



# TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

Town Hall  
405 Martin Luther King Jr.  
Boulevard  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

## Town Council

### Meeting Minutes - Final

Mayor Pam Hemminger  
Mayor pro tem Michael Parker  
Council Member Jessica Anderson  
Council Member Allen Buansi

Council Member Hongbin Gu  
Council Member Tai Huynh  
Council Member Amy Ryan  
Council Member Karen Stegman

---

**Monday, June 21, 2021**

**6:30 PM**

**Virtual Meeting**

---

#### Virtual Meeting Notification

Town Council members will attend and participate in this meeting remotely, through internet access, and will not physically attend. The Town will not provide a physical location for viewing the meeting.

The public is invited to attend the Zoom webinar directly online or by phone.

Register for this webinar:

[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_c-aKKEsyQVqI0J6Gd8-bsQ](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_c-aKKEsyQVqI0J6Gd8-bsQ) After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar in listen-only mode. Phone: 301-715-8592, Meeting ID: 845 3837 4014

View Council meetings live at <https://chapelhill.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx> – and on Chapel Hill Gov-TV ([townofchapelhill.org/GovTV](http://townofchapelhill.org/GovTV)).

#### Roll Call

**Present:** 6 - Mayor Pam Hemminger, Mayor pro tem Michael Parker, Council Member Hongbin Gu, Council Member Karen Stegman, Council Member Tai Huynh, and Council Member Amy Ryan

**Absent:** 2 - Council Member Jessica Anderson, and Council Member Allen Buansi

#### Other Attendees

Town Manager Maurice Jones, Deputy Town Manager Mary Jane Nirdlinger, Town Attorney Ann Anderson, Assistant Planning Director Judy Johnson, Affordable Housing Development Officer Emily Holt, Planning Director Colleen Willger, Economic Development and Parking Services Director Dwight Bassett, Interim Housing and Community Director Sarah Viñas, Affordable Housing Manager Nate Broman-Fulks, Economic Development Specialist Laura Selmer, Deputy Town Manager Loryn Clark, Communications and Public Affairs Director/Town Clerk Sabrina Oliver, and Deputy Town Clerk Amy Harvey.

## OPENING

Mayor Hemminger opened the special meeting at 6:30 p.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted that a closed session would follow the virtual meeting. She called the roll and all Council Members replied that they were present, with the exception of Council Members Buansi and Anderson, who had been excused due to prior commitments.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS BY COUNCIL MEMBERS

### 0.01 Mayor Hemminger Regarding July 4th Fireworks.

[\[21-0605\]](#)

Mayor Hemminger announced that the July 4th fireworks celebration would be held at Southern Community Park. COVID-related safety measures would be in place, she said, adding that more information was available on the Town's website.

### 0.02 Mayor Hemminger Regarding Upcoming Meeting.

[\[21-0606\]](#)

Mayor Hemminger said that the Council would meet again on June 23, 2021, to address more than 20 additional agenda items. In addition, there was a meeting tentatively scheduled for June 28th in case the Council was not able to complete its agenda on the 23rd, she said.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. Authorize the Town Manager to Negotiate and Execute a Construction Contract for the Rosemary Parking Deck Project.

[\[21-0568\]](#)

Deputy Town Manager Mary Jane Nirdlinger explained that this item had been pulled from a previous consent agenda for discussion at the current meeting. She said that a couple of questions had been answered regarding the Town Manager's authority to negotiate and execute a construction contract for the Rosemary Parking Deck Project and that all documents required for an Economic Development Agreement with Grubb Properties were in hand.

Upon Council authorization, the Town Manager would negotiate and execute a final construction contract and Samet Construction would confirm the bid lock and the pricing, Ms. Nirdlinger said. She said that a closing had been scheduled for June 23, 2021, demolition would begin in early July, and construction would begin in September 2021 with completion expected for fall 2022.

Ms. Nirdlinger noted that the project budget was \$39 million and discussed the items that were included in that amount. She said that Grubb Properties had agreed to reduce its \$1,400,000 fee to \$1,156,000 its July estimate.

Council Members confirmed with Ms. Nirdlinger that "guaranteed maximum cost" meant the price was locked in. That guarantee would protect the Town if the cost of materials were to rise again, she said. The Council also verified with her that representatives from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) had said that the rise in construction costs was what they had expected.

