

24
MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND BOARD
OF ALDERMEN, TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL, MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1976, 7:30 P.M.

Mayor Wallace called said meeting to order; present and seated were:

James C. Wallace, Mayor
Gerald Cohen
Robert Epting
Thomas Gardner
Jonathan Howes
Shirley Marshall
Marvin Silver
R. D. Smith
Edward Vickery

Also present were Town Manager K. Jenne, Town Clerk D. Roberts and Town Attorney E. Denny.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR THE PAVING OF LONGVIEW AND PRITCHARD -
PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Wallace called the public hearing to order to consider the preliminary assessment roll for the paving of Longview and Pritchard. Town Clerk Roberts gave the introductory presentation. He stated that the notice of the public hearing was published in the Chapel Hill Newspaper on February 20, 1976. On February 16, 1976, notices were mailed out to the property owners. On February 17, 1976, a copy of the Notice of Public Hearing were delivered to each house in the area to be assessed. The assessment is charged at \$6.00 per front foot. The total assessment is \$5,873.40.

In response to a question by Alderman Smith, Mr. Roberts stated that he had received one phone call concerning this assessment, from Mr. Bob Anderson, who said he would attend the public hearing. Mr. Roberts stated that he had received no correspondence and no other phone calls. Alderman Vickery expressed concern with the double assessing of corner lots owners. Alderman Howes stated that this is the price of a corner lot.

Ms. Eva G. McKenna, a property owner on Pritchard Street, stated that she would have been very happy to have had the street paved because she signed petitions. Now this street is used as a short cut to University Gardens and the Housing Project. She stated that she resents having to pay the assessment, after all these years, when someone else made the dust. Town Manager Jenne stated that he does not know exactly when the petition was submitted. The few records that are available show that the preliminary assessment hearing was held in October, 1973. The street was paved shortly after that. Ms. McKenna stated that there were earlier petitions than that. Alderman Gardner stated that he does not remember whether the paving was done under petition or not. He stated that it had only been in the last two or three years that the Town, by statute, had the authority to go in and to do paving without a valid petition. Ms. McKenna stated that Mr. Seibel had done several petitions, one, he was told, never reached the proper people. Mr. Jenne stated that the record of the October preliminary assessment stated that, at that time, the work was being done under petition. In response to Ms. McKenna concerning the delay in billing, Town Attorney Denny stated that while this particular project was done under petition as distinguished from some of the work done in the NDP area, the project was contracted along with the NDP work and was both speeded up and delayed as that project was. Mr. Jenne stated that he cannot say why the project was not brought to complete resolution last year. He just recently was made aware that it was still outstanding and, he stated, he thought it might not have been done early last year because of the necessity for a staff project to determine the actual cost in order to actually confirm the price of the project and to confirm the assessment.

Ms. McKenna stated that too much time has elapsed and that she does protest and object to this long range deal. Because of the time delay, many of the residents felt that the Housing Authority was giving assistance. Alderman Marshall stated that the Board realized that this situation had occurred and several assessment roles, outstanding over years even longer than this, have been brought in and processed within the last year. She stated that she hopes that the administration will see that this does not happen again.

Alderman Smith stated that the work has been done as a result of having a petition by the residents of that area. He suggested that, even with the assessment roll, the Board adopt the resolution so that similar situations won't occur. This is just a case of unfortunate delay. Alderman Cohen pointed out that the assessments are still being processed at the same price. The bill has not increased because of the delay nor has interest been added because of the delay. Alderman Smith stated that he thinks that most of the residents will pay the assessment. Ms. McKenna is questioning the delay.

For clarification Alderman Cohen stated that the purpose of the public hearing on the assessment role is to give each resident the opportunity to make sure that the number of feet assigned to them is correct. Town Attorney Denny stated that this is correct. In case of sewer assessment it would actually be verified by actual assessment cost of the project.

ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL TO ADJOURN THE PUBLIC HEARING. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mayor Wallace stated that the issue raised by Ms. McKenna, is by no means disposed of, but will be taken into consideration.

Mayor Wallace called the regular meeting to order. The minutes of the meeting of February 23, 1976 were duly considered and corrections were made. ON MOTION BY ALDERMAN SMITH, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL, SAID MINUTES WERE UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR OFFICIAL RECORDING AS CORRECTED.

Petitions and Requests.

Alderman Epting expressed concern about a copy of the County's Attorney's opinion with respect to the planning area extension. He asked if the Mayor, the Manager or the Attorney had received such a transmittal. Mayor Wallace stated that he had received none. Alderman Howes stated that he talked informally with Mr. Bernholz, who stated that a submission is being prepared to be sent to Town officials, along with a transmittal from the County Board of Commissioners. Alderman Silver requested that this matter be placed on the agenda to be discussed at the next regular meeting. Alderman Howes requested that the transmittal be distributed to Board members as quickly as possible, prior to packet.

Joseph Lee of 12-H Sharon Heights, presented the following petition:

As you are aware the Town is currently in the process of developing a Capital Improvement Program. In the fall of 1975, Town officials solicited suggestions for capital improvement projects from citizen and civic groups. This solicitation demonstrated to suggestions presented by citizen groups. It is my concern that this initial effort of public involvement in the Capital Improvement Program planning process be continuous.

During the Community Development Program over the past couple of years, the Town has invited the direct involvement and strong support in the development of the Community Development grant. Many citizens participated in Community Development public hearings, a nominal group process, and a subsequent resident survey administered in a sector of the city. Through these processes many needs and problem areas were identified through the citizen participation process. Because of this, many citizens and citizen groups have been watching the development of the Capital Improvement Program in the anticipation that opportunities for active citizen involvement will materialize.

Citizens view the Town of Chapel Hill as a unique place to live. Hopefully, the Town of Chapel Hill is unique enough to involve its citizens in all long range planning processes that will affect the development of the Town. Additionally, I hope the Town does not need federal programs such as Community Development to stimulate the need for comprehensive citizen involvement.

I would like to compliment the Planning Staff and other Town officials for the innovative and thought provoking techniques used to stimulate citizen participation in the Community Development planning, I would like to petition the Board of Aldermen to solicit the same innovative and stimulating citizen participation in the development, priority setting, and decision-making in the Capital Improvement Program.

In response to Alderman Gardner, Mr. Lee stated that he is talking about the Community Development Program in the context of citizen participation that is involved. He stated that his concern is that the Town of Chapel Hill does not wait until the federal government or any other governmental unit requires strong citizen participation, but that Chapel Hill strive to have citizen participation in all long range planning activities of which the CIP is a part. After securing that Mr. Lee had worked with the Pitch program, Alderman Marshall stated that much of the CIP came from the extensive citizen participation solicited in the Pitch program. She stated that there would be difficulty getting the initial bond issue out without the information gathered over the last several years. Mr. Lee stated that he understand that and he understands the fact that there are timetable constraints that the Board is working under, however, he stated that he feels that even with the time constraints, the Town can involve the citizens much more than it is at the present. He had no suggestions on techniques for achieving this. Alderman Vickery stated that the Board in a work session invited citizens to submit statements along with Board members about projections for the CIP to be considered by the Town and the Board in the deliberations on the CIP so if there are any specific thoughts about projects, write them up and submit them to the Town Manager or one of the Board members.

