



# Minutes of the Burlington City Council Meeting

Municipal Council Chamber, 425 S. Lexington Avenue, Burlington NC  
7:00pm - Tuesday, March 15, 2022

---

The City Council of the City of Burlington held a regularly scheduled meeting in the Municipal Council Chamber, 425 S. Lexington Avenue, Burlington, NC, 27215, and via Zoom on March 15, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Jim Butler presided.

**Council Members Present:**

Mayor Jim Butler  
Mayor Pro Tem Harold Owen  
Councilmember Kathy Hykes  
Councilmember Ronnie Wall  
Councilmember Robert Ward

**Staff Present:**

Interim City Manager David Cheek  
City Attorney David Huffman  
Interim City Clerk Michelle Parker-Evans  
Planning Manager Conrad Olmedo  
City Engineer Todd Lambert  
Principal Planner Jamie Lawson

**Council Members Absent:** None

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Jim Butler

**INVOCATION:** Councilmember Ronnie Wall

**RECOGNITION OF COVID ADVISORY COMMITTEE:**

Interim City Manager thanked the Covid Advisory Committee for tireless hours of serving the employees and citizens of Burlington and Alamance County during the pandemic. He thanked Tommy Simmons, Safety Director, for his leadership and dedication to the wellbeing of all he encountered.

The Committee received a standing applause from the audience.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion was made by Councilmember Wall and seconded by Councilmember Hykes to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2022, Worksession and March 1, 2022, City Council Meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

**CODE OF ETHICS DISCLOSING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST** –Interim City Clerk Michelle Parker-Evans read the Code of Ethics Statement. There were no conflicts of interest reported.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA:**

A motion was made by Councilmember Ward seconded by Councilmember Hykes to adopt the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

- A) To approve a Municipal Agreement for the Inspections of Bridges on the Municipal Street System with NCDOT
- B) To authorize the City Manager, the Director of Finance and Risk Management, and the Interim City Clerk to execute the contracts and to authorize the City Manager, the Director of Finance and Risk Management, and the Accounting Treasury Manager as signers on all of the accounts

A motion was made by Councilmember Wall and seconded by Councilmember Hykes to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **Item 1: Local Historic District Overlay – Amendment:**

A public hearing was held to amend the Local Historic District Overlay (LHO) boundaries, and remove the following four properties: 1004, 1010, 1016 and 1022 West Davis Street, also identified as Alamance County Tax Identification Numbers 125084, 125089, 125539 and 125546 (respectively). The properties were currently zoned Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Local Historic Overlay (LHO).

Ms. Jamie Lawson presented a map outlining the entire historic district as well as the properties being requested for removal. She stated that the request was a legislative matter and followed the City's UDO 3.19.E and State Statute 160D-944. The process started with an investigative report by Robert Grubbs and Associates. The report recommended that the properties remain in the historic district. The report was forwarded to North Carolina Cultural Resources. The State agreed with the consultant's recommendation. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) recommended unanimous denial of the request. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended denial 4-3. Staff recommended denial.

Ms. Lawson provided updates on relevant projects in the historic district. There was an Architectural Survey completed in 2021 to determine eligibility for properties within the National Register Study list. The Aurora Cotton Mill was designated as a local historic landmark and was seeking national status. The City received a grant to update the Historic District Standards which should be completed in July 2022.

An advisory committee of 15 members would be formed. The committee was seeking recommendations and would include representatives from the historic district, Historic Preservation Committee, architects, builders, developers, Planning and Zoning, and Preservation Burlington.

Mayor Pro Tem Owen questioned whether interested citizens would be considered by the advisory group. Ms. Lawson responded yes, but the group should be efficient and effective to meet the July deadline. Anyone with questions should contact a member of the Planning staff.

Mayor Butler recognized applicants for the rezoning request. Patrick and Emily Robinson, applicants, 1004 W. Davis Street, thanked City staff for their diligence on this issue. Ms. Robinson shared the roof timeline while attempting to repair a leaking roof. A design change of 2 feet on the residence that would change the color from brown to white necessitated a COA. She opined that the COA added no value to the process. It increased a burden to the homeowners who wanted to make updates to their property. There were major delays that caused the scope of work and the price to increase. Mr. Robinson pointed out a church that had been removed from the historic district in 1998, but it was still on the National Register. They felt the district would still be cohesive without the four properties. Their block was fully developed. They asked that the overlay be lifted.

