

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL,  
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1982, 7:30 P.M.

Mayor Joseph L. Nassif called the meeting to order. Present were:

Marilyn Boulton  
Winston Broadfoot  
Jonathan Howes  
Beverly Kawalec  
David Pasquini  
Joseph Straley

E. D. Smith was an excused absence. Jim Wallace was absent.

Also present were Town Manager, David R. Taylor; Assistant Town Manager, Sonna Loewenthal; and Deputy Town Attorney, Grainger Barrett.

Certificates of Appointment

Mayor Nassif presented Certificates of Appointment to Mr. John Gulick (Historic District Commission); Ms. Rita Berman (Transportation Board); and Mr. Don Thomson (Transportation Board). Mayor Nassif expressed appreciation on behalf of the Council to these persons for their willingness to serve the town in this capacity.

Public Hearing

Request by Duke Power Company for Annexation of 18.101 Acres at Northwest Corner of Homestead Road and N.C. 86

Mr. Mike Jennings, Planning Director, outlined the request by Duke Power Company for annexation of 18.101 acres at the northwest corner of Homestead Road and N.C. 86. Mr. Jennings stated that the site was currently under Orange County's jurisdiction. The property was contiguous to Town corporate limits.

Staff felt that police and fire services could be extended to the area with no burden on the taxpayers. Staff recommended approval of the annexation request. According to Council's direction, staff had contacted property owners (as listed with Orange County) and had advertised in The Chapel Hill Newspaper.

Ms. Virginia Cunningham, Chair of the Planning Board, stated the Board's unanimous support of the annexation request.

Mr. John J. P. Kincaid, Jr., representing Duke Power Company, reviewed the long-range plans to construct a district office operations center and substation on the site. The location for the facility was chosen because the site could more adequately meet density plans and buffer requirements. Duke Power Company had anticipated annexation of the property to the Town of Chapel Hill as it would facilitate the acquisition of permits necessary to begin construction of the substation in 1982, therefore, enabling Duke Power Company to receive federal tax credits for 1982.

There were no comments from citizens.

COUNCILMEMBER BOULTON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BROADFOOT, TO REFER THE REQUEST TO THE MANAGER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Request for Office-Institutional 2 Zoning of 18.101 Acres at Northwest Corner of Homestead Road and N.C. 86

Mr. Jennings stated that the Land Use Plan designated an Activity Center at the Homestead/Airport Road intersection. The O-I 2 request was comparable to the intensity of development and zoning designation of the area. The Zoning Ordinance would allow the proposed construction of the Duke Power substation as a permitted use in non-residential districts. A site plan review would be required.

Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Jennings stated that property owners had been properly notified of the request.

Mr. John J. P. Kincaid, Jr., representing Duke Power Company, stated that the request for O-1 2 zoning was an appropriate use of the property.

Ms. Virginia Cunningham, Chair of the Planning Board, stated the Board's approval of the request. Citizens were present at the Planning Board meeting.

No citizens spoke for or against the request.

COUNCILMEMBER HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BOULTON, REFERRAL OF THE MATTER TO THE MANAGER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Nassif declared the public hearing closed.

#### Petitions

Council granted permission to Mr. Grover C. McCain, Jr., to speak on Agenda Item #6 (re Hickory Hill drainage plan).

Mayor Nassif read a petition from "kids...[and] other people in Chapel Hill...." requesting that Halloween be celebrated on Saturday, October 30, 1982, rather than on Sunday, October 31, 1982.

Mayor Nassif stated that the absence of two Councilmembers would preclude Council's action on this petition at this meeting.

COUNCILMEMBER BOULTON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER STRALEY, TO ACCEPT THE PETITION AND REFER IT TO THE MANAGER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### Minutes (October 11, 1982)

COUNCILMEMBER STRALEY MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER KAWALEC, ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 11, 1982, AS CORRECTED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### Joint Meeting with the Historic District Commission

Mr. Grainger Barrett, Deputy Town Attorney, outlined the origin and purpose of the Historic District Commission under the North Carolina General Statutes and the Town of Chapel Hill Zoning Ordinance to oversee changes in historic districts as reflected in the issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness. A Certificate of Appropriateness was required to erect, alter, restore, move, or demolish any structure or building involving any exterior features visible from any street. The purpose of the Certificate of Appropriateness process and of the commission was to encourage harmonious design within the historic district, but not to dictate any particular style.

