



**MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF MINT HILL, NORTH CAROLINA  
MINT HILL TOWN HALL  
4430 MINT HILL VILLAGE LANE  
MAY 14, 2015  
7:00 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ADDITION, DELETION OR ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA ITEMS
4. APPROVE MINUTES OF MARCH 7-8, 2015 RETREAT, APRIL 9, 2015 QUARTERLY DEVELOPERS' WORKSHOP, APRIL 9, 2015 REGULAR MEETING AND APRIL 14, 2015 CALLED MEETING
5. ACCEPT APRIL TAX COLLECTOR'S REPORT
6. PUBLIC HEARING ON #ZC15-2, FILED BY PAUL SLEIMAN OF S.T.O. PARTNERS, REQUESTING CONDITIONAL ZONING APPROVAL FOR A DRIVE THROUGH FACILITY IN DOWNTOWN
7. PUBLIC COMMENTS\*\*
8. DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON #ZC14-11, FILED BY JOHN THOMAS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN CONSULTANTS, INC., REQUESTING A TEXT AMENDMENT TO SECTION 6.2.4 RELATED TO CURB AND GUTTER
9. OTHER BUSINESS/COUNCIL MATTERS
10. ADJOURNMENT

*\* In accordance with North Carolina General Statutes and/or local Ordinances, a public hearing is required/scheduled on this agenda item. Public comments related to this item have been or will be heard during the scheduled public hearing. Time allotted each speaker may be limited due to length of agenda. \*\*Up to one hour has been reserved for comments from the public on matters of general interest, or agenda items other than those for which a public hearing is required as noted above. **Individuals wishing to speak under "Public Comments" must sign up (on the sheet provided in the lobby) prior to the meeting being called to order. Speakers will be limited to two minutes per person, and recognized in the order in which they sign up.***

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF MINT HILL, NORTH CAROLINA  
MARCH 6-7, 2015**

The Board of Commissioners of the Town of Mint Hill met in called session on Friday and Saturday, March 6-7, 2015 beginning at 1:00 p.m. at The Hut in Pineville, North Carolina.

**ATTENDANCE**

Mayor: Ted H. Biggers, Jr.

Commissioners: Lloyd Austin, Carl M. Ellington, Richard Newton and Katrina (Tina) W. Ross

Town Manager: Brian L. Welch

Deputy Town Manager: Lee Bailey

Planning Director: John Hoard

Town Clerk: Michelle Wells Farrar

Mayor Biggers called the meeting to order, ruled a quorum present and the meeting duly constituted to carry on business. He stated the purpose of the called meeting was to hold a two-day retreat for the Board to provide Board members an opportunity to discuss and take action as deemed appropriate on short-term and long-term planning for the Town of Mint Hill. The Mayor and Commissioners were provided with an outline of various topics for discussion in which Board members had expressed interest. The outline was modified slightly to accommodate outside speakers.

**Presentation and Discussion on Grass Swales Versus Curb and Gutter in the Goose Creek Basin (Rusty Rozzelle and Don Cecarelli)**

Mr. Rozzelle, Charlotte Mecklenburg Storm Water Services, presented a PowerPoint. The Town of Mint Hill had five creeks in the Town sphere: Clear Creek, McAlpine Creek, Irvins Creek, Duck Creek and Goose Creek. He gave the example of 1" of rain falling on an acre of woods would produce no runoff. If the same amount fell on an acre of asphalt it would produce over 27,000 gallons of runoff. An increase of volume plus an increase of velocity equals a change in the natural stream hydrology. He listed the non-point source pollutants as: sediment, bacteria, toxic and mineral metals, pesticides, fertilizers and petroleum products. Unstable stream channels and nonpoint source pollutants caused degraded water quality conditions and were the biggest threats to the Carolina Heelsplitter.

The Town Curb and Gutter requirements were not in conflict with the Post-Construction Ordinance. Rain gardens used with curb and gutter still provided for infiltration. He then outlined and provided pictures of enhanced and grass swales. The Board discussed detention ponds, enhanced swales, grass swales and ditches.

Mr. Don Ceccarelli, Charlotte Mecklenburg Storm Water Services, stated although the term ditch and swale were often used interchangeably; the ditch was v-shaped and would not be considered a swale. Enhanced swales and grassed channels require infiltration. Maintenance was typically performed by the homeowner but they could petition the Town to take them over if they were on a Town maintained street. He reviewed the 3 to 1 slope for both enhanced and grassed swales along with the Infiltration Considerations as noted in the Best Management Practices (BMPs) manual.

The Board discussion included determining which agency would be responsible for the enforcement of the method of chosen for the development. If the Town was ultimately responsible for the systems then would the Town have the final authority of what types of systems were used? The Town really would look at the maintenance cost associated with the different types of systems because tax money would be paying for the repairs. The systems would be monitored for effectiveness. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources had no value reduction for grass swales. Mr. Rozzelle didn't think the Board would want to remove the swale option; better to keep the option but not require it. The Board continued the discussion and thought swales were better on larger lots as to allow for more trees and planting areas. Swales used in developments with smaller lots would leave very little room in the front yard. The Board agreed swales were good when the lot was flat and larger because of the aesthetics, function and cost.

Mr. Hoard reminded the Board that applicants could request a curb and gutter exemption with the current ordinance.

Concluding the discussion, the Board agreed there was no need to amend the ordinance at this time since the exemption was an option but the majority of the Board felt curb and gutter was the best practice.