Mr. Robinson spoke about double standards within the district. He spoke about property at 1010 W. Davis Street that was in major disrepair and demolished in 2020. He felt the COA process did not preserve homes. Ms. Robinson acknowledged a letter from homeowners. She added that 95 percent of the letters were form letters. She added that it was a coordinated campaign with misleading information. They felt the Historic Preservation Commission was more focused in opposing their application than looking at issues.

The applicants shared reasons for their application. They felt the COA process caused unnecessary delays and increased the burden to maintain homes; the increased costs and scope of work fell on the homeowner; the lack of concern from HPC regarding harmful impacts of the process to the homeowner; no sense of collaboration or dialogue; design standards were only part of the problem, and there were double standards.

The properties would remain on the National Register; the homeowners would continue to enhance and protect their home; and they asked to be afforded the same rights to do so as their neighbors located directly across the street.

Councilmember Wall asked for more information on the double standards. Mr. Robinson responded that they had to get approvals to update their home. There was no intervention on neglecting homes.

Allen Gant, applicant, participated thru ZOOM. Mr. Gant thanked Council and staff for their service to the community. He gave accolades to Jaimie Lawson and Conrad Olmedo. Mr. Gant reiterated that there had not been an update to the process or standards since 1995. There had been no change to the Historic District since 1987. He described certain properties on the map and pointed out inclusions and exclusions in the Historic District. There were different types of zoning including commercial properties. The boundaries did not have much meaning as to how the lines were drawn.

He spoke about 713 E. Willowbrook which was his property (guest house). He noted that one inch away, there were no restrictions; however, he was required to get a COA. He stated that he wanted to be able to take care of his property in an effective and efficient way. He wanted the same rights as his next door neighbor (himself). He asked Council to accept the application.

Mayor Butler spoke about the number of comments and calls that the Council had received. He asked that citizens not be repetitive. He informed speakers that they would have 3 minutes to speak.

**Public Comments**

The following residents spoke in opposition to the request:

Vickie Vernon, 903 W Davis Street  
Michelle Kobrick, 715 W Front Street  
Yvonne Whitley, 607 W Davis Street  
Molly Whitlatch, 912 W Davis Street  
Faith Grant, 911 W Davis Street  
Tom Cowan, 2451 Glencoe  
Bryan Norris, 2416 Glencoe  
Mary Beth Ashley, 411 Tarleton Street  
Rita Mannella, 605 Fountain Place  
Lee Pelton, 716 W Davis Street  
Maryanne Shanahan, 439 Circle Drive  
James Euliss, 1700 W Front Street  
Julie Budd, 324 Hillcrest Avenue  
Christy Benson, 622 W Davis Street  
Rachel Blunk, 2416 Glencoe  
Sue Lazara, 727 W Davis Street

Reasons for the opposition included affecting the tax value, keeping the historic character, removing the property would set a precedent for others to follow, the district would lose special character, protection for homeowners in historic district, and love for the district.

Mr. Euliss was concerned and stated that the Historic Preservation Commission was not out to harm anyone. He stated that the State prohibited the Commission from speaking with anyone prior to an application being made.

Attorney David Huffman clarified that although the HPC was a quasi-judicial board, this matter was not a quasi-judicial matter. The Commission was serving in an advisory role to the Council.

The following residents spoke in support of the request:

Michelle Graybeal, 1112 W Davis Street  
Tony Laws  
Allen Gant  
Janice Burgess, 606 Willowbrook  
Robert Griswold, 1103 W Davis Street

Neighbors were concerned because they felt attacked by a letter that was circulated and they supported the applicants. Nothing planned for the properties would decrease the value of the property. There were no apartment complexes planned. Mr. Laws, Director of Recreation and Parks spoke in support of Mr. Gant. He praised the applicant for all the great things he had done for the City of Burlington.

A motion was made by Councilmember Wall and seconded by Councilmember Hykes to close the public hearing.

Mayor Butler spoke about the letters and calls that personally attacked him. He felt that some residents were attempting to politicize the request. He disclosed that Mr. Gant contributed to his campaign and was also his longtime friend. He added that Mr. Gant had never asked him to make any decisions based on their relationship.