The Mayor and Council thanked staff and Grubb Properties for renegotiating Grubb's fee.

A motion was made by Mayor pro tem Parker, seconded by Council Member Huynh, that R-1 be adopted. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

### *CONCEPT PLAN REVIEWS*

Concept Plans: Presentations for Concept Plans will be limited to 15 minutes.

Concept Plan review affords Council members the opportunity to provide individual reactions to the overall concept of the development which is being contemplated for future application. Nothing stated by individual Council members this evening can be construed as an official position or commitment on the part of a Council member with respect to the position they may take when and if a formal application for development is subsequently submitted and comes before the Council for formal consideration.

As a courtesy to others, people speaking on an agenda item are normally limited to three minutes. Persons who are organizing a group presentation and who wish to speak beyond the three minute limit are requested to make prior arrangements through the Mayor's Office by calling 968-2714.

**2. Concept Plan Review: St Paul Community Village, 1604 Purefoy Drive.**

[\[21-0569\]](#)

Assistant Planning Director Judy Johnson presented a concept plan for St. Paul's Community Village, a five-parcel development that would be in a Residential-5-Conditional Zoning District on Purefoy Drive. She showed the 24-acre site on a map and indicated the nearby developments. She said that the applicant, St. Paul AME Church, was proposing about 350 residential units, a worship center, conference and events space, possible retail space, and outdoor and indoor recreational areas. The applicant could apply for either a Special-Use Permit, Conditional Zoning or an Economic Development Agreement, she said.

Ms. Johnson pointed out that the Town's Future Land Use Map identified the area as institutional/high residential and that the Town's Mobility Plan showed future pedestrian and bike lanes there. She said that the Community Design Commission (CDC) and the Housing Advisory Board

(HAB) had raised concerns about density, massing, transitions to nearby neighborhoods, stormwater, and parking numbers. The HAB was encouraging the applicant to target an area median income (AMI) below 60 percent and consider retail subsidies and vouchers, she said.

Dr. Rose Snipes, representing the St. Paul AME Leadership Committee, presented a "re-imagined" plan for the site and discussed how a 2012 SUP had been extended in 2016. She explained that the project vision included mixed-use facilities, active and passive recreation, historic preservation elements, community facilities, educational and training spaces, community-focused retail space, and a worship center.

Dr. Snipes provided details on the plan's evolution to one that currently included an increase in housing density and improvements to the area's natural environment. She showed a preliminary diagram of the project's orientation and layout and outlined a proposed increase in floor area, additional retail space, a re-designated parking area, and an extended road.

Dr. Snipes said that building heights would vary up to five stories. She explained that a 2017 sewer project had provided the opportunity to expand and said that the project's financial success would depend on the proposed increase in density. She outlined a plan that would have construction begin by the end of 2021.

Dr. Snipes provided details about a community center/events space with a community market, small eateries, and other amenities. She noted a need to reestablish the natural flow of water across the property by turning a wetland area back to effective green spaces.

The Council confirmed with Ms. Johnson that the Town's Mobility Plan identified an area road that needed improvements. They confirmed with Dr. Snipes that the buildings would include elevators, the project probably would be tax exempt, and the senior living building would include AH as well. They verified that the distribution of 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom units in the mixed housing building was based on a market analysis of both buildings.

In response to a comment about AH Bond funding, Dr. Snipes said that St. Paul AME was planning to fund the project on its own but was always willing to form partnerships. She pointed out that EmPOWERment Inc. had been part of the project since its inception. The church had been a stakeholder with AH various groups, including Habitat for Humanity, she said.

The Council and applicant discussed how industrial dumping along the western border in the early 1990s had blocked the flow of water to the site and led to stagnation and fallen trees. Ms. Johnson said that several beaver dams had created water problems as well.

Council Members confirmed that the applicant planned to retain an historic church and intended to discuss collaborating and/or sharing space with the nearby RENA Center. Dr. Snipes said that shared parking could be negotiated with the RENA Center as long as there was a sufficient amount for Community Village residents. Mayor Hemminger commented that Orange County leaders had been discussing an expansion request from the RENA Center and looking at a proposal that would include federal American Recovery Plan funds.

In response to a comment about the value of home-ownership, Dr. Snipes said there was an equal need for rental units. There would be some limited ownership opportunities connected with the church, but home ownership had not been the church's financial strategy, she said. When asked about the possibility of the development becoming student housing, Dr. Snipes replied that workforce housing was their target population.