The Historic District Commission consisted of 10 members (serving 3-year terms). By state law, these members were required to be residents within the town planning limits. A majority of the members were required to have demonstrated special expertise or interest in history, or in architecture. Within the historic district, the Commission also acted as the Town's Appearance Commission.

The Commission had authority over city, county, and state buildings, and structures (but not over structures owned or used by the University of North Carolina). Appeals from the Commission went to the Board of Adjustment for review of any errors in the application or implementation of the relevant law.

Councilmember Broadfoot asked if the special exception for UNC buildings was a special exception in the district, or if it was a part of a general immunity. Mr. Barrett felt that this immunity evolved from a "specific factual situation in Chapel Hill."

Mayor Nassif informed those present that the purpose of the worksession was to allow constructive interaction between the Council and the Commission.

Mayor Nassif welcomed and introduced the members of the Historic District Commission: Knox Tate (Chair), Arthur Marks, James Webb, John Gulick, Phil Rees, Gary Freeze, Randy Sather, Betty Williams, Shelley Hausler, and Richard Lamberton. Mr. David Parham, Planning Department liaison to the Commission, was introduced.

Mr. Tate informed Council that the Commission would like:

1. To see the Council authorize a study of a second historic district in Chapel Hill in the Cameron/McCauley Street area. Residents had petitioned for a historic district in 1979. The Commission concurred with the request and felt that this was an appropriate time for Council to consider it as studies had been completed by staff and area students regarding recommendations for boundaries and various historical aspects. This was a primary interest of the Commission.
2. For Council to consider the idea of establishing a Historic Properties Commission, which would deal with individual buildings of historical value that were not located within a historic district.
3. To have a voice regarding "color"; and
4. To see property owners in the historic district better informed regarding the need to apply for Certificates of Appropriateness when considering various alterations on properties in the historic district. This was a particular problem with fraternity and sorority houses where a greater turnover rate occurred.

Councilmember Kawalec asked Mr. Tate if he felt that Council needed to establish additional policies on street lights or special policies for lighting in the historic district in order to avoid any controversy similar to one that occurred previously.

Mr. Tate stated that part of that problem had been a breakdown in communication. That problem had been resolved. He did feel, however, that "some of the inexpensive lighting alternatives available to the Town...made it fairly difficult to do good lighting at all times." A different fixture might be appropriate in this area, as the harshness of the light was a problem. The number of lights in the district were, he felt, adequate. Individual property owners might need more lighting or a different kind of lighting. One problem was how to provide proper lighting in conjunction with the Town. At times, town poles and rights-of-way needed to be used to erect lighting.

Councilmember Straley asked Mr. Tate if he felt that some of the attractive qualities of the Central Business District (CBD) had disappeared. He felt that light was concentrated onto the street and that lighting on the sidewalks was not adequate.

Mr. Tate concurred, stating that the quality of lighting in the CBD used to be "a soft and old and human kind of lighting," but was a much harsher and colder kind of lighting now.

Councilmember Straley asked Mr. Tate if he felt it were under the purview of the Commission to design a more attractive and softer lighting style for the CBD for Council's consideration. Mr. Tate stated that the CBD was not under the purview of the Commission, but that the Commission would like to make recommendations for this area.

Councilmember Straley felt that if it were appropriate, he would like to see a recommendation from the Commission on the subject of lighting in the downtown area.

Councilmember Straley asked Mr. Tate if the Commission had an inventory of historical buildings that the Commission would like to "protect."

Mr. Parham, staff liaison for the Commission, stated that state enabling legislations established guidelines for criteria for the designation of historical buildings. A Historic Properties Commission would use the criteria in designating buildings.

Mr. Tate informed Councilmember Broadfoot that individual property owners usually petitioned to have their property declared "historical property"; in some instances, this would be a tax advantage.

Councilmember Broadfoot expressed support of the Commission's request to have the authority to consider color.

Councilmember Howes felt that the Commission was primarily involved in regulatory considerations and asked if they "would like to do more 'planning' for the district; i.e., 'to be more proactive...than...reactive'...in areas that they did not have the authority, but would like to be involved in."

Mr. Tate expressed the desire to have more guideliness in the area of lighting and signs. He referenced a large subdivision in the district that the Commission would have under its purview and the desire to be well-versed in order to handle it appropriately. Mr. Sather, a Commission member, stated that some of the members would be interested in reviewing specific subjects; i.e., lighting, etc. Some had good ideas on specific subjects that they would like to pursue.