Councilmember Ward thanked everyone for their comments. He felt the Council needed more information before making a decision. He was not prepared to make a decision. He suggested that the study be completed so everyone would be better prepared to make better decisions.

A motion was made by Councilmember Ward to delay a decision until the study was presented back to Council in July and to set this item for the August 16, 2022 agenda.

Councilmember Wall asked if the study could be accelerated? Ms. Lawson responded that the deadline for the grant application was in September, and it was ambitious to complete the process by July.

Mayor Pro Tem Owen expressed concerns about how the situation had escalated. He felt the matter had become personal. He agreed with Councilmember Ward that more information was needed. He seconded the motion.

Councilmember Hykes commented that she was impressed with all the presenters. She appreciated having engaged citizens and the conversations.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Item 2 – Rezoning 0 Danbrook Road:**

A public hearing was held to rezone a property zoned Medium Density Residential (MDR) to be Light Industrial (LI). The property is located at the south side of the intersection of Danbrook Rd. and Bonnar Bridge Pkwy., addressed as 0 Danbrook Rd., and consisted of Alamance County Tax Identification Numbers 106952.

Mayor Butler recognized Planning Manager Conrad Olmedo. Mr. Olmedo stated that the request was for conventional rezoning which was a request to change the zoning of the property from one use to another. There would be several potential uses. The (LI) zoning designation would not restrict uses. Future development would require approval from the technical review committee. The land use for the property called for business park/light industrial. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Matt Wall, 3455 Forestdale, applicant representative, was present to speak on behalf of the applicant and to answer questions. He stated that the request was complimentary to uses of surrounding properties. There were other uses consistent with the request and land use plan. The applicants conducted a neighborhood information meeting. He noted that the future plan might

change. He mentioned a letter that was submitted by a property owner concerned about noise, lighting and traffic. He also noted a report conducted regarding noise levels.

Mr. Wall addressed concerns about traffic issues. NCDOT was concerned about ensuring the entrance and exit was as far away from Danbrook Road as possible. He commented that the concerns would be addressed when a site plan and design plan were submitted.

### **Public Comments**

Charlie Beasley, 1134 Cardross Street, requested that the Council deny the request. He was concerned about the effects on property values and traffic. He mentioned a planned community would also cause future increased traffic.

Mr. Olmedo clarified that McIntosh was 81 percent built out. There was a planned development townhouse development and apartment complex in the vicinity.

Allen Blinn, 4027 Comrie Lane, was concerned about increased traffic coming on Bonnar Bridge.

Thomas Ozbolt, 1960 W Buckhill, was concerned about traffic and also the manner in which residents were notified regarding the notified about the rezoning. He also was concerned about speeding in the area.

Mr. Olmedo clarified that Planning staff posted signs for P&Z and City Council as required by State law no less than 10 days or more than 25 days. Letters were also mailed to property owners within a 300-foot buffer.

Jenna Roney, 1034 Cardross, was also concerned about due diligence of notice to community residents. She spoke about the traffic congestion issues in the area.

A motion was made by Councilmember Wall and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Owen to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Pro Tem Owen commented that there might be a better rezoning request that was more specific. He questioned the feasibility of the proposed business being appropriate for that location. He thought there might be other zoning options that might be better supported.

Mayor Pro Tem Owen asked the Attorney Huffman if it was statutorily possible for homeowners' associations to be notified as a matter of courtesy. Attorney Huffman replied that the City was not required to send letters out, but the signs were very prominent. The State statute required notice to "abutting properties" and the City exceeded that. The City could look into expanding the notification areas.

Councilmember Hykes commented that the land use plan allowed neighborhood commercial and she felt that was a convenience for neighborhoods so residents would not have to leave the neighborhood.

Matt Wall indicated that he would withdraw the request and go back to the staff to rework the item. He noted that a gas station was not part of the zoning request. Council was concerned about not knowing what would be developed on the property.

Councilmember Ward commented that it might be good to back and explore other options. The Mayor spoke about significant traffic information needed for his comfort level with the request.

Nolan Kirkman, Assistant City Manager for Development, suggested it would be best to withdraw the application, and if Council desired, the applicant could apply the fee to the new application.

A motion was made by Councilmember Ward to allow the applicant to withdraw the application and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Owen. The motion carried unanimously.