### **Family Care Homes**

Mr. Hoard said the State allowed municipalities to regulate distance separation up to a half-mile but this would require a text amendment. The text amendment would specify the one-half mile separation in the BR Residential District. Staff also proposed a new term to the definition section which was as follows:

*Family Care Home Subdivision: A subdivision development consisting of four or more residential lots, subdivided in accordance with the Mint Hill Subdivision regulations, created for the purpose of permitting Family Care Homes in close proximity with one another. The development shall be owned and operated by a single entity.*

The Board asked about an existing development on Thompson Road; would it still be in compliance if the Board pursued the amendment. Mr. Hoard stated the development had already been approved for 4 houses. The amendment would prohibit entities from buying several distressed homes in neighborhood and operating family care homes. He reminded the Board that the people wouldn't be treated for mental illness; alcohol or drug abuse; maternity care; professional nursing care under continuous medical supervision; lodging, when the personal assistance and supervision offered for the aged and disabled were not needed; or, who pose a direct threat to the health or safety of others. Many towns and cities enforce a distance separation such as Charlotte, Raleigh, Wilmington and Matthews. A Group Home would be interchangeable with a Family Care Home and would have no more than six mentally or physically disabled persons and a care giver.

Concluding the discussion, the Board agreed by consensus to have Staff prepare a text amendment to come before the Board regarding separation for Family Care Homes and the creation of a Family Home Subdivision definition.

### **Discussion About Higher Density Residential Development Outside of Downtown**

The Unified Development Ordinance didn't allow for higher density residential development outside of downtown currently. The Board discussed the narrow roads and challenges they place on the fire, police and public works departments along with the waste collection provider. The example for the discussion was the property on Margaret-Wallace Road brought to the Board via the January Developers Workshop. The Board discussed the office/retail concept versus the patio home design. Mr. Hoard said the applicant had recently stated there was no market for the office retail concept and there was no clear decision as to if they would pursue this at all. He said they had also entertained the idea of a conservation easement or park. The Board discussed the need for recreational activities in this area and the abundance of foot traffic. The concern was the foot traffic may contribute to loitering.

There had been others interested in developing active adult communities outside of downtown. The Board was asked if they wanted to place a mechanism on the books to allow for pinwheel/common-wall communities. It could be achieved through conditional rezoning and authorized based on individual site plans. The Board contemplated how many units per acre; the quality of the project versus the increased density; and, the appeal of rural small town feel versus a patio home development. The discussion reiterated downtown was created to allow higher density and downtown wasn't first come-first serve but instead was careful placement. Lower quality construction was mentioned and it was countered with the prohibitive land cost for that type of construction. The Board wanted projects and developments they would be proud of. Other possible projects along Lawyers and Matthews-Mint Hill Roads were mentioned and would be perceived as an asset if the Board chose to allow higher density outside of Downtown. The Matthews-Mint Hill corridor was perceived by many residents as slated to become commercial in the future because of the bank, veterinarian hospital and physicians offices but the Board didn't have any plans for commercial. The duplexes allowed at Davis Trace were called into question but it was clarified that twenty percent of a conventional subdivision could have a zero lot line. It was noted Mint Lake Village was approved as an office/apartment rezoning and many residents would find that unsettling now.

Concluding the discussion, the majority of the Board agreed to leave the ordinance as it was currently written.

### **Presentation by Arts and Science Council**

Robert Bush, President of the Arts and Science Council (ASC), spoke to the Board about the Mint Hill Plan. He spoke of the ASC investments, cultural vision plan, cultural life task force, the goals of the task force recommendations, short-term stabilization strategies, long-term stabilization strategies, recommended private sector investment increases, recommended public sector investment increases, the ASC progress to-date, changes in the ASC governance, paradigm shift(old/new models), cultural life task force recommendation for the Town of Mint Hill and ASC proposed FY16 investment from the Town of Mint Hill.

The ASC hoped to secure \$1.30 per resident, by 2020, which would be approximately \$42,000 for the Town of Mint Hill. They would ask for gradual increases until the full funding was in

effect. They would be asking for \$16,000 for next fiscal year, instead of the \$10,000 budgeted by the Town this year.

The Board asked how services/events were allocated. Mr. Bush said the priority would be given to the underserved areas. The programming would be directed more toward the areas that have deficits. Building relationships with the Town would allow ASC to serve the needs in the community. The Board thanked Mr. Bush for attending.

### **Branding for the Town and Economic Development**

Deputy Manager Bailey supplied the Board with numerous Gateway and Direction sign examples. The discussion centered on the need to have signs on Interstate 485 along with the major thoroughfares (Matthews-Mint Hill Road and Lawyers Road). The Board was encouraged to speak with the legislators at Town Hall Day (March 18, 2015) about the interstate signs similar to the ones that say "Welcome to Matthews." Motif/logo suggestions for the local signs included having a horse's head or mint leaf logo. It was even suggested to have the signs placed in a bed of mint. The seven locations identified for Downtown signs were: Highway 51 (North) at Interstate 485; Highway 218 at Interstate 485; Lawyers Road at Bain School Road. Idlewild Road at Interstate 485; Highway 51 at Idlewild Road; Lawyers Road at Lebanon Road; and, Wilgrove-Mint Hill Road at Albemarle Road. The cost associated with the signs/poles/landscaping was discussed.

Manager Welch would gather more information, including quotes/pricing, for the Board.