Councilmember Howes concurred, stating that there was a kind of "guardianship responsibility" that went beyond the regulatory function of the Commission and that he hoped that the time would come when they would feel free and able to do that.

Mr. Webb, a Commission member, stated that there was a kind of "blinder" put on the Commission in dealing with design. He expressed his concern that the internal structure of the building was often ignored when judging alterations of the exterior. He felt it would be helpful to consider the probability of interior modifications when making recommendations for the exterior.

Mayor Nassif stated that the Council would like for the Commission to feel that they could present their recommendations to them, and that they could be assured that the ideas would be reviewed and given serious consideration. Mayor Nassif also stated his feelings that some regulations were required only in the historic district that should be made town-wide, rather than isolated within certain pockets of the Town.

Councilmember Kawalec felt that the proper way to proceed with any new projects or studies was at the time of budget when staff budget and priorities were established. Since these worksessions were being held at this time, she felt that it was important to understand that this procedure should not be abandoned.

Councilmember Broadfoot stated that his intention in suggesting these worksessions was to promote the image of Town boards/commissions in relation to "other Town bureaucracies." He wished to be more in touch with these committees and to hear their comments. He did not feel that most of their suggestions were budget related, and if so, quite nominally.

Mayor Nassif clarified that some studies would take considerable staff time and some would not. The Manager would determine if the staff had sufficient time to consider proposals. If time was sufficient, Council would not need to be contacted. If time was not sufficient, Council would be advised.

Mayor Nassif expressed his appreciation to the members for their recommendations to Council. He suggested to Mr. Tate that he present suggestions to the Manager so that he could determine if staff time was available in the budget.

#### Resolution Concerning the Drainage Plan for the Hickory Hill Development

Mr. Grover C. McCain, Jr., 2505 Foxwood Drive, expressed concern that the proposed detention basins for the development would exacerbate the existing drainage problems. He felt that the Council should make sure that the drainage plan proposed by the developer was, in fact, appropriate and would not exacerbate current problems.

Mr. McCain requested that Council send the matter back to the Town Manager for further study and that alternative methods of drainage be considered. He supported keeping the detention basins on the developer's land and that channel improvements be made to protect downstream properties.

Mr. Bill Morris, Town Engineer, presented engineering background and findings that constituted the conclusions of the study. He reviewed the surrounding area of the Hickory Hill development and demonstrated the on-site detention basins.

Mr. Morris stated that the developer had been advised of Town standards for controlling run-off to reduce the impact on downstream properties.

The developer proposed to store the excess amount of run-off water in temporary detention basins. The developer's calculations showed that the run-off from the detention basins from this site would not increase the levels of flow to a significant degree downstream. His calculations showed an increase of approximately 2", leaving plenty of freeboard before it would flood the roadway." All calculations were based on a 10-year storm plan--an accepted basis of calculations for such developments.

The staff concurred with the developer's calculations and felt that there would not be any damage to downstream property.

Councilmember Straley asked Mr. McCain to interpret his consistent use of the word 'exacerbate."

Mr. McCain responded that adjoining property currently experienced flooding during an average rainfall and that erosion existed. He stated that he did not have any reason to challenge the high water mark or that the peak flow would be increased, but felt that yards would stay flooded because the retention basins would have excess overflow. He also expressed concern for severe flooding further downstream. He felt the developer should bear the cost of coming up with a better drainage plan that would more adequately protect downstream properties.

Councilmember Broadfoot asked what could be done to correct the situation if these plans were later proven to be inadequate. Mr. Morris stated that more catch basins could be installed.

Councilmember Howes asked if expansion of the culvert behind area homes had been considered to any extent. Mr. Morris explained that the current drainage problem of the culvert had not been created by other developments; the problem was pre-existing. The amount of rainfall contained on this site would not flow any faster and would not cause the water levels to go any higher. It could cause an increase of approximately 20-25 minutes of flow time during heavier rainfall. That was small and insignificant and keeping the ground wet that much longer had not been shown to create that much more of a problem.

Mr. Morris explained that the alternative proposed by the developer to deepen and widen the channel and rip-rap the sharper curves. The developer had proposed these improvements in exchange for consent from area property owners to use the area's open space for retention basins. The proposal had been rejected by area property owners.