Mayor Hemminger confirmed with Dr. Snipes that the St. Paul's AME would be open to working with Urban Designer Brian Peterson on the project in addition to their own proposed architect, Perkins and Will.

Molly McConnell, a Chapel Hill resident, praised St. Paul AME Church for its hospitality, compassion and vision and for including affordable rental units in its plan.

Delores Bailey, executive director of EmPOWERment, Inc., said that she had been involved with the project since its inception and strongly supported it. There was a dire housing need for those in the 30-60 percent of area median income (AMI) range, she said, and she praised the applicant for creating a project with 25 percent affordable units.

The Mayor and Council expressed enthusiasm for the opportunity to add more vibrancy and community-centered activity to the particular section of Town. They asked the applicant to explore, including more units at the 60 and under AMI level, and to accept housing vouchers. Council Member Huynh said that including units at the 30 percent level would add huge value to the community. Mayor pro tem Parker proposed that the applicant work with the Affordable Housing Coalition to shift toward lower income levels.

Council Member Huynh recommended that the project include more 2- and 3-bedroom units. Several Council Members asked the applicant to work on reducing parking and exploring the possibility of sharing parking with the RENA community. The Mayor and Council recommended that the applicant have stormwater experts look at the wetland area early on to make sure that the reclamation project was feasible.

A motion was made by Mayor pro tem Parker, seconded by Council Member

---

Stegman, that R-2 be adopted. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

3. Concept Plan Review: Jay Street Apartments, 66 Jay Street.

[\[21-0570\]](#)

Mayor Hemminger said that staff was in the process of investigating two petitions regarding the Jay Street property. The Council would not be voting on anything before those findings were presented in the fall, she said.

Ms. Johnson summarized the Jay Street Apartments concept plan for a Town-sponsored affordable housing (AH) project on the Chapel Hill/Carrboro border near the Tanyard Branch Greenway. She said that the proposed 48-52 AH apartment complex would include 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom units, community building, playground and picnic center. She said that the CDC and HAB had both reviewed the concept plan and had raised concerns about site constraints and access. The boards had praised the AH aspect, but the HAB had discussed accepting housing vouchers, she said.

Interim Director of Community and Housing Sara Viñas emphasized that the process was at the very early stage and that there would be many more opportunities for community input. She reviewed how the Town had prioritized using its own land to facilitate AH development since 2011 and had created AH projects such as Greenfields and 2011 Homestead Road.

Affordable Housing Development Officer Emily Holt provided background on the project, which had begun in 2018 when the Council prioritized the land for AH. Staff had ultimately signed a memo of understanding with Taft-Mills Group, LLC and Community Home Trust in February and had submitted a concept plan application in March, she said. She said that staff had been gathering feedback from the community on the conceptual project since its inception.

Developer Dustin Mills, of Taft-Mills LLC, described his Greenville-based company's experience as a workforce housing developer. He said that Taft-Mills had built about 1,000 AH units since 2014 and showed visuals of projects they had done in North Carolina and elsewhere.

Mr. Mills said that a driving principle behind the Jay Street Apartments concept was to leave about half of the seven-acre site undisturbed. The site was well-located for AH, with a bus stop within walking distance and direct access to the Tanyard Branch Trail, he said. He described a plan for two 3-story garden style buildings with a breezeway between.

Mr. Mills said that some Jay Street Apartments residents would be in the 80 percent AMI range, but the majority would be at 60 percent or below, down to 30 percent AMI. Eligibility for tax credits required a minimum affordability period of 30 years, he pointed out. He said that incentives existed for adding an additional 30 years.

Mr. Mills described potential on-site amenities and proposed financing the

approximate \$9 million development with tax exempt bonds and 4 percent low-income housing tax credits. The plan would meet buffer requirements and exceed them in some areas, he said. He showed architectural renderings of the built environment and pointed out that most of the surrounding area consisted of multi-family properties.

Mr. Mills showed a list of the interested parties that his firm had met with and said that answers to questions the community had raised were on the Taft-Mills and Community Home Trust websites. Concerns had been expressed about issues such as saving trees, traffic, site impact, visual changes, road restrictions, parking, access to Tanyard Branch Trail, and trash collection, he said. He said that his designers were considering ways to incorporate feedback from Urban Designer Brian Peterson.