Mr. Lee stated that in the early fall of 1975, the Town did solicit comments and suggestions from some organizations with which he is involved. He stated that these organizations submitted comments and suggestions and have heard nothing about them. Alderman Howes stated that these comments were received and acknowledged by the Planning Staff and the Town Manager and reviewed by the Planning Board and incorporated in the draft proposal that the Manager prepared late last fall. They will also be a part of the submission that the Manager is to prepare for April 15th. He stated that if evidence of the comments is not seen in this proposal, there will be a public hearing on April 26th at the Institute of Governments where everyone concerned will have the opportunity to be heard. Alderman Vickery stated that there is a statement about what happened to each of the thirteen citizen requests in the back of the CIP draft. Alderman Smith stated that some of the suggested activities may be in the process of being funded in some other way. These would not be in the CIP. Some of the suggestions may be found in one of those other funding categories.

ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES, TO RECEIVE THE PETITION AND TURN IT OVER TO THE MANAGER. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Assessment Roll for the Paving of Pritchard Avenue and Longview Street - Resolution

ALDERMAN GARDNER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SMITH THAT A RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR THE PAVING OF PRITCHARD AVENUE AND LONGVIEW STREET, BE APPROVED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED at 8:09 p.m.

A RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR THE PAVING OF PRITCHARD AVENUE AND LONGVIEW STREET.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that the assessment roll for the paving of Pritchard Avenue and Longview Street is hereby confirmed as follows:

Owner	Front Feet	Assessment (at \$6.00 per front foot)
Paul Seibel, Stewart, Anderson, Jr.	324	\$1,944.00
Richard I. & Charlotte Levine	62	372.00
Eva G. McKenna	75	450.00
Edwin L. & Pearl Caldwell, Sr.	75	450.00
Paul G. Carr	158.9	953.40
Paul G. Carr	50	300.00

Karl E. Bauman & Geraldine Gourley	25	150.00
Karl E. Bauman & Geraldine Gourley	50	300.00
Paul G. Carr	50	300.00
Van & Janet Price	109	654.00
	<u>978.9</u>	<u>\$5,873.40</u>

This the 8th day of March, 1976.

Community Development Program - Resolution

Mike Jennings, Planning Director for the Town of Chapel Hill, gave background information and presented the referrals from public hearing concerning the Community Development Program. He also gave the recommendations from the Community Development Task Force, the Planning Board and the Manager. Alderman Gardner had requested information concerning expenditures made under the Revenue Sharing and Community Development programs. In reference to this, he read, from the minutes, the paragraph dealing with the Community Development Task Force recommendation for reductions in the administrative costs in the program. He stated that there was some indication at the public hearing that it is desirable to have more funds included in the rehabilitation grants. He stated that he feels that with the work that the Community Development Task Force put on this matter, that the Board should give strong consideration to their recommendation to reduce administrative costs in this program. The Board could perhaps do this and provide some other desirable areas for alternatives for expenditures in addition to the one raised for more funds into the rehabilitation grants. He suggested programs such as aid to the elderly, grants for animal control, traffic control, appearance and beautification, trash recepticals and neighborhood storm drainage. He suggested some cuts in general administration and relocation, but not so much cut to the rehabilitation administrative costs. He stated, in response to Mayor Wallace, that he is proposing a reduction as recommended by the CD Task Force, of \$8,000 in general administrative costs, \$5,000 in relocation administrative costs, and a reduction in rehabilitation administrative costs from \$56,000 to \$27,000 or \$30,000 instead of the recommended cut to \$21,600. In response to Alderman Marshall Town Manager Jenne informed the Board of some of the things involved in the administrative costs. He stated that the Task Force recommendation is not based upon the deletion of anything in particular. These administrative costs are based on salaries and supportive costs of personnel required to undertake the various activities needed to meet federal requirements. For example, the Executive Director of the Housing Authority spends some of his time on conventional housing which is appropriately charged to the Public Housing budget. He spends a lot of his time on the Community Development Program. That part of his salary is charged to Public Housing. This is also true of the other personnel involved. Some of them spend 50% of there time on the Community Development Program and others spend 100%. The administrative cost for rehabilitation and relocation is an allocated portion. A lump sum figure was sent to HUD last year and they came back and said that these salaries must be allocated to the activities that they are actually covering. This is what is reflected in this year's administrative figures. Al Stevenson, Executive Director of the Housing Authority, added to this stating that the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners has worked very hard to keep expenses low. It has a Finance Committee that reviews all budgets of all administrative costs in the programs. This Finance Committee reports and makes recommendations to the full Board. He stated that the Housing Authority was pleased to find that this years administrative costs only shown an increase of \$2,000 over last year. He stated that there are prorations of salaries between programs, as there is some staff that works with the Community Development and some with Public Housing. Last year the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners took it upon themselves to compare the number of people that it has on staff as compared to other agencies this size, involved in the same kind of work. It was found that Chapel Hill's staff is smaller than other agencies that are involved in the same kind of work. In addition to this, the Housing Authority feels that it is at a level of staffing which it can accomplish some of the objectives which it desires to accomplish. The Housing Authority has used the Town's pay plan and some of the Town's positions as comparables in establishing ranges and costs for implementing these programs. He stated that he had checked with Charlotte, Burlington, Winston Salem,

28

all communities involved in Community Development, and found that their rehabilitation staffs along consist of nine or ten people. Chapel Hill has a rehabilitation staff, property acquisition staff, relocation staff and still have only nine people. In response to Alderman Gardner, Mr. Stevenson pointed out that the total Community Development salary is \$86,690 and the total salaries for the low rent housing staff is \$74,416. Each employee is given a time allocation sheet which is kept over a twelve month period. Based on compiling that information, the staff is able to tell how much time various staff people spend in each program. Town Manager Jenne stated, in response to Alderman Gardner, that the figure of \$96,000 (total administrative costs for last year) was reached by the number of staff required to undertake these activities. The salaries are allocated on a prorata basis.

Alderman Howes stated that as long as the Town chooses to participate in this program and chooses to organize it in the way it is, the amount of money allocated to the administrative expenditures, is necessary. He stated that the Town is going to sooner or later have to address the question of whether it is going to continue to have a Housing Authority and its staff independent of the Town Manager and the Board. In the meantime, manuver within the budget that has been proposed. ALDERMAN HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL THAT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS, BE ADOPTED.

5

Alderman Smith stated that it disturbs him greatly that the Community Development Task Force would make such a request of the Board, and he inquired as to the rationale behind the request. He also inquired into the Town's cost of living increases and their affect on the various staffing groups involved in this program. Thirdly, he inquired as to the expenditures for safety and environmental protection. In response to Alderman Smith, Mr. Jenne stated that the Community Development Task Force's concern is with the amount of additional money that could be put into rehabilitation and relocation, if administrative expenses were lowered. This is an unfortunate result of the way the program is structured. These are criteria that have been dictated by HUD although the Community Development Program was originally to have been a very open Revenue Sharing sort of program. The Town found, on its adoption, that it is not and it has been restricted more and more ever since. At this time, the budget could not include a cost of living increase in the administrative costs because it has not been determined by the Town. Within the Community Development budget, on line items, there is a 10% leeway during the program year to adjust various line items in the budget. There is also a local option of about \$35,000 and if a cost of living increase were approved, and it were given to the Housing Authority staff we well those adjustments could be made without HUD approval within the 10% limit in the budget. The terms by which revenue sharing and fund expenditures to the federal government, are required to be put in categories.