Mr. McCain stated that he had approved of the alternate proposal. Mayor Nassif stated that the issue concerning the drainage plan was the question at this time. Fast approval by citizens at any other meeting was not relevant to this consideration by Council.

Mr. John McAdams, the developer's representative, stated that Council had, in February, asked the developer and staff to reconsider the downstream drainage problems. He outlined for Council the proposed drainage plans of the developer to effect a rate of flow after the development that would not be greater than the rate of flow before the development (in an up to a 10-year storm). The developer had initially desired to improve the existing drainage area in exchange for use of the open space to install the proposed drainage system. The residents opposed the proposal.

Mr. McAdams explained that there were several feet of freeboard between the current highwater mark and the floor level. The 10-year storm detention basin was reasonable in this area, and that was what was proposed. Mr. McAdams stated that the most vulnerable house would still have a 3½-4 foot freeboard during a 10-year storm. The crest of the road was approximately 2 feet lower than any lower floor elevation; the water would overrun the road before it would enter the house. The proposed site would sit higher than the already built development by approximately 10-30 feet. The proposed development's floors would be about 4 feet higher than the crests of the berms.

Mr. Taylor informed Councilmember Pasquini that the detention basins would be the responsibility of the owners of that property to maintain. It would not be maintained by the Town.

COUNCILMEMBER BROADFOOT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER HOWES, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DRAINAGE PLAN FOR THE HICKORY HILL DEVELOPMENT (82-R-195)

WHEREAS, the Special Use Permit for the Hickory Hill development includes a condition that the drainage plan be approved by Council before issuance of a Zoning Compliance Permit for said development; and

WHEREAS, the Town Engineer has reviewed the drainage plan for the Hickory Hill development submitted by the developer's engineer, and has determined that said drainage plan would control stormwater discharge from the Hickory Hill development so as not to exceed pre-development flow rates and so as not to significantly alter the storm drainage across the property adjoining the site;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council accepts such determination by the Town Engineer and that said drainage plan meets the Council's requirement as contained in Stipulation No. 11 of the Special Use Permit for the Hickory Hill development.

This the 25th day of October, 1982.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### Discussion of State Constitutional Amendment to Allow Tax Increment Financing

Mr. Taylor informed Council that the proposed amendment would give additional options to the downtown people in developing the downtown areas. A local group had recently been formed "to work in the downtown area...[and] they were interested in the tax increment finance and proposal. The proposed constitutional amendment would be voted on on November 2, 1982. Staff submitted a resolution for Council's consideration that expressed support of the proposed amendment and encouraged citizens to vote in favor of this amendment.

COUNCILMEMBER BOULTON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER HOWES, ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 82-R-196.

Councilmember Straley expressed his concern for the potential abuse of the proposed amendment because the wording was vague. He felt that it could result in the construction of a facility that had already been rejected by voters. Mr. Taylor explained that any decision on a particular project in a particular district had to be made by the local governing body.

Mayor Nassif felt that Councilmember Straley meant that elected officials or boards could show favoritism for one individual or another. The very fact that a municipality would underscore this without voter approval could "be one big red herring."

Mr. Taylor concurred, but felt that this was very much like the revenue bond concept. Revenue bonds did not require voter approval, but revenue bonds and the tax increment financing bonds would require approval of the local government. That was a protection.

Councilmember Broadfoot opposed the proposed amendment on the grounds that it was a misuse of the document and tended to encourage bypassing existing practices of going before the court for a decision, using the amendment to tell the courts how to vote. He continued, "we are getting way out of civic government...way out of what government is supposed to be. We become speculators and manipulators and promoters and hustlers, etc., and I don't like any part of it. I urge you to vote against it."

Councilmember Howes did not feel that this was the point. He felt that this was trying to give municipal government a "halfway house" between general obligation bonds and revenue bonds--it was an additional bit of flexibility that would be available to local governments. He did not feel comfortable with the vague wording

of the proposed amendment, but felt that the concept would "assure that, at least on the financial side, we won't go completely off the deep end. I think it is the assurance that has worked effectively in this state now for almost 50 years, and I think would work effectively in this particular case.... I think it is worth our passing a resolution in support of it."

VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 82-R-196 FAILED 5 TO 2 WITH COUNCILMEMBERS HOWES AND BOULTON SUPPORTING, AND COUNCILMEMBERS BROADFOOT, KAWALEC, PASQUINI, STRALEY, AND MAYOR NASSIF OPPOSING.