In response to a question from Council Member Ryan, Mr. Mills explained that the Community Home Trust would manage the property. There would be no direct affiliation with the NC Housing Authority regarding ownership or management of the development, he said.

Mayor pro tem Parker said that affordability should be longer than 30 years, and Mr. Mills replied that he would support making Jay Street as affordable as long as possible. Thirty years was merely the statutory timeline associated with the initial allocation of tax credits, he said.

The Council confirmed that the project would be a tax-paying entity. They ascertained that Taft-Mills foresaw a probable \$2-3 million contribution from the Town, or Orange County, since the project would likely qualify for only the 4 percent tax credit option. Mayor pro tem Parker calculated that the Town would pay between 25 and 35 percent of the total project cost, not including the value of the land, which would mean subsidizing around \$60,000 per unit.

Council Member Gu raised questions about the narrowness of Jay Street, but Mr. Mills replied that there was sufficient space to pass in both directions. He would work with the Town to determine whether improvements would be required, he said, and she confirmed with him that the proposed \$9 million from the Town would include a reasonable amount for off-site work.

Robert Beasley, a Chapel Hill resident, pointed out that the Town had purchased the Jay Street property in 2005 with Open Space Bond funds. Moving forward with a private development project would violate the will of the voters, he said.

Joanna Vajda read a petition from 134 Village West residents, relatives, and friends, which stated that Jay Street Apartments would cause environmental, traffic and safety issues for them and their neighbors. The development would be in direct conflict with the 2005 Open Space Bond

Fund vote, she said, adding that residents were primarily concerned about traffic and potential flooding.

Chapel Hill residents Tara Kachgal, Susan Bolotin, Laura Wilkinson, Margaret Widener and Trisha Lester all raised concerns about issues such as inadequate bus service to and from the area, traffic on one narrow road leading into the area, no sidewalks, and flooding.

Rachel Gray and Penny Sparacino argued that providing low-income rentals would not increase quality of life in the way that helping people to buy properties would. Ms. Sparacino said that Jay Street Apartment residents would be spending what money they did have on gas. Ms. Gray said that adding 95 parking spaces would exacerbate existing traffic problems, including pedestrian safety. It would be unethical to build on land that had been purchased with Open Space Bond funds and was located near unmarked grave sites, she said.

Julie Pace, a Village West resident, criticized the Council for entering into a contract with Taft-Mills, an all-white organization. She expressed concern about how few AH units were being created in Town, in general, and said that payments in lieu were among factors pushing the Town to build them on open space lands. UNC would eventually need the Jay Street area to connect to Carolina North, and the Town should finish mapping the adjacent historical cemetery before adding to its destruction, she said.

Pam Cooper, a Chapel Hill resident, said that the project's environmental impact would be overwhelmingly negative and that little quality of life would be created by establishing housing in such a cramped space near the railroad tracks.

George Barrett, executive director of the Marion Cheeks Jackson Center, characterized the need for AH in Chapel Hill as a justice and equity issue. He said that the nearby Northside community overwhelmingly supported the Jay Street development. If the Town wanted to create safety and economic opportunities for those on the margins, Jay Street was exactly the type of project that was needed, he said.

Yevette Matthews, office and community organizer for the Community Empowerment Fund, said that she saw people every day who were at 30 percent AMI and below level and suffering. Developing the Jay Street property would mean a lot to those who were living on the streets, she said.

Delores Bailey said that the best way to produce AH was to put it on Town-owned property. She encouraged others to work with the Community Home Trust as well and said that the need for AH was so



desperate that everyone would have to give up something somewhere.

Mayor Hemminger thanked the speakers for their comments and emphasized that the Council was only looking at a concept plan. Staff would investigate the petitions and return to Council with more information in the fall, she said.

The Mayor and Council said that they had walked the site. They praised the proposal to build AH while preserving half of the site but agreed that the bike, pedestrian and road infrastructure would need to be safe. They proposed looking at ways to reduce the amount of parking and decoupling parking and rental fees. They recommended that the design be more responsive to the site's topography and suggested rearranging the space to create more distance from surrounding neighborhoods.

The Council stressed the value of working with the Town's urban designer on the plan. Council Member Ryan expressed interest in exploring a CDC recommendation for a permanent conservation easement. Council Members commented on the need to understand the implications of citizens' petitions and to protect the nearby cemetery.