The economic development conversation addressed attracting new businesses to Mint Hill. Existing retail/shopping centers were reviewed as some commissioners felt concern about the empty storefronts. Vital statistics about the residents of the Town could be found on our website and the additional information requested could and would be linked to the website. The need for entrepreneurs was ongoing but many businesses were interested in relocating to Mint Hill. The leasing costs associated with bringing the businesses to Mint Hill were between the tenant and the owner. The Board expected more businesses to make Mint Hill their home because the economy was getting better and because Mint Hill was adding new residents.

The Board was encouraged to send website "items of interest" to Ms. Sheryl Smith.

### **Plans for the "Circle" in Front of Town Hall**

Mayor Biggers hoped a water feature (fountain) would be placed in the circle along with a concrete pad to accommodate a Flag Plaza. The raised wall around the water feature could blend into the Flag Plaza. He suggested a lit fountain with water streamed from a low angle across the fountain. He suggested a permanent Christmas Tree holder in the middle of the fountain. The cost and maintenance of a fountain was discussed. The Board had many ideas of what style of fountain would be most appealing in front of Town Hall.

The Board agreed to submit fountain concepts/designs to Manager Welch.

**Next Sidewalk Phase(s)**

Manager Welch had identified several areas for sidewalk construction. Wilson Grove Road had two sections (342 feet and 352 feet) identified. Highway 218 at Highway 51, near Earps, would require a section of 62 feet. Lawyers Road at Somerset Plaza had a section (465 feet) identified. Matthews-Mint Hill Road to Lebanon Road had two identified sections (2200 feet and 695 feet). Two sections (544 feet and 846 feet) were identified along Idlewild Road. Four sections (540 feet, 2312 feet, 200 feet and 280 feet) were identified along Matthews-Mint Hill Road.

The Board had received appreciation from many residents regarding the on-going sidewalk projects. They were supportive of the plans presented. It was noted along Lebanon Road (heading toward Matthews-Mint Hill Road) there was a section that may be worth investigating.

Concluding the discussion, the Board agreed by consensus to build as many sidewalk sections as possible with the money budgeted for their construction.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Board agreed by consensus to recess the meeting and reconvene at 9 a.m. on Saturday, March 7, 2015.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mayor Biggers resumed the meeting at 9 a.m. on Saturday, March 7, 2015. Mayor Biggers, Commissioners Ellington, Newton and Ross were in attendance along with Town Staff.

**Discussion about Property Located at Matthews-Mint Hill Road and Idlewild Road (“Sam’s Mart”)**

Mayor Biggers stated he, Commissioner Ellington and Manager Welch had met with a representative for the owner of the Sam’s Mart property located at Matthews-Mint Hill Road and Lawyers Road. During the discussion, they learned the owner had created a visual site plan which may include two restaurants or one restaurant and a bank. The prospect of the one-story buildings elicited a positive reaction as a restaurant(s) would be nice. The parcel closest to the residential section would be low impact. The representatives were anxious get started.

The Board discussed the roundabout and the necessary approvals needed with NCDOT for the two parcels. The discussion covered the possible opposition from the neighbors about the light and sound but they agreed approval would be based on the restaurants closing at a reasonable time and not being an “all night” facility. Any design would have to go through a re-zoning process. The representative wanted to see if the Board would be receptive to this design concept before pursuing it any further. The Board agreed they’d like to see formal plans and suggested the possibility of a gateway sign, landscaped corner, trees in the parking lot and decorative street lights provided by the owner of the property.

Upon the motion of Commissioner Ross, seconded by Commissioner Newton, the Board agreed they were unanimously receptive to the concept with controls, decorative lights, a decorative gateway sign and restricting closing of the businesses to a reasonable time.

### **Idlewild Roundabout Update**

NCDOT would be working jointly with the Town to provide sidewalks and decorative street lights at the roundabout site. NCDOT experienced a few glitches with right-of-way but the roundabout would be constructed in the Summer of 2016.

Manager Welch had been in talks with the Town of Matthews in regard to the sign in the middle of the roundabout. Each side of the sign would identify the Town residents would be entering.

### **Snow Removal Policy Discussion**

Board members were presented with information regarding the winter weather procedures. The Public Works department received information from various news and media sources. If inclement weather were in the forecast the Public Works personnel would begin working around the clock in 12-hour shifts until the streets were clear. Heavily traveled streets, called Priority 1 streets, would be salted/plowed first. The Town streets consist of nearly 130 miles of roads; once the Priority 1 streets were cleared then work would begin on minor thoroughfares. Residential streets would be plowed only after the main roads had been cleared. In the event of damage to mailboxes, by a snow plow, the resident should call Town Hall and the incident would be investigated. The trucks and plows typically respond in the different quadrants of the Town during a snow/ice event. If during inclement weather, after hours or on a weekend, a resident should see a downed tree then they should report it to 911.

### **Park Policy Discussion**

The Board asked for an update on the Armed Forces Museum. Staff had been told the Armed Forces Museum Board was non-existent. The Town would not be bound by any plans made by the Armed Forces Museum Board; there was no formal agreement.

The Purple Heart organization had raised money for the monument. The money was earmarked for missions, however, and couldn't be used for the monument. They would be obtaining a quote and would come to the Board for guidance on completing the project. The "Purple Heart Memorial" may need site work and concrete donated by the Town to finish the project.

The radio tower should be moved by July of 2015 but it was possible that a slight extension would be given if needed. The tower site area may be used by Mint Hill Fire for training.

The softball field at Veterans Park had always been first-come first-serve. The Board could certainly decide to change it and allow reservations. The Board stated that since many individuals and groups used it without reservations then they would not change the policy.