**Item 3: Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment Section 4.5.11 (Fence or Wall)**

A public hearing was held to amend the Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment to Section 4.5.11 (Fence or Wall), subsection d.ii., Easements.

Mayor Butler recognized Planning Manager Conrad Olmedo. Mr. Olmedo stated that the request was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for placement of fences. Planning and Zoning recommended approval. Staff recommended approval.

Todd Lambert, City Engineer, stated that the purpose was to simplify the permitting process. All easements were not the same. The applicant would have to confirm that they had permission from the private easement owner, such as Duke Power. The applicant could cross a City easement. The City did not want fences erected on top of sewer lines. Staff continued to review fencing permits and could determine if there was an easement involved. The cost of permitting was based on valuation of the project. Planning was the clearinghouse for fence permits.

**Public Comments**

Daniel Hernandez, 478 Sapphire Road, asked for clarification on the distinction between public and private easements. Mr. Lambert responded that the easement Mr. Hernandez referred to was a public easement so the language would apply that he could erect a fence on the side of the easement, but not in the middle of the easement.

A motion was made by Councilmember Wall and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Owen to close the public hearing.

The following motion was made by Councilmember Hykes and seconded by Councilmember Wall:

to approve the request to amend the City of Burlington Unified Development Ordinance with the proposed text amendment. The motion was based upon the consistency of the proposed text amendment with the Comprehensive Plan, in that:

- Section 4, Land Use, Goal 1, Recommendation 5, of the Comprehensive Plan, calls for an update of the Unified Development Ordinance.

- Section 4, Land Use, Goal 1, Recommendation 5, of the Comprehensive Plan, calls for ensuring sound land planning decisions that are consistent with the vision of the Plan.

This action was reasonable and in the public interest, in that:

- Section 4, Land Use, Goal 2, Recommendation 4, of the Comprehensive Plan, addresses confusion, conflicts, and obsolescence of the Zoning Code through a new Unified Development Ordinance.
- Section 4, Land Use, Goal 2, Recommendation 4, of the Comprehensive Plan, a new UDO will be modern, graphically intensive, and user-friendly from both a public/petitioner and administrative perspective.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Ordinance #22-11**

**ORDINANCE TO AMEND UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE  
UDOTA 2-22**

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Burlington, North Carolina:

Section 1. That the City of Burlington Unified Development Ordinance, will be amended in accordance with the attached amendments (see attached EXHIBIT A).

Section 2. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent or in conflict with this ordinance and is hereby repealed.

Section 3. That this ordinance shall take effect upon passage.

**EXHIBIT A**

**Unified Development Ordinance Section 4.5.11 (Fence or Wall), subsection d.ii., Easements, currently reads as:**

- a) In cases where a fence or wall is proposed within an easement, the applicant shall provide evidence of the easement owner’s consent regarding the placement of the fence or wall.
- b) The landowner shall remain solely liable for any repair or replacement if any portion of the fence or wall located within a required easement is damaged during the maintenance of construction activities within the easement by the easement owner or their agent.

**Unified Development Ordinance Section 4.5.11 (Fence or Wall), subsection d.ii., Easements, to be amended as:**



- a) In cases where a fence or wall is proposed within a public easement, the fence or wall shall be allowed to cross the easement perpendicularly and run along the edge of the easement but not run along and inside the easement. Crossings may be required to install a gate wide enough for maintenance equipment to traverse.
- b) It is the landowner's responsibility to verify fence or wall locations within a private easement with the easement owner. The City's permitting of such fence or wall does not supersede or negate any private easement agreements or allowances.
- c) The landowner shall remain solely liable for any repair or replacement if any portion of the fence or wall located within a required easement is damaged during the maintenance of construction activities within the easement by the easement owner or their agent.

#### **Item 4: Resolution NC Building Reuse Grant Program: National On-Demand Project**

A public hearing was held to approve the resolution to apply to the North Carolina Department of Commerce Building Reuse Grant Program in support of National On-Demand's project.

Mayor Butler recognized Peter Bishop, Economic Development Director. Mr. Bishop shared that the National On-Demand (NOD) was requesting the City to be a partner in a building reuse grant through the Department of Commerce. NOD was formed 10 years ago in Mebane. The company was a full service construction design firm serving fiber, energy and technology and wireless sectors.