In response to Alderman Smith concerning the drainage problem, Mr. Jenne stated that in the Revenue Sharing monies that have expended, there has been no work done on storm drainage. Last year's Community Development application, as well as this year's there is not included an anticipated expenditure on storm drainage problems in the Community Development area. This, however, is included in the Capital Improvements Program. The expenses of Revenue Sharing Funds that come under Environmental Protection, in 1975, were about \$13,200 or so for improvements to wastewater treatment equipment purchases.

In response to Alderman Silver, Mr. Jenne stated that the \$48,000 cut in administrative expenses would mean a cut in Community Development Staff.

ALDERMAN VICKERY PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE SUBMISSION AND TO THE REQUEST FROM THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN TO THE HOUSING AUTHORITY AND THE MANAGER FOR A STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES WHICH WOULD COMPARE OUR EXPENSES WITH THOSE OF COMPARABLE COMMUNITIES AND WITH ALTERNATE WAYS OF ACCOMPLISHING THE TASKS NOW PERFORMED BY THE NINE MEMBER STAFF. Mayor Wallace clarified the amendment stating that this is conditional after the fact. Alderman Epting stated that the Manager and the Housing Authority Director have already stated that they have made such a study in effect and have given the results in summary. Alderman Vickery stated that he is not convinced, as the communities that were mentioned are all larger than Chapel Hill. ALDERMAN HOWES, WHO MADE THE ORIGINAL MOTION AND ALDERMAN MARSHALL, WHO SECONDED THE ORIGINAL MOTION, BOTH ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT.

Alderman Gardner stated that he raised this matter because a great deal has been done in this program. The concern has been raised last year and this year over administrative costs. The flexibility that the recommendation of the Community Development Task Force gives would provide further progress in what is now being accomplished in the NDP area to alleviate the problem and give more aid to the people who need aid. The FHA in Hillsborough administers millions and millions of dollars in loans with four people. Why must Chapel Hill incur such administrative costs. Alderman Cohen stated that if the people in HUD all over the southeast that are working in this, were counted and the Town Manager's time and everyone else's time were counted, it would be found that more money is being spent on the program than is actually being programmed. The program is shot through with this. Something should be presented to the people at a higher level that huge amounts of money are being wasted. Alderman Marshall stated that Chapel Hill wants a sensitive approach given to these projects as was with Ms. Riggsbee. In order to have this sensitive approach, staff time is needed. The People in Hillsborough are not doing this kind of sensitive work.

THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Alderman Epting stated that it is curious that with all the discussion concerning administrative costs, that the Board should charge the administrators with yet another task. He stated that this is not meant as a criticism, of the philosophy of what's being done, but simply a statement on his part. He also stated that the Community Development Task Force offered no specifics with its recommendation as to what should be cut or the basis of their dissatisfaction.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Town of Chapel Hill authorizes its Town Manager, Kurt J. Jenne, to file with the Department of Housing and Urban Development an application, including all understandings and assurances required therein, for grants of \$600,000 in Community Development Block Grant funds, divided into a grant of \$465,000 in Entitlement (Hold-Harmless) Funds and a grant of \$135,000 from General Purpose Metropolitan Discretionary Funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Kurt J. Jenne, be and the same is hereby directed and designated as the authorized representative of the Town to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.

This the 8th day of March, 1976.

Certificate of Just Compensation - Resolution

Town Manager Jenne presented background and details of the Certificate of Just Compensation. Aldermen Smith expressed concern for Ms. Riggsbee's health and well-being when she is moved from her home. He was assured by Mr. Stevenson that Ms. Riggsbee is fully aware of everything that is going to happen. She is aware of the temporary relocation, which will be from 90 to 120 days, and it is acceptable to her, as long as it is not permanent. Alderman Smith requested that action be taken and completed as quickly as possible with Ms. Riggsbee's home. He also requested, for Ms. Riggsbee's comfort, that she is picked up and brought to see the progress being made on her home.

ALDERMAN SILVER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EPTING, THAT A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING VALUATION AS REQUIRED BY HUD HANDBOOK 1320.1, BE ADOPTED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING VALUATION AS REQUIRED BY HUD HANDBOOK 1320.1

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Board of Aldermen has determined on the basis of three appraisals that the fair market value of certain properties intended for purchase by the Chapel Hill Housing Authority, is as follows:

<u>Parcel Number</u>	<u>Area (Sq. Ft.)</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Interested to be Acquired</u>	<u>Established Fair Market Value</u>
23-10	759	Carrie Foushee	Structure	\$3,814.20
204-19	911	Annie Mae Fuller	Structure	\$6,809.55
204-21	873	Eugene Atwater	Structure	\$5,358.09
205-3	384	Luzelle Burnette	Structure	\$3,461.00
81-B7	1,266	Laura J. Merritt	Structure	\$3,475.07
208-5	584	Lottie Riggsbee	Structure	\$1,287.00

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Aldermen on the basis on information supplied by Alvin E. Stevenson, Executive Director of the Chapel Hill Housing Authority, hereby certifies that the work of the appraisers and the review appraiser with respect to each of the above properties has been performed in a competent manner in accordance with applicable state and federal law and the policies and requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This the 8th day of March, 1976.

The Housing Loan Trust Fund - Resolution

Al Stevenson, Executive Director of the Chapel Hill Housing Authority, stated that when the Housing Loan Trust Fund was established in 1973 and the Housing Authority undertook administration of it, they made recommendations to the Board of Aldermen, pointing out some potential problem areas. One of those was income limits that determine eligibility for participation in the Housing Loan Trust Fund. At that time, the Housing Authority stated that it would not make any recommendations that the income limits be changed, but that it would, in the course of trying to implement the program, review and evaluate the income limits as they proceeded. Since that time, it has been found that the income limits are too low for implementation of the program. Presently, the Housing Loan Trust Fund has a set of income limits and they begin at \$3,000 for a one family. The idea behind the loan, particularly the improvement loan, is that the family would have enough income to pay the loan back, otherwise the loans cannot be made. The problem in trying to process Housing Loan Trust Fund loans, is there are overlapping categories, particularly in families of one, two, or three. Those families under the present Housing Loan Trust Fund income limits are not only eligible to participate in the Housing Loan Trust Fund, but are eligible to participate in the Housing Loan Trust Fund, but are eligible to receive Community Development Block Grants. That has posed a problem in that families are saying they should not be forced into getting a loan when their income level qualifies them to receive a grant. The Housing Authority realized that families of four, five, six and seven, with what appears to be pretty large income, really doesn't amount to much when there is family of that size. Earlier this year, the Housing Authority set up some income criteria for processing the Community Development Block Grant. Those criteria were taken directly from HUD's recommended income limits for participation in the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment Program. They adopted what they call very low income limits. For a family of one, \$3,650, for a family of two \$4,900 and so forth. There is some overlapping of income requirements for participation in the grant program and the loan program. ~~What the~~ Housing Authority is seeking to do is to raise the income limit for participation in the Housing Loan Trust Fund so there is not this overlapping and therefore not the delay and also provide enough in a family so that the loan can be paid back. In response to Alderman Howes, Mr. Stevenson stated that to date, they have administered three loans and there are five awaiting processing pending the Board's action here. The Housing Authority is expecting to administer some twenty more over the year. These loans are to be used for housing rehabilitation.