The possibility of an amphitheater was discussed in great detail. It was decided that although both parks would benefit; the Veterans Park would be the priority due to Mint Hill Madness. The Board had many ideas on size and appearance. The Board agreed to submit amphitheater concepts/designs to Manager Welch.

The topic of weddings/memorial services/funerals was mentioned. The Town enforced rules, already in place by way of minor and major event applications, if we were aware of the event. Ultimately, the Town tried to minimize injury and liability but as the land owner the Town

would be contacted if injury occurred. The incident would then be investigated by the Town and the Town insurance provider.

The topic of a splash feature was proposed in the round rink area at Wilgrove Park. The splash features were very popular but must be designed and inspected just like a swimming pool. They were very expensive to install and maintain. The Board agreed to possibly pursue this at a later date.

The topic of future park expansion was addressed. Currently the Town was working on the Brief Road property purchased in conjunction with the PARTF grant. The property owned by Ms. Mills was discussed as a possible park because the area was underserved. The liability of the pond, the cost of the property, and the accessibility to the Morris Park HOA area may be things the Board would want to strongly consider before pursuing the property. Could Mecklenburg County purchase the property and develop it? Possibly, however, 11 acres may be too small for them to pursue.

The topic of the Greenway System was addressed. Staff could get an update for the Board but greenways were essentially the dedication of land to the system. The Town had been focused on providing sidewalk accessibility in the last few years.

The topic of a dog park was approached. Most town run dog parks were just fenced areas with no fee. The park could be as simple or elaborate as the Board wanted it to because the tower would be removed this calendar year.

### **Process for Developing Property on Brief Road**

The Brief Road property would take approximately two or three years to develop. The Town would seek a Request for Proposal (RFP) and a Construction Manager at-Risk. The Board would select the professionals they would like to work with and they would hold the public meetings. Attorney Bringewatt would advise the Board in the process. The projected cost of the total project would be in the millions; phases would be shown and the Town could do as many phases as they wished at a time. The Town would obtain a loan to pay for the project. The preliminary ideas would be for at least one turf field and additional rectangle fields for sports such as football, lacrosse and soccer. Once the project was completed the Town would maintain the project and perhaps the Mint Hill Athletic Association would contribute to the upkeep. The location and traffic at the site may trigger a traffic study where safety precautions may be required.

The consensus of the Board was to refer to the project as an Athletic Park.

### **Bridges at Mint Hill Update**

Manager Welch shared what he knew about the Bridges at Mint Hill in his memo to the Board. He had contacted Chris Thomas but had not spoken to him in person. The preliminary surveying for the force sewer line along Lawyers Road and for the roundabout at Lawyers/Bain School Roads had been completed. The design for the regional lift station was nearly complete and the developer had paid several hundred thousand dollars toward the project.

The Board expressed irritation and frustration at the delays; Steele Creek had been developed in two years and it had been 12 years since the Bridges at Mint Hill had been announced. The frustration was understood but the Town had no real alternatives. Although the project approval eliminated the option of having a lawn/automotive area they could skirt that and place a facility that wouldn't be pleasing to the Town.

The Board agreed by consensus to have Manager Welch contact Chris Thomas and retrieve as much information as possible from the "source". Mayor Biggers would contact the Belk representatives to obtain any additional information.

\*\*\*\*\*

Commissioner Austin arrived.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Possible Request for Legislative Annexation of Contiguous Neighborhoods**

Pleasant Valley, Iron Gate and Plantation Falls were the three neighborhoods highlighted by Manager Welch that were contiguous with the Town limits. The annexation would have no impact on the ability to provide services to them. The immediate costs would consist of street lights and trash service. The individual home owners, already contracting for trash collection, would see a reduction in their tax burden as they currently paid a fire and police service district tax.

The Board agreed by consensus that Manager Welch should continue to look into this possibility.

### **Discussion on Noise Ordinance**

The Board had been contacted by residents about the current noise ordinance. In many cases, living in close proximity to properties that emit loud and disturbing noise could cause a hardship for the surrounding properties. If a new ordinance was to be accepted then the Mint Hill Police Department would have an opportunity for better enforcement and tougher penalties. Chief Ledford stated the current ordinance was subjective which made it hard to enforce. He stated the Town of Matthews used the City of Charlotte's ordinance as a guide to enhance the way they dealt with noise complaints. Manager Welch had spoken with Attorney Bringewatt and he was happy with adapting their ordinances to fit Mint Hill. Chief Ledford stated Matthews had modified the Charlotte ordinance slightly. He recommended the Board go with a finite number as to reduce the subjectivity. The noise meters would need to be purchased and calibration would be required.

The Board discussed the hours the ordinance would be applied, the appropriate decibel level, issuing of permits for restaurants or outdoor entertainment, what amplified sound really meant and where the sound would be measured from.

The Board agreed by consensus that Chief Ledford should draft an ordinance for their review.

### **Downtown Code Text Changes**

The Downtown Code was adopted on July 18, 2002; Staff requested guidance in regard to several items.

The Board discussed the placement of meter boxes and appropriate screening. The Board agreed by consensus that meter boxes would be screened from public view from a public street and/or sidewalk.

The Board discussed backflow preventer options in regard to color and screening. The Board agreed by consensus that they should be dark green and screened.

The Board discussed Best Management Practices (BMP) for Stormwater. The ordinance had previously required underground detention but was modified to accommodate other developments. The Town must have a list of BMP options that were acceptable to the Town. The Board discussed things they would like to eliminate as options. The Board agreed by consensus that Staff should present a list of BMPs for Board approval.