Resolution Calling a Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the Development Ordinance

COUNCILMEMBER BOULTON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER STRALEY, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

A RESOLUTION CALLING A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (82-R-197)

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby calls a public hearing for Monday, November 15, 1982, at 7:30 P.M. in the Meeting Room of the Municipal Building, 306 N. Columbia Street, to consider the following amendments to the Chapel Hill Development Ordinance:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 4.3 Schedule of Use Regulations<br>Use Group C                             | Allow Place of Assembly with less than 2,000 seating capacity as an accessory use in all districts. To allow Recreation Facilities, Non-Profit in any district. To allow Earth Stations (dish antennas) as an accessory use in TC, CC, NC, OI-1, -2, -3, I and all Planned Development Districts and as a special use in Residential districts. |
| 5.6.1 Gross Land Area Defined<br>and<br>18.50 Gross Land Area (definition) | Allow credited open space to increase the net land area by no more than 10%.  |
| 5.7.2 Minimum Lot Width  | Require that a lot meet or exceed the minimum lot width for a depth of at least 25 feet from the minimum street setback.  |
| 5.9.9 Zero Lot Line Setback<br>Modifications                               | Cross reference from provisions for Zero Lot Line Developments in Article 7.  |
| Figure 6-1 Buffer Matrix   | Include provisions for buffers for any principal use in Use Group A, not just for single family and multifamily.  |
| 7.7.7 Zero Lot Line Setback<br>Modifications                               | Include provisions to allow zero lot line developments.   |
| 8.3 Findings of Fact   | Delete requirements for Planning Board to make findings.  |
| 8.4.5 Planning Board Review  | Delete requirements that Planning Board base recommendation on findings of fact.  |
| 12.5.5 Actions Subsequent to<br>Decision (Historic District)               | Remove requirement to notify by personal service or registered or certified mail.   |
| 13.5.5 Actions Subsequent to<br>Decision (Appearance Dis-<br>tricts)       | Remove requirement to notify by personal service or registered or certified mail.   |
| 14.4.1 Definition (of Noncon-<br>forming Features)                         | Expand definition to clarify intent.  |
| 14.4.2(b) Limitations on Contin-<br>uing Nonconforming Features            | Provide that, if a nonconforming feature is demolished to the extent of fifty percent or more, it may be reconstructed only if it conforms.   |

- 16.4.4 Actions Subsequent to Decision (Appeals & Variances) Remove requirement to notify applicant by personal service or registered or certified mail and include requirement that variance be recorded in the Office of the County Register of Deeds.
- 18.56 Home Occupation (definition) Include limitation on amount of supplies which could be kept.
- 18.71 Lot Line, Zero (definition) Include definition pursuant to addition of zero lot line developments to subdivision ordinance.
- 18.102 Recreation Facility, Non-Profit (definition) Remove "private" so that public facilities which are not open to the general public are permitted (i.e., school and university facilities).

Amend the following sections to delete references to Comprehensive Plan:

- 1.4.2 Purpose
- 2.2.4 Powers of the Board (Planning) #1., 6., 10.
- 4.1 Intent (of use regulations)
- 5.1 Intent (of intensity regulations)
- 7.7.1 Design of Subdivision
- 8.3(d) Findings of Fact
- 8.4.2 Town Manager's analysis
- 8.4.3 Preliminary Conferences
- 8.8.1 Establishment of Planned Developments
- 8.8.2 Reduction of Increase in Required Land Areas
- 8.8.7.1 Intent (of Planned Development-Shopping Center)
- 8.8.8.1 Intent (of PD-OI)
- 8.8.9.1 Intent (of Planned Development-Mixed Use)
- 8.8.10.1 Intent (of Planned Development-Industrial)
- 16.3.1 Variances from Dimensional Regulations
- 18.30 Comprehensive Plan (definition)
- 19.1 Intent (Amendments) (2 references)

Amend the zoning classification of Chapel Hill Township Tax Map 93, Block M, Lot 16 from Residential-3 to Town Center-2. This lot contains St. Joseph's Church C.M.E. at 510 West Rosemary Street.

This the 25th day of October, 1982.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Quarterly Reports

Council Liaison Reports. Council received the Council Liaisons' reports. Councilmember Straley explained that the JOCCA report would not be submitted until the next occasion, as JOCCA's quarterly system differed from the Town's.