Alderman Smith stated that there is no schedule of payment back to the Town. He asked if this is intended to be a revolving fund so that once the Revenue Sharing is gone and one the Community Development is gone, the Town can still carry on rehabilitation in this community out of the Housing Loan Trust Fund money. Town Attorney Denny stated that this has been set up, to date, that the Board of Aldermen passed a Resolution that authorized a loan to the Chapel Hill Housing Authority. That loan now

totals \$350,000. The purpose for which that loan would be used, was set forth in that initial resolution, that it only be used to establish and implement a Housing Loan Trust Fund. That loan can be called at any time by the Town of Chapel Hill. Pursuant to that Resolution, the Housing Authority then adopted a trust agreement which formally created the Housing Loan Trust Fund with that \$350,000 and then further adopted a resolution that designated the Finance Director of the Town of Chapel Hill for the fiscal agent for that fund, so that fund is and has always been in the hands of the Town of Chapel Hill for investment purposes. The Housing Loan Trust Fund does not make loans to anybody. It either subsidizes the interest or in some instances, guarantees payment of the loan. Once a person applies for the loan and it is approved by the Housing Loan Trust Committee, contact is made with a local finance institution and the bank or building and loan actually makes the loan to the individuals and then the bank makes the trustees of the Housing Loan Trust Fund execute a document and deliver a copy of it both to the borrower and the bank and if the loan is made at 8% total interest, that document certifies to the bank that each month the trust fund will pay either 5% or 3%. If this change is made at this time, the borrower will always only pay the maximum 3%. That document assures the borrower that the payment will always come within their income limits. All such loans are secured by the first lien of the property and if the loan is on top of a relocation grant, there is ample security for the loan at all times. The borrower owns nothing to the Town because he has not borrowed anything from the town. It is also possible for the Housing Loan Trust Fund to guarantee the payment of the loan also. It has been used only once in the past and then on a very temporary interim period. It is therefore a revolving fund as long as it is paid off. In every instance, the Town is earning more interest on the fund it is holding than it is paying out.

In response to Alderman Vickery, Mr. Stevenson stated that processing of the loan is based on need which consider income and severity of housing conditions. Mr. Denny stated that in January of 1975, at the request of Board of Aldermen, the Housing Authority prepared a complete explanation of this with guidelines standards. It is filed in the Mayor's office at the present for anyone who wished to look at it.

ALDERMAN COHEN MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY THAT THE RESOLUTION AMENDING THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A LOAN TO THE CHAPEL HILL HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENABLING THE ESTABLISHMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOUSING LOAN TRUST FUND, BE ADOPTED.

Alderman Epting stated that he is unclear on what circumstances that the Town might wish to call on the Authority for repayment. Mr. Denny stated that the Primary reason that the Town took this approach, at the time the program was was initiated, the Town lacked sufficient enabling legislation to permit it to enter into it directly. Certain amendments that this last legislature made did not then exist, so that the Town had to use this round about way to accomplish the desireable end. Yet, the Town wanted to keep this option open, if it ever wanted to administer the program direct, and got the legal authority to do so, it could do so. In response to Alderman Cohen, Mr. Denny stated that it would not be administratively any simpler to change to direct administration now that there is enabling legislation. In response to Alderman Gardner, Mr. Denny stated that the original resolution as adopted, made credit life insurance a mandatory provision. The reason for that being that the Board did not want anyone to get into the position of having the responsibility of paying off the loan left to the family should the head of the family die. In practice, it appeared that the cost of such credit life insurance was so disproportionate that it was impracticable. The cost of it was more than the interest subsidy that they were given under the loan. It was just not within the means of the applicant to have the life insurance. Consequently, that requirement was made discretionary so that if the family can afford it and wanted it, he could borrow the money to make a lump sum payment and have it part of the loan paid back over a period of time. It is not required. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A LOAN TO THE CHAPEL HILL HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENABLING THE ESTABLISHMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOUSING LOAN TRUST FUND

SECTION I

That Section 8 of the Resolution as adopted November 19, 1973 be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

8. Income limits for participation in interest subsidy program.

In order for an applicant to be eligible for participation in this program, the family of which he is the head, must fall within the following maximum adjusted income limits:

<u>Number Persons in Household</u>	<u>Maximum Adjusted Income Limits</u>
1	\$ 6,100.00
2	7,800.00
3	8,800.00
4	9,750.00
5	10,400.00

Households of larger size than that shown may petition the Housing Authority for special consideration.

The interest subsidy for all loans shall be such that the applicant shall pay no more than three per cent (3%) interest.

SECTION II

That Section 9 of the Resolution as adopted November 19, 1973, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

9. Income limits for participation in the loan guaranty program.

In order for an applicant to be eligible for participation in the loan guaranty program, the family of which he is the head, shall fall within the following maximum adjusted income limits:

<u>Number Persons in Household</u>	<u>Maximum Adjusted Income Limits</u>
1	\$ 6,100.00
2	7,800.00
3	8,800.00
4	9,750.00
5	10,400.00

Households containing more than the above number of persons may petition the Housing Authority for special consideration.

This the 8th day of March, 1976.

Traffic Problems on Merritt Mill Road at Frank Porter Graham School.

Mike Jennings, Planning Director for the Town of Chapel Hill, gave background presentation and details of the traffic problems on Merritt Mill Road at Frank Porter Graham School along with staff recommendations for resolution of the problems. He stated that the problem consists basically of conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian traffic, uncontrolled student pedestrian traffic and insufficient control of vehicular traffic. The objectives to be sought in solving the problem include channelizing student pedestrian traffic along safe routes and controlled crossings, providing adequate walking surfaces to define routes, increasing safety and easing walking, and providing reasonable vehicular traffic control during periods of high student pedestrian activity to reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflict. Town Manager Jenne stated that this does not call for final action but it has been a matter of concern for members of the Board, people in school administration and citizens. This is by no means what is regarded as a final answer. There have yet to be discussions with the School System, Carrboro and the other jurisdictions involved. The ultimate solution of the problem will have to be the result of a coordinated effort by all three

jurisdictions. In response to Alderman Smith, Mr. Jenne stated that there are fifteen to twenty children walking from home to school. Others are left off by parents either at the convenience store or on the school property. These walking children are mostly from Carrboro and the trailers across the street from the school. Alderman Smith questioned the possibility of extending the road in front of the school to tie into the ramp to the 54 bypass. Ms. Anne Wyne, President of the PTA, stated that apparently, when the school was built, this was the intent, however, the state will not join the ramp to the bypass. She stated that she had been to both Town governments because coverage is needed. Even the light at Merritt Mill Road that Carrboro has put in is backing up traffic to the point that no one can get in or out with the parents who know the danger, yet still let their children out on a dangerous road. He also expressed skepticism as to whether Carrboro is willing to carry out its responsibility in this action and he asked if any contact had been made with Carrboro to ascertain whether or not they are interested in improving the conditions at the area in question. Mr. Jenne responded stating that Carrboro is quite interested in pursuing the situation. He stated that this is going to take a coordinated effort not only on the part of the Town of Chapel Hill and the Town of Carrboro and the School System, but on the part of the parents themselves and their control of the children on the site. Part of the problem is that the children are uncontrolled after being dropped off. There is limit to the solution that Town governments can provide to that. Everyone involved is going to have to work for a solution including the Towns, the School Administration and very substantial part of the problem is the lack of attention given by parents or neighbors who bring the children to school and let them off without any supervision. What is proposed here is that the Town spend approximately \$40,000 which is less than the life of any child that is lost. Mayor Wallace stated that it is the concensus of the Board of leave this matter with the Manager and hear from it in connection with the upcoming budget. Alderman Vickery stated that he would like to commend the staff on their presentation of this matter.