The Board discussed the Street Tree preference. The October Glory Maple was prone to a black fungus and it may be more beneficial for the developer to choose from a list of acceptable trees approved by the Board. The Board was receptive to a list of approved street trees and to be clear the property owner was responsible for them for perpetuity.

The Board discussed fences; primarily the material, location, screening and height of the fences. The Board agreed by consensus to allow the planning staff to do additional research and then submit information to the Board.

The Board agreed by consensus to require sod in commercial and residential developments located in downtown.

### **Assisted Living Centers in Downtown**

A text amendment may be necessary to determine the building type of an assisted living center. The three current building types were Shopfront Building, Workplace Building and Civic Building. The Board discussed a specific project that had been proposed by Carillon Assisted Living on Lawyers Road. An assisted living center created a challenge because of the typical building shape. The Board discussed the possibility of an exchange of property to allow the center to be closer to the road along with other opportunities.

The Board agreed by consensus to have Staff speak to the applicant about continued interest and what could be done to receive conditional zoning approval.

### **Sign Ordinance Discussion**

Mecklenburg County administered the sign ordinance for the Town of Mint Hill. Staff would only respond when there was a complaint made against a sign. Illegal portable signs received the largest amount of complaints. Staff would remove the sign if it were located in the right-of-way or the owner would be contacted if on private property. The Board was shown pictures of on structure, ground mounted and freestanding signs allowed and currently used in Town. The Board was also given a complete copy of the sign ordinance.

The Board asked about the temporary signs on private property that weren't removed. Staff explained that Environmental Court was so backlogged that typically the cases were thrown out.

95% of the violators complied with the ordinance but occasionally there were those who chose not to comply. Often times, the violators never applied for a sign permit from the County or the permit was issued in error. Historically, the Town had allowed new businesses to have extra or additional signage for up to one month.

The Board discussed the advantages and disadvantages of extending the policy of allowing businesses to have additional signs longer than one month especially if it were a directional sign. Staff told the Board that most owners didn't ask for any extension after the one month period. A concern was expressed that not all businesses had the same opportunity since the policy was unwritten.

Concluding the discussion, the majority of the Board agreed to leave the ordinance as it was currently written.

### **Commissioner Comments and Wrap Up**

Commissioner Ellington stated he felt the retreat had been very beneficial. Commissioner Newton stated this had been his first retreat and he felt it had gone very smoothly and that everyone was on the same page. Commissioner Austin commented he would look forward to reviewing the items that were going to be amended by the Board. Mayor Biggers thanked the Staff for their time, effort and willingness to prioritize projects they would like to see in Mint Hill.

Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Newton, the Board unanimously agreed that the meeting be adjourned. Mayor Biggers adjourned the meeting at 2:42 p.m.

---

Michelle Wells Farrar, CMC, Town Clerk

**MINUTES OF THE CALLED MEETING OF  
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF MINT HILL, NORTH CAROLINA  
APRIL 9, 2015**

The Board of Commissioners of the Town of Mint Hill met in called session on Thursday, April 9 at 6:40 p.m. in the John M. McEwen Assembly Room, Mint Hill Town Hall.

**ATTENDANCE**

Mayor: Ted H. Biggers, Jr.

Commissioners: Carl M. Ellington, Richard Newton and Katrina (Tina) W. Ross

Town Manager: Brian L. Welch

Planning Director: John Hoard

Town Clerk: Michelle Wells Farrar

Absent: Lloyd Austin

Mayor Biggers called the meeting to order, ruled a quorum present and the meeting duly constituted to carry on business. The purpose of the called meeting was to hold the Quarterly Developers' Workshop scheduled for the first Board meeting of each quarter.

Mayor Biggers recognized Jeff Smith, Meineke Car Care Center, who asked to be placed on the agenda to discuss the possibility of building a Meineke in Mint Hill. Mr. Smith said he had been in the car business for 38 years and would like to move his Meineke from Kannapolis to Mint Hill. The Meineke, in Kannapolis, was ranked in the top third nationally in customer service. Meineke had a nationwide warranty and they stood behind the work of other locations. He stated his wife had retired from the Mint Hill Library therefore they were very familiar with the area.

He proposed a location along Matthews-Mint Hill Road near Lebanon Road or Fairview Road near Large Oak Lane. The approximately 4,200 square foot building would be brick with six bays, a waiting area and an office. He had spoken to John Hoard, Planning Director, but wanted to see if the Board was receptive to the idea and the locations. His first choice was at Matthews-Mint Hill Road and Lebanon Road but Fairview Road would be acceptable, too.

Mayor Biggers stated he was very receptive to Mr. Smith bringing his business to Mint Hill. Mayor Biggers suggested there may be better locations available and asked the Board to look for properties that would be a better fit for Mr. Smith. Mayor Biggers said the Board would gather information on potential properties and ask Staff to relay suggested parcels to Mr. Smith for consideration.

Mr. Smith thanked the Board for their help and looked forward to additional information.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mayor Biggers adjourned the Developers' Workshop at 6:58 p.m.

---

Michelle Wells Farrar, CMC, Town Clerk

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF MINT HILL, NORTH CAROLINA  
APRIL 9, 2015**

The Board of Commissioners of the Town of Mint Hill met in regular session on Thursday, April 9, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the Mint Hill Town Hall.