Quarterly Reports. Mr. Taylor submitted staff quarterly reports. He stated that the end of the first quarter finances were "managing to stay pretty close to the 25% level, but were not collecting at the 25% rate."

Councilmember Straley questioned if difficulties were anticipated since interest rates on investments were lower. Mr. Taylor stated that at the time the budget was prepared, a downfall of interest rates had been anticipated, but this amount of downfall had not been anticipated. The first quarter, however, was on schedule. The administration was carefully watching three areas: (1) interest on investments; (2) sales tax; and (3) franchise tax. Council would be advised as necessary.

Ms. Loewenthal explained to Councilmember Straley that plans for landscaping of the post office were in process and it was anticipated that work would begin in the spring.

Consent Agenda

COUNCILMEMBER BOULTON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER KAWALEC, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:



## A. RESOLUTION APPROVING VARIOUS RESOLUTIONS (82-R-198)

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby adopts the Resolutions submitted by the Manager in regard to the following:

- a. Bids for refuse truck (82-R-199).
- b. Valuation of Mitchell Lane and Gomains Street right-of-way parcels to be acquired under Community Development Program (82-R-200).

This the 25th day of October, 1982.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolutions Adopted on the Consent Agenda

The following resolutions were adopted on the Consent Agenda:

A RESOLUTION AWARDDING CONTRACTS FOR ONE (1) CAB AND CHASSIS EQUIPPED WITH SIDE-LOADING PACKER BODY (82-R-199)

WHEREAS, the Town of Chapel Hill has solicited formal bids on September 16, 1982, and the following bids have been received:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Colonial Int'l. Truck, Inc. (Greensboro)</u>	<u>Miller Truck Sales &amp; Service, Inc. (Durham)</u>	<u>John Robbins Motors Co. (Greensboro)</u>	<u>Worth-Keeter, Inc. (Charlotte)</u>
Cab & Chassis	\$31,120.28	\$36,359.07	\$34,095.82	No Bid
Side-Load Packer Body	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	\$18,656.00
Installation of Packer Body on Chassis	<u>No Bid</u>	<u>No Bid</u>	<u>No Bid</u>	<u>\$ 814.00</u>
Sub-total	<u>\$31,120.28</u>	<u>\$35,359.07</u>	<u>\$34,095.82</u>	<u>\$19,470.00</u>
TOTAL (Cab/chassis with packer body installed)	<u>\$50,590.28</u>	<u>\$54,829.07</u>	<u>\$53,565.82</u>	-----

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Town rejects the low bid of Colonial International Trucks, Inc., as non-responsive and accepts the bids of John Robbins Motors for the cab and chassis in the amount of \$34,095.82 and Worth-Keeter, Inc., for the amount of \$19,470.00.

This the 25th day of October, 1982.

## A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING VALUATION OF FOUR PARCELS (82-R-200)

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that it has determined, on the basis of an appraisal and a review appraisal, that the fair market value of the right-of-way fragments intended for purchase by the Town's Community Development Program are as follows:

<u>Parcel No.</u>	<u>Area (Sq.Ft.)</u>	<u>Owners</u>	<u>Interest to be Acquired</u>	<u>Just Compensation</u>
1. 85-C-1 (309 Mitchell Lane)	1,058	Ms. Mazie Harris	land	\$ 688.00
2. 84-J-4 (Gomains Avenue)	608	Mr. George Tate	land	\$ 640.00
3. 84-J-6 (500 Gomains Avenue)	621	Ms. Bessie Edwards	land	\$ 745.00
4. 84-J-9 (Mitchell Lane)	970	Ms. Jean S. Coneys	land	\$ 500.00

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council, on the basis of information supplied by Alvin E. Stevenson, Executive Director of the Chapel Hill Housing Authority, hereby certifies that the work of the appraiser and review appraiser with respect to the above property has been performed in a competent manner in accordance with applicable State and Federal law and the policies and requirements of the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This the 25th day of October, 1982.

Nominations to the Board of Adjustment

No nominations were made by Council.

Mayor Nassif stated that Council could make further nominations on November 8, 1982.

Executive Session

COUNCILMEMBER HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PASQUINI, TO ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 P.M.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph L. Nassif, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
David B. Roberts, Clerk