Annexation - Resolution of Intent

Town Manager presented the details of the Resolution of Intent to Consider Annexation of Certain Areas Bordering the Town of Chapel Hill. He stated that this is a resolution of intent to annex the Oaks area and an area near Frank Porter Graham School. Both of these will be areas that the staff would intend to bring before the Board for consideration for annexation this year. The resolution of intent is the necessary first step in allowing the staff to proceed in preparing the annexation report. ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN COHEN THAT THE SECTION OF THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING ANNEXATION OF THE OAKS AREA, BE ADOPTED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EPTING THAT THE SECTION OF THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING ANNEXATION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY NEAR FRANK PORTER GRAHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, BE ADOPTED. Mr. Jennings, Planning Director, pointed out some corrections to the resolution and showed the proposed areas on maps. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

A RESOLUTION OF INTENT OF CONSIDER ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN AREAS BORDERING THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Town of Chapel Hill, pursuant to the provisions of Part 3, Article 4A of Chapter 160A of the North Carolina General Statutes, intends to consider annexation of the following areas:

Area 1. Oaks Apartments, Oaks Subdivision and land north to Little Creek.

BEGINNING at the northwestern corner of Lot 6A, Tax Map 52, and proceeding thence eastward with the northern line of said lot approximately 540, 320, 400, 495, 315, 200, 520, and 125 feet to the western right-of-way line of Pinehurst Drive; proceeding thence across Pinehurst Drive to a point one foot east of the eastern right-of-way of said street, thence southward parallel to said right-of-way approximately 590 feet to the northern corner of Lot 54B-D-1; proceeding thence southward with the eastern line of Lot 54B-D-1 291 feet to the southeastern corner, and 100, 80, and 104 feet westward with the southern line of said lot to a point one foot east of the eastern right-of-way line of Pinehurst Drive; proceeding thence south parallel to said right-of-way line 151 feet to the northern line of Lot 54B-D-2; proceeding thence with the northern lines of Lots 54B-D-2

34

and 488, 70, 200, and 165 feet to the eastern corner of Lot 54B-D-4 proceeding thence westward with the southern lines of Lots 54B-D-4 and 54B-C-14 320 and 625 feet to the southwestern corner of Lot 54B-C-14; proceeding thence south with the western line of Lot 52-6 approximately 560, 280, 995, 315, and 160 feet to the northeastern corner of Lot 54A-A-6; proceeding thence south with the eastern lines of Lots 54-A-A-6 through 1, 240, 240, 240, and 163 feet to the northern right-of-way of N.C. 54 Bypass; proceeding thence southward to the centerline of said right-of-way, the present Chapel Hill Corporate Limits, and proceeding thence westward with said centerline approximately 850 feet to the extended centerline of Rogerson Drive, the present Corporate limits; and running thence north with said corporate limits approximately 4,920 feet to the point of BEGINNING.

Area 2. Right-of-Way near Frank Porter Graham Elementary School

BEGINNING at a point in the Eastern right-of-way line of Smith Level Road, the southwestern corner of Lot 1, Block B, Chapel Hill Township Tax Map 122; proceeding thence approximately 30 feet to the centerline of the right-of-way of Smith Level Road; proceeding thence with said centerline north approximately 730 feet to the centerline of Merritt Mill Road; proceeding thence with the centerline of Merritt Mill Road approximately 904 feet east to its junction with the extended western line of Lot 122-C-1; proceeding thence south with said western lot line 148 and 385 feet to the north right-of-way line of N.C. 54 at its junction with the extended western line of Lot 122-B-3A; proceeding thence with said extended lot line south across the right-of-way of N.C. 54 to the northeast corner of Lot 122-B-1; proceeding thence west and south with the northwestern lot lines of lot 122-B-1 approximately 240, 845, 95, and 265 feet to the point of BEGINNING.

BE IT FURTHER resolved that a public hearing on the question of annexing the above described areas will be held in the Meeting Room of the Municipal Building, 306 North Columbia Street, at 7:30 P.M., on April 12, 1976, at which time plans for extending services to said areas will be explained and all persons desiring to speak on the matter will be given an opportunity to be heard; and be it further resolved that a report of plans for extending services to the above-described areas are on file in the office of the Town Clerk for public inspection at least 14 days prior to the date of said public hearing; and be it further resolved that notice of said public hearing shall be given by publication as required by statute.

This the 8th day of March, 1976.

Elderly and Handicapped Bus Service

Town Manager Jenne discussed the details of the elderly and handicapped bus service to be considered at this time. He stated that the radio installation in the bus has been delayed until hopefully the first of June. The Transportation Board and The Transportation Department, with the assistance of various citizen groups and the Department of Human Services, have developed a means of proceeding with the operation of this bus on a reserved schedule basis until the installation of the radios. There is a significant demand for these buses. Before starting operation, the staff recommends that a special fare structure be established for the elderly and handicapped bus. The fare structure proposed basically imposes a surcharge over the regular fare to reflect the higher cost of operation of the bus and to provide a disincentive for the persons who could normally use a regular bus. ALDERMAN GARDNER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL THAT A RESOLUTION SETTING FARES FOR ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED BUS SERVICE, BE ADOPTED. Alderman Marshall stated that there is no mention made of the necessity for the bus taking handicapped students on a regular basis to and from the University. John Pappas, Transportation Director, responded that it is part of the plan. He stated that he has not listed all of the needs for the vehicle that have been uncovered. They are numerous, including dental and medical trips from the home on Legion Road, trips to the hot lunch program, among others. He stated that staff has visited Kent State University and looked at their handicapped student bus. Alderman Epting stated that in view of the justification which is taken to be dual in nature for the higher fares for use of the bus, half of the justification can be served by surcharging those who are not handicapped and not surcharging those who are handicapped. He asked if a study had been made to show the surcharge would be significant to the overall cost of the system. If not there is no purpose in surcharging the handicapped. Mr. Jenne stated that the surcharge would not cover the additional cost

of running the service. Mr. Pappas stated that he doesn't have a handle on ridership. They don't know how many people will use it. He stated that at his most outside estimate of keeping the vehicle busy, the staff can see no better than \$1.25 per person. Alderman Silver stated that this is a bus to perform a service. He is unhappy with the surcharge particularly since it represents only approaching 10% of the overall cost. ALDERMAN SILVER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EPTING, TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION TO HAVE NO SURCHARGE ON ANYTHING DEALING WITH THE HANDICAPPED. This does include anyone accompanying a handicapped person. Alderman Howes stated that the Town has a Transportation Advisory Board to advise the Board of Aldermen on matters of this sort. He stated that it might be best, to refer this back to the Transportation Board, expressing the Board of Aldermen's concern over the whole concept of surcharges and ask them to study the matter further and propose an alternative. Alderman Marshall stated that she thinks that the Transportation Board has given the Board of Aldermen what they think is reasonable. The Board of Aldermen is responsible for tax money and should make the decision.

