wife and Robert C. Draughon and wife.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item and stated the City received a detailed development plan for a Planned Neighborhood District called Reserve at Bingham. He showed vicinity maps and provided overviews of the current land uses, current zonings, surrounding land uses and zonings, and 2010 Land Use Plan. He explained the PND development application process and stated after approval of the site plan by Council, the developer would have two years to submit a detailed site plan. He stated the developer had already submitted a site plan that had gone before the Planning Commission. He stated the Planning Commission and staff recommended approval of the detailed site plan.

# Public hearing to consider a petition requesting annexation – submitted by Methodist University (Meadowcroft Drive – Riverdell Drive Property).

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item and provided background information. He stated the existing land use in the area was mostly vacant, but there were two lakes and several storage buildings. He stated there were no housing units or population and the property was exempt from taxes. He stated staff recommended adoption with an effective date of September 26, 2011.

## Public hearing to consider a petition requesting annexation – submitted by Methodist University (Longview Drive Extension Property).

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item and stated the second property for Methodist University was referred to the Longview Drive extension property. He stated the only thing that passed through the area that was anything close to being developed was the Longview Drive extension running through it, and it was just a trail at that point leading to one house. He stated there were no homes or population in the area and the petition was sufficient. He stated staff recommended adoption of the ordinance with an effective date of September 26, 2011. Public hearing to consider a petition requesting annexation – submitted by various owners of property in the Baywood Point Subdivision.

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item and stated this was a satellite request grant for annexation. He stated the item was on the July 25, 2011, agenda but was pulled because it was determined at that time the petition was not sufficient. He stated the new petition was received September 12, 2011. He stated it was located in an area referred to as Vander which was unincorporated. He stated it was required by City policy for properties within the City of Fayetteville's Municipal Influence Area (MIA) area, and if PWC water and sewer were requested, the owner must submit an annexation petition. He stated staff recommendation was that the effective date be December 31, 2011, because there were some people living in the area and there was an election coming up. He explained the people would not be precleared to vote in the City elections in time for the primary and general election in November.

### Public hearing to consider the City of Fayetteville Hazard Mitigation Plan (a part of the Cumberland County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update).

Mr. David Nash, Planner II, presented this item and provided background information. He stated it was a five-year document and which needed to be updated. He stated the City had worked with all the other jurisdictions in the County on the original plan and had elected to work with all the other units of local government in updating it. He stated the work on the update began in May of 2010 and most of the research and work of the City's efforts were completed in September 2010. He stated it was then submitted to FEMA and the State and approved by the State on April 4, 2011. He stated the focus was keeping the natural hazards from becoming disasters. He stated hazard mitigation meant reducing some of the adverse consequences of the hazards. He stated the benefits of having an approved Hazard Mitigation Plan was making the area eligible for hazard funds should an event happen in the area. He stated the staff and Planning Commission recommended adoption of the City of Fayetteville Hazard Mitigation Plan as part of the overall Cumberland County plan.

## A request that a sidewalk not be required to be constructed with the City's Municipal Influence Area (MIA) (southern side of Eastern Boulevard.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item and reviewed the process. He explained the request came up when the project was going through the subdivision process in the County within the MIA area. He showed vicinity maps and gave overviews of the current land uses, current zonings and surrounding land uses and zonings. He stated staff recommended that the City recommend to the County Commissioners denial of the sidewalk waiver but require only a 10-foot sidewalk easement, based on the fact that NCDOT indicated that a sidewalk would not be allowed within the right-of-way along the roadway under the current conditions but anticipated that future development along the service road would warrant retrofit to provide a sidewalk or multipurpose path.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.