NOD was looking to invest more into the community. They purchased the former Bank of America building downtown in 2019 through a grant. They had continued to expand and purchased the First Horizon Bank building in downtown. They proposed 15 new jobs and invest \$1.4 million in the building. The average salary would be \$129,333. The ask from the City would be a \$25,000 match. The building reuse grant program required 5 percent local match and the State would put in 95 percent. Funds would go directly to local government. The security for the investment would be a Deed of Trust with the owner. He felt Burlington was a good fit for this partnership and would increase vitality in downtown.

The Mayor opened the floor for public comments.

A member from the audience asked why there were only 15 positions. Mr. Bishop responded that the 15 positions were initial employees in addition to existing positions.

A motion was made by Councilmember Ward and seconded by Councilmember Hykes to close the public hearing.

Mayor Pro Tem Owen made a motion seconded by Councilmember Hykes to approve the resolution to apply to the North Carolina Department of Commerce Building Reuse Grant Program in support of National On-Demand's project.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Resolution #22-02**

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CITY OF BURLINGTON GRANT APPLICATION  
ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL ON-DEMAND**

**Whereas**, the City Council supports the revitalization of Burlington and seeks to encourage small business development within downtown Burlington; and,

**Whereas**, National On-Demand is a North Carolina corporation registered to do business in North Carolina; and,

**Whereas**, National On-Demand's operation of a corporate headquarters at 445 South Main Street, Burlington, North Carolina, will positively impact the revitalization vision and goals as stated in the 2008 "Downtown Burlington Master Plan," and positively impact the development of a thriving small business climate in downtown Burlington; and,

**Whereas**, pursuant to N.C.G.S. §158-7.1(a) the City is authorized to make appropriations from property taxes and other unrestricted revenue sources for economic development purposes to increase the taxable property, employment, and business prospects of the City; and,

**Whereas**, pursuant to N.C.G.S. §143B-472.126 et seq., the North Carolina Legislature created the Rural Economic Development Division within the North Carolina Department of Commerce, organizing and promoting grant and loan programs including the Building Reuse Program, and encouraging applications from local governments in the State; and,

**Whereas**, the City Council deems it in the City's best interest to make application to the North Carolina Department of Commerce seeking grant funds from the Rural Economic Development Division's Building Reuse Program to be utilized in the redevelopment of the building to be owned and occupied by National On-Demand, 445 South Main Street, Burlington, North Carolina 27215; and,

**Whereas**, the Rural Economic Development Division's Building Reuse Program requires a local government entity to be the named applicant to the State; and,

**Whereas**, the Building Reuse Program provides for the City to secure its investment in a Building Reuse project by way of a promissory note secured by a mortgage deed of trust executed and conveyed by the building owner to the City; and,

**Whereas**, paragraph III.M. of the City of Burlington's Economic Development Incentive Policy provides for the City Council to hold necessary public hearings as required under State law and N.C.G.S. §158-7.1(c) calls for the governing body of the local government to conduct a public hearing prior to approval of an economic development appropriation; and,

**Whereas**, following proper notice, the Burlington City Council conducted a public hearing on the proposed Resolution;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Burlington City Council that:**

1. The City make application to the North Carolina Department of Commerce Rural Economic Division for Building Reuse grant funds in an amount not to exceed Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for building reuse purposes of the building at 445 South Main Street, Burlington, North Carolina.
2. The City's investment in said Building Reuse project shall be secured by a mortgage deed of trust executed by Burlington Executive Offices, Inc, the owner of the real estate.

**Adopted this 15<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022.**

**Item 5 – NC Department of Commerce Building Reuse Grant Program – ChenMed's Project:**

A public hearing was held to approve the resolution to apply to the North Carolina Department of Commerce Building Reuse Grant Program in support of ChenMed's project. Mr. Bishop indicated that ChenMed was a primary care service that specialized in senior care. The company was new to North Carolina. It was the largest family-owned family practice in the United States. They had experienced growth and were looking to move into North Carolina.

Mr. Antwon Harris shared that the company had 4000 employees in 12 states and would be expanding over the next couple of years. A personal family crisis was the driver for the passion ChenMed had when they started the company.