Alderman Cohen stated that this is a social service and wondered if this is eligible under Title XX as a contracted social service therefore making it eligible for a grant. Mr. Jenne stated that there is reason to believe it might be eligible for Title XX money for the operation of this bus with a lot of strings attached. Among those strings is that the Town identify passengers as being either eligible or ineligible for Title XX. A person who might be elderly or handicapped but would not otherwise be eligible for Title XX funds, would not be able to be included in our allocation of people being serviced. Alderman Cohen asked if such an identification could be made, would this make a considerable amount of revenue available. Mr. Jenne stated that the administrative overhead in determining eligibility and noneligible passengers would possibly be quite high. Alderman Cohen stated that he is concerned with the possibility and hopes that it will be looked into. He stated further that he is not familiar with the way grants are usually handled under what used to be the aid to the blind and disable program. He stated that he believes that transportation allowances were paid through them. He expressed concern that these people could possibly be reimbursed through them.

Alderman Smith stated that the Town has a good elderly and handicapped program in this community and asked if any contract has been made with these organizations concerning the ability of the people to pay the surcharge and the regular fare.

Alderman Vickery stated that in the Transportation Advisory Board meeting, there was a rather lengthy debate on the appropriateness of a surcharge for the elderly as well as the handicapped. One of the more interesting things that came out the discussion was, given that the bus cost for this special purpose to operate is more than the cost for other buses to operate, is it appropriate to build the transportation system with that extra cost. Maybe it is more appropriately handled as a special project out of some other department such as Human Services. He stated that he came out against any surcharge because it would be difficult to determine, if someone were elderly, if they were handicapped or not. Secondly, it is an unlikely problem that people who are elderly would want to define themselves as handicapped just to call the bus to the door. Thirdly, that flagrant abuse of the privilege could be monitored and recorded. Lastly, that numerous studies show that income and earnings tend to decline after retirement. ALDERMAN VICKERY PROPOSED A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO STATE NO SURCHARGE AT ALL TO EITHER ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED. Alderman Silver expressed his willingness to incorporate this into his amendment. Alderman Cohen stated that it is obviously more convenient to have the bus come to one's door and take him where he is going. With several hundred people eligible and no incentive to take the regular service, the demand may be so high that the system will be unable to serve the handicapped. Alderman Epting stated that if the use of the system is overburdened, the Town might want to use a third category of bus service which would be just for the elderly, without lift and other mechanisms needed for the handicapped. Until the use of the system is seen to be overburdened, Alderman Epting stated, it should go on as is.

Leonard Mayo, a member of the Chapel Hill Committee on Aging, stated that he cannot speak for the Committee on Aging because they have never reached a unanimous conclusion. There were members of the Committee who felt that a surcharge was not only fair but desirable. He stated that elderly people that he had talked with had expressed no disagreement

with a reasonable surcharge. It is true that it is almost impossible to differentiate between an elderly person who could not comfortably or adequately use a regular system, and a physically handicapped person who may be under sixty. This does seem to indicate that dropping the surcharge completely would be the fairest thing to do. Elderly people are very eager for the program to start. He stated that the soundest thing to do might be to go with any plan that is suggested for a year and see what demand is and then let the Committee on Aging, the Transportation Board and the Transportation Department discuss it again and bring recommendation.

Alderman Silver stated that if all surcharges are dropped, then there is no resolution to be considered. It is important to make a positive statement in this regard. ALDERMAN SILVER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHA TO STATE THE RESOLUTION AS FOLLOWS: BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF ALDE MEN OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL THAT NO ADDITIONAL FARES FOR THE SPECIALL EQUIPPED BUS IN ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED SERVICE FOR THOSE ELIGIBLE IN THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL SHALL BE CHARGED.

In response to Mayor Wallace, Mr. Pappas stated that implementation is estimated to begin on Monday, March 15, 1976.

Alderman Cohen stated, in long range terms, that perhaps there should be no charge at all for this service. This is in light of the fact that in the Operating Assistance Act, if operating assistance is received, it will be required that the Town lower the fare to ten cents because it cannot be more than half the normal fare. Mayor Wallace stated that he would like to make a motion at a later time that the Town have people over 65 ride for nothing in off hours.

Alderman Howes stated that he would like to go on record as leaving the matter of surcharge open for a year, to change after some experience is gained in the necessity for one. ALL FORMER MOTIONS WERE WITHDRAWN. ALDERMAN HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EPTING THAT OPERATION OF THE BUS SERVICE FOR THE ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED BEGIN ON MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1976.

Alderman Marshall stated that if general revenue sharing is reenacted, s hopes that the Board will look at the concept of no fares under certain conditions. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Mike Jennings, Planning Director for the Town of Chapel Hill, stated that a public hearing was held on December 22, 1975 to hear these zoning ordinance and map amendments. Six amendments were heard. The recommendation is that one not be approved, four be approved and one be readvertised for consequent public hearing. It is also being asked that two additional amendments be heard at the same public hearing.

Mr. Jennings stated that in item one, concerning Curbing Requirements for Automobile Service Stations, the recommendation was to change the curb height from six inches to eight inches. The reason for this was to raise the height of the curb above the center of the wheel thus making accidental mounting of the curb highly unlikely. However, in checking the chassis of many popular cars, it was found that many of them were eight inches or a little lower. The potential damage to the car outweighs the benefits, so the recommendation is that it not be approved. ALDERMAN GARDNER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NOT BE APPROVED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Item two, concerning Disposal of Liquid Refuse, Mr. Jennings stated pertains only to automobile service stations and drive-in businesses. It compliments the sewer use ordinance. ALDERMAN COHEN MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES, THAT THE AMENDMENT BE APPROVED AS PROPOSED, AND THAT AN ORDINANCE SO STATING BE DRAFTED. In response to Alderman Gardner, Mr. Jennings stated that John Davis, Building Inspector, does have some information he has gotten from the Building Code Congress, on this, which includes diagrams of what a settling pond, grease trap and filter would look like. The information is there, it is just not in the ordinance. Anyone coming in for information concerning the opening of a service station, Building Inspection can give them the information necessary to meet all standards. Again in response to Alderman Gardner, Mr. Jennings stated that he has no figures on cost. He stated that the Town has had a lot of problem with people putting chemically treated effluents

into streams. The purpose of this amendment is to get this all to the sanitary sewer system. This is only applicable in automobile service stations and drive-in businesses under special use, because these places are where the primary problems have been. THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN TO ONE WITH ALDERMAN GARDNER OPPOSING.

Item three deals with public Hearings for Special Use Permits, and Zoning Text and Zoning Map Amendments. Mr. Jennings stated that the Board presently does not hear zoning text and zoning map amendments during the months of July, August and December. This amendment would have six public hearings during the year, during the months of January, March, May, July, September and November. The Charter Commission on its November 19, 1974 report, appendix 2, page D, recommended that a Planning Board review be held both before and after public hearing. The first review being a very intensive one which would insure that all relevant data is brought before the public hearing. By allowing more total time in the process, this would allow the administration to require more time between the time the request is submitted and the public hearing is held. Mayor Wallace stated that this, in his opinion, is the most important of all as it lets the developer know early that he is in trouble rather than spend many thousands of dollars and then perhaps be turned down. ALDERMAN COHEN MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SMITH THAT THE AMENDMENT BE APPROVED AS PROPOSED AND THAT AN ORDINANCE SO STATING BE DRAFTED. Alderman Gardner asked Mr. Jennings if he felt that adoption here would give the Planning Board, as was the original intent, the time to review and establish an opinion prior to the public hearing. Mr. Jennings responded that the Planning Board will not form an opinion, but will bring out all of the relevant data. There should be no opinion based on anything but the public hearing. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

On Home Occupations, Mr. Jennings stated that the Planning Board recommendation is that a significant change in wording be made in the Home Occupations Ordinance to more clearly define what is a permitted use and what kind of sale goods are permitted. Consequently, this will require another public hearing. ALDERMAN HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SMITH THAT A SECOND PUBLIC HEARING BE CALLED TO CONSIDER THE REVISED AMENDMENT.