Mayor Hemminger said that the Town would need to address citizens' questions before it could move forward. Ensuring traffic and pedestrian safety was one of the site's challenges and the Council would need good answers on that, she said. She pointed out that the Town had a desperate need for AH in places where people could access amenities. She was disappointed to hear about bus service issues and wanted to explore that further, she said.

A motion was made by Council Member Huynh, seconded by Mayor pro tem Parker, that R-3 be adopted. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**4. Concept Plan Review: 101 East Rosemary Street.**

[\[21-0571\]](#)

Ms. Johnson gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on a concept plan for a 7-story building at 101 E. Rosemary Street in the Town's Downtown Future Focus Area. She said that the applicant, Grubb Properties, was proposing to rezone the property, under its Link Apartments brand, from Town Center-2 to Town Center-3-Conditional Zoning District. The proposed project would include approximately 140 apartments, shops, commercial offices, parks and gathering spaces, in addition to the apartments, she said.

Ms. Johnson presented a photo of the location and gave a brief overview of the site plan. She said that the Town's Land Use Management Ordinance allowed up to four stories, including setbacks, at that location. The CDC and HAB had both recommended more AH, encouraged rental vouchers and street activation, and expressed concern about the

development becoming student housing, she said. She mentioned that the boards had also noted the importance of design, considering the site's prominent location, and had commented on the need for special sensitivity to the area's historic architecture.

Joe Dye, executive vice president of Grubb Properties, said that Link Apartments Rosemary would be part of the continuing redevelopment of the 100 block of East Rosemary and would bring more 25 to 35 year-old post-graduate students and professionals to the Downtown area.

Kristen Casper, of Grubb Properties, explained that Link Properties typically targeted those earning 60-140 percent of AMI. Proposed floor plans would range from 360 to a little more than 1,100 square feet, she said, and she described additional amenities that would be oriented toward young professionals. Few students live in Link Apartments because of their small sizes, she said.

Ms. Casper said that Link Apartments Rosemary would include approximately 140 units, 91 one-bedrooms and 19 two-bedrooms. A swimming pool and fitness center would typically be at ground level, she said. She explained that there would be no on-site parking and that residents would share parking at the East Rosemary Deck.

Brian Bunce with BB&M Architects said that the concept plan closely followed input from Urban Designer Brian Peterson, the CDC, and BB&M's own instincts from having worked many times in an urban context. He showed an overhead view of the site as well as images of other Link properties.

Mr. Bunce described a building facade that would anchor the corner but allow pedestrians to flow through easily. He proposed setting the entire building back, rather than stepping it back, in order to allow for more terracing and street activation in front. The building would pick up on materials from both the new parking deck and the Old Town Hall, he said.

Council Members confirmed with Mr. Dye that a payment in lieu for parking would be acceptable to Grubb Properties. Council Member Huynh asked if the applicant would accept housing vouchers, and Ms. Casper replied that Link Properties' typical target was 60-140 percent of AMI. Mayor Hemminger confirmed that the building on the E. Rosemary Street side would be 75 feet tall, with each floor being a little under 11 feet.

Delores Bailey expressed concern about the lack of an AH plan. She pointed out that a person holding a voucher could afford an apartment at 60 percent AMI. Additionally, she did not see anything that would prevent students from renting those apartments and did not see how such a tall building would blend into the corner, she said.

The Mayor and Council voiced concerns about the proposed height, massing, and contemporary design. They pointed out that Town plans called for four stories at the street and up to a six-story core. The Town had stated a specific preference for buildings that step back from the street, they said.

Council Members said they wanted to see generous sidewalks with large street trees. They said that a modern design worked well on Grubb Properties' other Rosemary Street buildings but seemed disconnected at the corner, which was near the Old Town Hall and other smaller scale brick buildings.

Mayor pro tem Parker suggested designing a building that would combine the two areas with step-backs and slightly different materials on the Columbia Street side that would make it fit in better with the look and feel of the neighborhood there. He suggested that the applicant take visual cues from the Rosemary Street Hotel. In addition, a rooftop restaurant/bar would make the building a special destination, he pointed out.

Council Members said that having fitness and leasing centers at ground level would do nothing to activate the street. They proposed including a library, art gallery or performance space instead. Some suggested that the project include retail. They raised concerns about parking deck capacity and asked staff to bring back information on how the Town planned to balance that among its different goals.