**ATTENDANCE**

Mayor: Ted H. Biggers, Jr.  
Commissioners: Lloyd Austin, Carl M. Ellington, Richard Newton and Katrina (Tina) W. Ross  
Town Attorney: Kevin M. Bringewatt  
Town Manager: Brian L. Welch  
Planning Director: John Hoard  
Police Chief: Tim Ledford  
Town Clerk: Michelle Wells Farrar

**CALL TO ORDER, INVOCATION AND PLEDGE**

Mayor Biggers called the meeting to order, ruled a quorum present and the meeting duly constituted to carry on business. Following the invocation offered by Commissioner Ellington, Mayor Biggers led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Addition, Deletion or Arrangement of Agenda Items:** The March 7-8, 2015 Retreat Minutes and *Item 8 Private Streets and Gated Communities* were pulled from the agenda.

**Approval of Minutes March 12, 2015 Regular Meeting:** Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Ross, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the March 12, 2015 regular meeting.

**Consent Agenda: (a) Accept February and March Tax Collector's Report; (b) Accept February Treasurer's Report and Financials; (c) Accept Streets of Morgan Run Subdivision for Maintenance- Amadeus Drive, Monogramm Lane, Ferzon Lane and Bask Court; (d) Adopt Resolution to Donate Computers to Johnson C. Smith University and, (e) Recognize "Armenian Martyrs Day" by Proclamation:** Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Ross, the Board unanimously approved Consent Items a, b, c, d and e. (Copy filed with minutes of record.)

**Public Hearing on #ZC14-14, Filed by The Town of Mint Hill, To Allow a Text Amendment Regarding Family Care Home Distance Separation:** Mr. Hoard told the Board the purpose of the text amendment was to establish a minimum separation distance of 2,640 feet (.5 miles) between Family Care Home facilities and create a Family Care Home development option. In a memo to the Board, he outlined the Text Amendment:

Family Care Home (SR Residential District-Table of Permitted Uses)

\*Add 7.1.13 cross reference

Add Section 7.1.13- Establish minimum distance

Add Family Care Home Subdivision (CD Residential District-Table of Permitted Uses)

\*Add 7.2.32 cross reference

Add new Section 7.2.32 –Specify development shall follow subdivision requirements

Add Family Care Home Subdivision to Section 2.4 Terms Defined in this Ordinance.

### **Family Care Home Subdivision**

*A subdivision development consisting of four or more residential lots, subdivided in accordance with the Mint Hill Subdivision regulations, created for the purpose of permitting Family Care Homes in close proximity with one another. The development shall be owned and operated by a single entity.*

### STATE STATUE

§ 168-22. Family care home; zoning and other purposes. (a) A family care home shall be deemed a residential use of property for zoning purposes and shall be a permissible use in all residential districts of all political subdivisions. No political subdivision may require that a family care home, its owner, or operator obtain, because of the use, a conditional use permit, special use permit, special exception or variance from any such zoning ordinance or plan; provided, **however, that a political subdivision may prohibit a family care home from being located within a one-half mile radius of an existing family care home.** (b) A family care home shall be deemed a residential use of property for the purposes of determining charges or assessments imposed by political subdivisions or businesses for water, sewer, power, telephone service, cable television, garbage and trash collection, repairs or improvements to roads, streets, and sidewalks, and other services, utilities, and improvements. (1981, c. 565, s. 1; 1993 (Reg. Sess., 1994), c. 619, s. 1; 1999-219, s. 3.2.)

Commissioner Austin asked how the ½ (.5) mile was measured. Mr. Hoard said it was measured by a straight line from the property line.

There being no public comments, Mayor Biggers closed the Public Hearing on #ZC14-14.

**Public Comments:** None.

**Discussion of Private Streets and Gated Communities:** The item was pulled from the agenda.

**Discussion and Decision on #ZC14-13 Regarding a Public Park Text Amendment and Public Involvement Policy:** Mr. Hoard reviewed the proposed text amendment:

### ***Section 2.4 Terms Defined in This Ordinance***

*Delete “Park” definitions and replace with the following:*

***Town Park*** –A facility operated by the Town of Mint Hill that is open to the public for outdoor active recreational uses, including, but not limited to: ball fields, swimming facilities, and which

*contains improvements designed specifically for such active recreational uses. Such Facilities may also contain improvements designed for passive recreational uses.*

***Park***-A facility operated by an entity, other than the Town of Mint Hill, that may or may not be open to the general public for outdoor active recreational uses, including, but not limited to: ball fields, swimming facilities, camping facilities, and which contains improvements designed specifically for such active recreational uses. Such Facilities may also contain improvements designed for passive recreational uses.

**\*For Town Parks, add to Section 5.2, Table of Principal Permitted Uses, and list BR (By-Right) under the R, O-A, I and DO- A & B districts.**

**\*For Parks, cross reference existing 7.2.15 Nonresidential Use in the Residential Zoning District**

Mr. Hoard presented the Board with a Draft Notification Policy- Town Land Purchase:

**Minimum Notification**\*post contract to purchase\*

- Notify by letter adjoining property owners (within 200' of site)
- Provide notification on Town website
- Installation of sign (similar to rezoning sign) on proposed site.

*(Town may opt out of the minimum notification if acreage is minimal)*

**Optional Notification** \*the following notifications are optional. Staff will implement all or specific notification options as directed by Board of Commissioners

- Advertise in newspaper
- Public workshops at Town Hall
- Announcement in quarterly newsletter
- Information booth at Madness Festival
- Notification letters beyond 200'

Additionally any applicable ordinance provisions shall be followed (e.g. under current ordinance requirements, a PIM is sometimes required for Non-residential By-Right Developments if traffic impacts meet thresholds stated in the ordinance).