The amendment dealing with Greenhouses is to classify greenhouses as private, public and commercial and to apply applicable standards to each. The recommendation is that the amendment be approved and advertised for a definition of public greenhouses at the next public hearing. The basic problem has been the adverse effect some of the greenhouses have had no residential areas and this would essentially require that large greenhouses in residential areas, come under special use. ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SILVER THAT THE AMENDMENT BE APPROVED AS PROPOSED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. ALDERMAN SILVER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES THAT DEFINITIONS FOR PUBLIC GREENHOUSES BE ADVERTISED FOR PUBLIC HEARING. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Item six deals with residential parking lots holding six (6) or more automobiles and not otherwise covered by Special Use Permit. Mr. Jennings stated that there has been considerable problem with defining what a commercial parking lot is. This particular amendment would require that any parking lot that would hold six or more automobiles, not otherwise covered by Special Use Permit, that it must come under the Special Use. During the public hearing, two questions were raised about the provisions of this particular amendment. The first question was concerning how the parking spaces could be clearly marked on a stabilized surface. The staff did not recommend requiring paving in all cases. The intent here is that even though paving will not be required in all cases because of possibility of unreasonable burden, the staff still feels that maintenance of the property is necessary and that some definition between the driveway and the parking area is necessary. It was agreed that some type of physical barrier be used to identify parking spaces as opposed to the driveway. Sides of the parking spaces can be identified by logs. The Town Manager is responsible for approving curbs and the Community Appearance Commission is responsible for approving planting. In its review, the Planning Board asked that this Special Use not be used to provide additional parking for retail and office uses in University A and B districts in addition to the Commercial districts listed. ALDERMAN HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL THAT THE AMENDMENT BE APPROVED AS PROPOSED AND THAT A PUBLIC HEARING BE CALLED TO CONSIDER ADDING UNIVERSITY A AND B DISTRICTS TO THE LIST OF DISTRICTS FOR WHICH THIS SPECIAL USE PERMIT

MAY NOT BE USED TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PARKING. Discussion of his amendment centered around Alderman's Smith's objection. He stated that it is seemingly ridiculous for him to buy a car for each of his four children, his wife and himself, and have to go through a design standard and come to the Town for permission to park these cars. This could be the case with a number of people. He stated this is an invitation for people to park on the street before going to such lengths. Alderman Vickery concurred, stating that it is terribly difficult to justify, telling people what to do with their property. Mayor Wallace stated that this is what planning does. ALDERMAN SMITH PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION THAT THE SECTION OF RESIDENTIAL PARKING LOTS HOLDING SIX (6) OR MORE AUTOMOBILES AND NOT OTHERWISE COVERED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT, BE RESTUDIED. Town Manager Jenne stated that regulating parking in residential areas has been hanging like a black cloud over the heads of administration and the Board of Aldermen for a long time. He stated that he is not confident of how productive an additional study would be. With the preparation that has gone on with everyone involved, this seems to be the only solution to the problem. Alderman Howes announced his intent to vote in favor of the original motion. He stated that Alderman's Smith's point is well taken but it is a most unlikely case. Alderman Smith suggested that the problem be addressed by simply saying "vacant lots" rather than "all residential lost". Mr. Jennings stated that this would not work as there is a very large loop hole. All a person would have to do is build a small structure on the same lot. The lots as they are now may not be as they will be after the ordinance is adopted. The only thing that can be done is to say "residentially zoned lots". Alderman Marshall pointed out that if there are teenage kids in the house, there can be as many as six cars parked in one's yard every night of the week. This amendment seems to say that one cannot have guests. Alderman Howes stated that the kinds of concerns expressed by Alderman Smith and Alderman Marshall are not the manner in which this particular amendment is directed. The fact is that there are parking lots operating around this Town in both historic areas and other areas, which are unsightly. They should be policed. This seems to be a reasonable proposal for dealing with this problem. Alderman Epting stated that it is ridiculous that any family in Chapel Hill, with the bus system here, would need six cars to get around. He stated that the people are going to have to realize that resources are limited. ALDERMAN SMITH WITHDREW HIS AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. Alderman Cohen stated that this is a continuing problem of an ordinance with a lot of loop holes in it. With people able to build huge parking lots in residential areas or rented lots at major intersection corners, the Board should have a motion to have an ordinance drafted and then go back and work the problems out of it rather than leave the current intolerable situation. Alderman Smith called for the question. THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX TO TWO WITH ALDERMAN GARDNER AND ALDERMAN MARSHALL OPPOSING. Alderman Gardner stated that this ordinance is intended to clear up two or three lots around town. If these two or three lots are causing this much concern, then there are several other matters that are going to cause a lot more concern.

Application for an LEAA Regional Training Grant Resolution

ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EPTING THAT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TRIANGLE COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO FILE AN APPLICATION OF BEHALF OF THE TOWN, FOR AN LEAA REGIONAL TRAINING GRANT, BE ADOPTED. In response to Alderman Gardner, Town Manager Jenne stated that this request for training needs has been approved by the Triangle Commission on Criminal Justice. This will be regular training for a number of policemen and patrolmen up to the Chief of Police. It covers everything from advance training in basic patrol work to technical criminal violations to police administration. A listing of the course work is available. Alderman Gardner stated that the Board is talking about \$8,150 for special programs, for a specific purpose, for specific needs, but doesn't say what these needs are. Alderman Smith stated that there has been a lot of criticism of LEAA grants. He hopes that there is substantial documentation for use of this money. Mr. Jenne stated that it can be itemized. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TRIANGLE COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO FILE AN APPLICATION, ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN, FOR AN LEAA REGIONAL TRAINING GRANT

WHEREAS, the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill herein called the "Applicant" has thoroughly considered the problem addressed in the subgrant application entitled Regional Training and has reviewed the project described in the application; and

WHEREAS, under the terms of Public Law 90-351 as amended, the United States of America has authorized the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, through the North Carolina Division of Law and Order to make federal grants to assist local governments in the improvement of the criminal justice system,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill in open meeting assembled in the Town of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, this 8th day of March, 1976, as follows:

1. That the project referenced above is in the best interest of the Applicant and the general public.
2. That the Triangle Commission on Criminal Justice be authorized to file, in behalf of the Applicant, an application in the form prescribed by the Division of Law and Order for a subgrant in the amount of \$8,105.00 to be made to the Applicant to assist in defraying the cost of the project described in the application. This individual shall act as the authorized representative of the Applicant in connection with all aspects of the application process.
3. That if the subgrant is made, the Applicant shall provide or make arrangements to provide, a local cash matching contribution in the amount of \$451.00 as required by the Act to defray the cost of the project.
4. That the Project Director designated in the application form shall furnish or make arrangements for other appropriate persons to furnish such information, data, documents and reports pertaining to the project, if approved, as may be required by the Division of Law and Order.
5. That certified copies of this resolution be included as part of the application referenced above.
6. That this resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

DONE AND ORDERED in open meeting.