The Council asked to see a clear AH plan and a commitment to accepting housing vouchers. Mayor Hemminger said that the Town and applicant probably could agree on an AH plan if the applicant would be willing to work with a group that qualifies people for AH.

All Council Members expressed opposition to having student housing at the location and said they wanted to see a concrete plan to avoid that. Mayor Hemminger commented on the probability that students with resources would flock to the building, and she stressed that it was not what the Town wanted.

A motion was made by Mayor pro tem Parker, seconded by Council Member Huynh, that R-4 be adopted. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

### *CONTINUED DISCUSSION*

- 5** Update on Redevelopment of Police Station Property at 828 Martin Luther King, Jr Boulevard.

[\[21-0572\]](#)

Economic Development Specialist Laura Selmer introduced Ken Reiter,

president of Belmont-Sayre, who presented the pros and cons of two scenarios for redeveloping the contaminated Police Station site at 828 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. One scenario included 60-80,000 square feet of market rate office space or the Town's Multiple Services Center), up to 300 multi-family housing units, and a dedicated 690-space parking structure, he said. The other scenario was all commercial and included the Multiple Services Center and another standalone office building.

John Gallagher, of Belmont-Sayre, discussed case studies of Brownfield sites in Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill and Winston Salem. He explained how contamination had been safely contained with the land redeveloped at those locations.

Ms. Selmer said that some of the Town's Climate Action Plan goals could be met with infill redevelopment, which could preserve greenspace and provide an opportunity for trail- and transit-oriented development. The Multiple Services Center (MSC) could serve as a model for future "triple bottom line" sustainable development that addresses community, environmental and fiscal impacts, she said.

Ms. Selmer outlined staff's work plan for the summer. She said that the Council would meet with Hart & Hickman on June 23rd to discuss methodology and risk and then would return in the fall with a draft Economic Development Agreement (EDA) for discussion. She shared comments that staff had heard from the Council and community regarding safety, sustainable design, public benefits, and best and highest uses for the site. She asked the Council what other guiding principles it would like staff to consider when exploring site reuse and an EDA.

The Council asked Mr. Reiter about possible hybrid models that might fall between the two scenarios, and he said that everything was possible and that staff would benefit from having parameters. There was a market limit on commercial space and a huge demand for multi-family residential housing, he pointed out.

Mayor pro tem Parker pointed out that the highest and best use for Chapel Hill did not mean getting the largest economic return possible. He asked if the presence of coal ash would prevent a park or other public recreational amenity from being built at the location. Mr. Reiter replied that the uses would drive the remedy. Ms. Selmer recommended consulting with Urban Designer Brian Peterson about what and where such spaces could be.

Megan Kimbell, an attorney with Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC), characterized the case studies that Belmont-Sayre had presented as misleading. She said that the pollutants at Raleigh's Union Station site had not been from coal ash. Studies had found a significant amount

of arsenic in the upper portion of the Town's site, she said. She stressed that building on top of the Town's 40 feet of coal ash, construction debris, and large pockets of water would be very different from building on top of a car dealership or dry cleaner site.

Julie McClintock, a Chapel Hill resident and environmentalist, stressed the need to consider a risk assessment that had been performed on the site. She said that many technical questions had not been addressed and that staff had done an insufficient job of understanding the relative risks of different uses.

Several Council Members said that they liked the idea of having some form of public gathering space on the site and would like information on the safety and cost implications of that scenario. Mayor Hemminger and Council Member Stegman proposed adding "the creative use of public space and community benefits" to the guiding principles. The Council encourage staff to take Ms. Kimbell up on her offer to consult with them.

Mayor Hemminger said that she was not excited about having apartment buildings and the police station at such a density level and wanted to see what other options might be available. She did like the idea of having the police station return to that location, but it would need to be physically and financially feasible, she said.

This item was received as presented.

### **REQUEST FOR CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PROPERTY ACQUISITION, PERSONNEL, AND/OR LITIGATION MATTERS**

A motion was made by Mayor pro tem Parker, seconded by Council Member Stegman, to enter into a closed session as authorized by General Statute Section 143-318.11(a)(3), to consult with the Town Attorney regarding a judicial action and to preserve attorney-client privilege. At the conclusion of the closed session, the Council will adopt a single motion to end the closed session and adjourn the meeting without taking further action.. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Council recessed the meeting at 11:06 p.m. and adjourned the meeting at the conclusion of the closed session.