Commissioner Ross asked if it was possible to post the rezoning signs perpendicular to the street and make them two sided. Manager Welch said yes and agreed to make that standard for all parcels applying for a rezoning.

Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Newton, the Board unanimously adopted #ZC14-13 Public Park Text Amendment along with the Public Involvement Policy.

**Discussion and Decision on #ZC15-1, Filed by William Gray, Requesting a Rezoning from R to I-G (CD) for Property Located at 11131 and 11207 Blair Road to Allow Construction of a Storage Facility:** Mr. Hoard stated the Planning Board had unanimously given a favorable recommendation at the March 16, 2015 meeting with the following recommendations:

1. Add the following Zoning Plan notes:
  - No outdoor storage shall be allowed in conjunction with the facility with the following exceptions: boats, cars, motorcycles, trailers, motor homes, pickup trucks and similar type and size vehicles. Outdoor storage is restricted to the areas designated as outdoor storage on the Zoning Plan
  - Landscaping associated with the screening and buffer shall be maintained in a good and healthy condition
  - Street trees will be maintained by the property owner
  - Development of the site will be governed by the Zoning Plan as well as the applicable provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance
  - Lighting shall be fully shielded and downwardly directed.
2. Correct I-G zoning to read, I-G (CD).
3. Small maturing street tree should be considered due to the existing power lines along Blair Road
4. Indicate future R/W for Blair Road (118')
5. ~~A sidewalk easement may be required~~ A sidewalk easement will be granted if required  
\*modified by the Board during the meeting on April 9, 2015

The Board discussed the three houses on the properties. The process of phasing the anticipated storage facility was discussed in regard to rezoning only one parcel until the second phase was ready to build. The applicant stated they would be required to implement buffers for the other parcel and modify erosion control plans, if they sought to rezone only one parcel at a time. The applicant was asked why they requested to split the zoning on one parcel and the applicant stated they would use the rental house for income. The applicant would need to come before the Board if they were to do anything not listed on the site plan.

Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Ellington, the Board approved #ZC15-1 with Staff and Planning Board recommendations.

**Discussion and Decision on Article V, Section 28 (Mint Hill Code)- Permit for Commercial Vehicles:** Manager Welch gave back ground information on the history of Article V, Section 28 stating residents had complained about construction traffic utilizing existing Town maintained streets. The revised Ordinance would provide Staff the flexibility to address this on an “as needed” basis not just on specific streets. The revised Ordinance would provide an enforcement mechanism to address the issues.

He offered to answer any questions on the Amendment Recommendation to Section 28, Article 5:

**Sec. 28-149. - Prohibition.**

- (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to drive upon any town maintained street, without first obtaining a special Temporary permit, a vehicle that:
- (1) Exceeds 30 feet in length or 80 inches in width;
  - (2) Has a commercial license plate as required by the state department of motor vehicles;

(3)Has three or more axles; and

(4)Is a property-carrying vehicle licensed for a gross vehicle weight of 32,000 pounds or more.

(b) The streets to which subsection (a) of this section applies are ~~the following~~: the town-maintained street with a posted No Construction Traffic sign.

~~(1) Central Drive.~~

~~(2) Hannon Road.~~

*(Code 1983, § 7-37)*

**Sec. 28-150. -- Exceptions.**

~~This article shall not apply to a vehicle that enters upon such a street for the sole and exclusive purpose of loading or unloading of materials, performing work of a temporary nature, or gaining access to other streets that are not otherwise accessible in the area for the same purposes, or to a vehicle that is in fact actively engaged at the time in a governmental or public purpose in carrying out its activities.~~

*(Code 1983, § 7-38)*

**Sec. 28-151. - Permits.**

Permits to operate vehicles under section 28-149 shall be secured from the ~~town clerk~~ at least 48 hours ~~before actual use~~ Public Works Director. The permits will have limits in reference to time of day, number of days required, and related items. Permits are subject to rejection or approval depending on the circumstances and or special provisions.

*(Code 1983, § 7-39)*

**Sec. 28-152. - Remedies.**

In addition to the remedies provided in G.S. 160A-175, police officers of the town shall have the authority to issue a \$50.00 citation for each day of a violation of this section. This shall not preclude the issuance of an arrest warrant, when appropriate, nor preclude any other lawful enforcement action.

The Board asked how a builder could comply with the proposed ordinance. Manager Welch stated a builder would apply for a permit issued by the Town. If a builder was constructing a new neighborhood and simply chose to use streets connected to an existing neighborhood, instead of the newly constructed roads in the subdivision, then the Town would now have a way to prohibit them from doing so. Accessibility would be reviewed when the permit application was received by the Town. Currently, there was no fee associated with the permit as it would merely serve as notification to the Town. The fine for non-compliance would be \$50 per day.

Upon the motion of Commissioner Ross, seconded by Commissioner Newton, the Board unanimously adopted changes to Article V, Section 28 (Mint Hill Code) - Permit for Commercial Vehicles.

**Other Business/Council Matters:** Commissioner Austin attended Town Hall Day with Commissioner Ellington; it was very informative and successful.