The UNC Capital Improvement Bond - Resolution of Support

Alderman Cohen stated that he is not a great believer in resolutions and has not brought too many in, in the last two years. He stated that since he has been on the Board, there have been several resolutions dealing with outside subjects. One was airport expansion which the Board tabled. The second was the revenue bond amendment of 1974 which the Board approved and the voters turned down. This one, is a lot more important, in terms of people in this area. It has a direct relation, not only state-wide, but to the people in Chapel Hill and the University and in terms of the Board's responsibility as citizens. He stated that he thinks that it is the Board's responsibility to study important issues like this and lend its support. The bond issue on the ballot on March 23rd, is for close to \$36,000,000 in capital improvements of which \$5,000,000 is to be made available for a new intramural facility at UNC. It also provides for capital facilities at twelve of the other fifteen campuses and universities. The ones exempted are funded directly by the legislature. They are the Medical School, the Law School at North Carolina Central University and a classroom building at the School of Arts. The other thirteen projects are included in this bond referendum and Alderman Cohen stated that he feels that it is part of the Board's civic responsibility to state its position on important issues like this. It does affect this community in a great way. A lot of this money, more than any other county, city or state, will be spent here. He asked that the word "dilapidated" be changed to "aged." ALDERMAN EPTING MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY THAT A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PASSAGE OF THE UNC CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BOND, BE ADOPTED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PASSAGE OF THE UNC CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BOND REFERENDUM

WHEREAS the physical education and intramural athletic facilities of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill are wholly inadequate through age and the great increase in enrollment, especially among women, since their construction; and

WHEREAS the Capital Improvement Bonds for State Institutions of Higher Education which will be before the voters of North Carolina for approval on March 23, 1976, include funds for upgrading the physical education-intramural facilities on the Chapel Hill campus, a necessary step to the ideal of "a healthy mind in a healthy body; NOW THEREFORE,

40
BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Town of Chapel Hill urges voters to support the issuance of Capital Improvement Bonds for State Institutions of Higher Education at the polls on March 23.

This the 8th day of March, 1976.

Public Facilities Naming Committee

Mayor Wallace appointed Aldermen Howes, Marshall and Smith to the Public Facilities Naming Committee. He stated that the Gomains Tot Lot is now in the position to be available for naming. He asked the committee to take into consideration, the ways and means to receive proposed names for the naming of Gomains Tot Lot. Alderman Marshall, stated that the resolution, as adopted, made a point that names should come in, in a confidential manner. She stated that this point should be stressed. Mayor Wallace stated that all requests should be in writing and confidential. Alderman Marshall stated that there are all kinds of things that have been around for over a year and would be available for naming. Mayor Wallace instructed the Manager to draft a general official notice that might be put in the paper listing items that are now available for naming.

Report on Proposed Issues for Discussion by NLC's Effective Government Policy Committee.

Alderman Marshall stated that the proposed issues for discussion in the Nation League of Cities Effective Government Policy Committee is a document that stresses all kinds of ways that government should interact. She stated that she is most interested in Mandated Costs and Grant Administration, at this point, as they are the two things that she thinks are most important to the Town with planning programs and labor relations coming up. She asked if there are any special items that any Board members would like to hear to take up the discussion. Alderman Smith stated that since Alderman Marshall is a veteran Alderman, he is sure that she is aware of problems that Chapel Hill has, along with other cities this size. He stated that he would hope that she would express the concerns as the Board has expressed them over a period of time. He also stated that he concurs in what she has said so far. Alderman Marshall stated that this discussion is just to set priorities. The chapter on Effective Government is what is lobbying. From looking at the few participants in these different organizations, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Regional Councils, there is an overlapping of people. There are probably a hundred people or less in this country in municipal government that are setting policies and what is being lobbied, and they are spending a great deal of time on it. She stated that while she knows that it is much more expensive for a small city to send people to these meetings, it is time that Chapel Hill starts to be a part of that group and get some of the things that it is most interested in. Alderman Howes concurred stating that the number of people outside of the federal establishment that effects national policy that affects Chapel Hill, is very small. They tend to be big city Mayors because they are the ones who have the greatest access to those positions of power and are listened to more often. That system is not likely change. What is subject to change, however, is the extent to which smaller communities can make their voice heard, by becoming involved and part of that group. Beyond that, Chapel Hill would probably have to work together with communities with which it finds a commonality of interest and together with them express the concerns of these matters. The disappointing thing is that the National League of Cities was originally created as a body in which primarily the state League of Municipalities and the small communities, would be the principal bodies that supported it. Because of that, the Conference of Mayors was formed as a body representing primarily big cities. Now what has happened is that the big city Mayors not only dominate the Conference of Mayors, which politically is a much stronger entity than the National League of Cities, but they also dominate the National League of Cities. Alderman Marshall stated that she thinks that this is changing. There is a movement to have the National League of Cities attended more by Councilmen and get the Conference of Mayors to represent the Mayors. Mayors of small towns

have a lot to say too, if they can get over the shadow. The worse thing that ever happened was last December, when New York, who has never participated at all, when they were in trouble, sent many people down to disrupt every meeting.

In response to Alderman Howes, Alderman Marshall stated that the Congress of Cities is always right after Thanksgiving. There is a notebook, kept by the Assistant to the Manager, which tells of everything that comes in, of announcements of meetings and the like.

Mayor Wallace stated that he would like to inform the Board that he has set up two meetings with the people in relationship to the 201 situation. The attempt is to get as many firm alternatives as possible to get back to this Board as quickly as possible. First, the technical aspect of it has to be determined and then the political situation here has to be determined. Hopefully, within the next two or three weeks, the conclusion of what is wanted, will be reached in relation to 201. Until this is determined, it will be difficult to determine what can be obtained and then it might be impossible. It is the hope that in connection with the National League of Cities and other Congressmen, that the Town can begin to put whatever persuasion it can from that area into this thing.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Aldermen, said meeting adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

James C. Wallace

Mayor James C. Wallace
David B. Roberts

Town Clerk, David B. Roberts

MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING AND A REGULAR MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN, TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL, MUNICIPAL BUILDING MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1976, 7:30 P.M.

Mayor Wallace called the regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order; present and seated were:

- James C. Wallace, Mayor
- Gerald Cohen
- Robert Epting
- Thomas Gardner
- Jonathan Howes
- Shirley Marshall
- Marvin Silver
- R. D. Smith
- Edward Vickery

Also present were Town Manager K. Jenne, Town Attorney E. Denny and Town Clerk D. Roberts.

Mayor Wallace stated that before the public hearing, the Board must consider a matter that the public hearing is dependent upon. Town Attorney Denny stated that the item deals with certain Zoning Text Amendments which were heard in an earlier public hearing. The Board has received recommendations of the Planning Board and have directed this ordinance to be drawn for consideration at this time. One of these Zoning Text Amendments modifies that portion of the Zoning Ordinance dealing with quas-public buildings as a special use and the districts in which they are permitted. The amendment amends Section 4-C-4-b to insert three zones which are not now included in the zones in which quasi-public buildings are permitted, namely R-10A, R-4A, and R-3. It is necessary to adopt the ordinance in order to make the application for a quasi-public building in a R-10A district, appropriate for public hearing. ALDERMAN MARSHALL MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES THAT AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE "ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ZONING OF CHAPEL HILL AND SURROUNDING AREAS", BE ADOPTED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. In response to Alderman Smith, Mr. Denny stated that this matter has been heard at a previous public hearing, heard by the Planning Board and their recommendations have been approved by the Board of Aldermen.