Mr. Bishop added that the service would cater to seniors 71 years old with five chronic conditions and focus on moderate income populations. The company, thru an LLC, purchased property at 478 Harden Street. He recalled a recent rezoning to allow the use. The average salary would be \$90,339 with 30 jobs in the first two years. The company would invest \$1.55 million in the building. They were requesting a \$300,000 grant and the City match would be \$15,000. He added that there was a special category for health care professions.

A decision would be made on April 27 regarding the grants.

Mayor Butler opened the public hearing. Mary Ann Shanahan asked if the practice would accept Medicare/Medicaid. Mr. Harris responded in the affirmative.

A motion was made by Councilmember Hykes and seconded by Councilmember Wall to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Owen and seconded by Councilmember Ward to approve the resolution to apply to the North Carolina Department of Commerce Building Reuse Grant Program in support of ChenMed's project. The motion carried unanimously.

**Resolution #22-03**

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CITY OF BURLINGTON GRANT APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF DEDICATED NC HOLDING**

**Whereas**, the City Council supports the revitalization of Burlington and seeks to encourage small business development within Burlington; and,

**Whereas**, Dedicated NC Holding PLLC is a North Carolina professional corporation, (hereafter “Dedicated”); and,

**Whereas**, Dedicated’s proposed operation of a medical office at 478 Harden Street, Burlington, North Carolina, will positively impact the revitalization vision and goals as stated in the 2015 “Destination Burlington: Comprehensive Plan,” and positively impact the development of a thriving small business climate in Burlington; and,

**Whereas**, pursuant to N.C.G.S. §158-7.1(a) the City is authorized to make appropriations from property taxes and other unrestricted revenue sources for economic development purposes to increase the taxable property, employment, and business prospects of the City; and,

**Whereas**, pursuant to N.C.G.S. §143B-472.126 et seq., the North Carolina Legislature created the Rural Economic Development Division within the North Carolina Department of Commerce, organizing and promoting grant and loan programs including the Building Reuse Program, and encouraging applications from local governments in the State; and,

**Whereas**, the City Council deems it in the City’s best interest to make application to the North Carolina Department of Commerce seeking grant funds from the Rural Economic Development Division’s Building Reuse Program to be utilized in the redevelopment of the building to be owned and occupied by Dedicated, 478 Harden Street, Burlington North Carolina 27215; and,

**Whereas**, the Rural Economic Development Division’s Building Reuse Program requires a local government entity to be the named applicant to the State; and,

**Whereas**, the Building Reuse Program provides for the City to secure its investment in a Building Reuse project by way of a promissory note secured by a mortgage deed of trust executed and conveyed by the building owner to the City; and,

**Whereas**, paragraph III.M. of the City of Burlington’s Economic Development Incentive Policy provides for the City Council to hold necessary public hearings as required under State law and N.C.G.S. §158-7.1(c) calls for the governing body of the local government to conduct a public hearing prior to approval of an economic development appropriation; and,

**Whereas**, following proper notice, the Burlington City Council conducted a public hearing on the proposed Resolution;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Burlington City Council that:**

3. The City make application to the North Carolina Department of Commerce Rural Economic Division for Building Reuse grant funds in an amount not to exceed Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for building reuse purposes of the building at 478 Harden Street, Burlington, North Carolina.

4. The City's investment in said Building Reuse project shall be secured by a mortgage deed of trust executed by JMCG Corporate Buildings, LLC, the owner of the real estate.

**Adopted this 15<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022.**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Mayor Butler opened the floor for public comments for topics not on the agenda. There were no public comments.

### **CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Mayor Butler welcomed Interim City Manager David Cheek to his first meeting.

The St. Paddy's Day event would be held Friday, March 18<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 in downtown Burlington.

Councilmember Wall asked if something could be sent to the newspaper regarding the Western Electric building status. He also asked Chief Long if there could be more police presence at the vacant Rite Aid on Chapel Hill Road as well as more visibility on Bonnar Bridge for speeders.

Interim City Manager Cheek announced that it would be the last meeting for the Interim City Clerk and expressed appreciation for her service.

There being no further business, Councilmember Wall made a motion seconded by Councilmember Hykes to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously,

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



V. Michelle Parker-Evans, NCMMC  
Interim City Clerk

March 15, 2022  
City Council Meeting