Commissioner Ross attended the Mint Hill Chamber of Commerce Luncheon titled “Creating Vibrant Communities” , the speaker was Pat Riley of Allen Tate. She attended the Mint Hill Historical Society meeting and they were very involved in the planning of Discover Mint Hill on May 2, 2015. She and Commissioner Newton attended Opening Day at the Mint Hill Athletic Association Complex; she noted Commissioner Newton did a nice job welcoming everyone and providing the invocation. She reminded everyone of the Relay for Life at Veterans Park on May 15<sup>th</sup>. She gave the report from the Mint Hill Volunteer Fire Department meeting. The Mint Hill Volunteer Fire Department (MHVFD) responded to 218 EMS calls and 87 Fire calls in February for a total of 305. In March, they responded to 266 EMS calls and 81 Fire calls for a total of 347. The year-to-date total was 975. Three applicants wishing to join the Mint Hill Volunteer Fire Department had submitted applications for membership. The old #8 had been sold and a new Tahoe had been ordered. They had 2,839 training hours in the first quarter. She asked if the Town had any new information on The Bridges at Mint Hill. Manager Welch said he had traded voicemails with Chris Thomas. She said it was critical now because Belk may be sold and they were the main commitment. She asked about the legislative annexation and Manager Welch said the Bill was submitted and letters had been mailed to residents. He had a few phone calls and most had been very receptive; if the owner spent any money on garbage removal they would save money by being annexed by the Town. He had not received any push back yet and didn’t expect any from the legislator. She asked about the Noise Ordinance update; Manager Welch stated Chief Ledford was still working on the draft Noise Ordinance.

Commissioner Ellington expressed regret over missing the Mint Hill Athletic Association Opening Day. He had a previous commitment and thought it was the first one he had missed. He attended the Mint Hill Historical Society meeting, the Planning Board meeting and Town Hall Day.

Commissioner Newton attended the Mint Hill Athletic Association Opening Day. He informed the Board that Centralina Council of Government (CCOG) would be charging .24 per capita for a total of \$5,950 for 2015/2016. CCOG was rolling out CONNECT Our Future that would help students find occupations that fit their personalities.

Manager Welch reminded everyone of the Budget Workshop, to discuss department budgets and external agency funding request, scheduled for Tuesday at 6 p.m. at Town Hall. He introduced Steve Frey, the new Town Engineer, who previously worked in the private sector as well as Charlotte-Mecklenburg Storm Water for 5-6 years. Rarely did one sit in an interview and have a mental list of duties for someone to perform, and before you get them out of your mouth they expressed previous experience with the same duties; he was very pleased to have Steve join the Town. Mr. Frey expressed gratitude and the Mayor welcomed him on behalf of the Board.

Culminating his announcements, Brian introduced his and Bethany’s son, Naylen Bradshaw, to the Board and Town Residents. Manager Welch said his son was the newest Mint Hill resident and in 18 years Naylen would be registered to vote. Mayor Biggers asked Bethany, to please

bring their son forward to meet the Board so he could formally welcome Naylen Welch to the meeting.

**Adjournment:** Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Austin, the Board unanimously agreed that the meeting be adjourned. Mayor Biggers adjourned the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

---

Michelle Wells Farrar, CMC, Town Clerk

**MINUTES OF THE BUDGET WORKSHOP  
OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF MINT HILL, NORTH CAROLINA  
April 14, 2015**

The Board of Commissioners of the Town of Mint Hill met in called session on Tuesday, April 14, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Flex Room, Mint Hill Town Hall.

**ATTENDANCE**

Mayor: Ted H. Biggers, Jr.

Commissioners: Lloyd Austin, Carl M. Ellington, Katrina (Tina) W. Ross and Richard Newton

Town Manager: Brian L. Welch

Finance Director: Naida Sergel

Public Works Director: Tim Garner\*

Town Engineer: Steve Frey\*

Fire/EMS Operations Director: David Leath\*

Police Chief: Tim Ledford\*

Town Clerk: Michelle Wells Farrar

\*Not in attendance for entire meeting

Mayor Biggers called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., ruled a quorum present and the meeting duly constituted to carry on business. Manager Welch stated the purpose of the called meeting was to begin the budget preparation process for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2016 (FY16). The Board would hear budget requests presented by various department heads of the Town and discuss/consider applications from external agencies requesting funding in the FY16 budget.

Mayor Biggers recognized the Department Heads scheduled for presentations.

Tim Garner presented the FY16 Public Works Budget Request including:

- Steel (65'x80') or fabric (50' x 80') building for vehicle/equipment storage
- Tandem Dump Truck
- Single Axle Dump Truck
- Expansion of Public Works Compound
- Dump Bed for Dually Pickup Truck
- Concrete Mixer (9 or 12 cft)
- Pressure Washer (3800-4200 psi)

After discussing the items requested, the Board thanked Mr. Garner for attending.

Chief Tim Ledford presented the FY16 Police Department Budget Request including:

- Vehicles- Previously the Board had agreed to replace two vehicles with Ford Explorers every year. Unfortunately, several of the vehicles had major issues and he requested 6 Ford Explorer Police Interceptors

- Equipment/Technology- video server update, blu ray backup robot for video server, installation/training/data migration to new server, 12 additional body cameras (in addition to the 22 applied for through a non-matching grant), body camera equipment (docking station, power supply, maintenance and switch) and a network server upgrade.
- Equipment Maintenance for 5-(AED, in-car video system, mobile data laptops and tasers w/holsters and replacement cartridges)
- Emergency Alert Notification for Mecklenburg County
- Garage for impound lot storage for seized vehicles and bulk items (26x30 ft)
- Transfer Switch for generator

After discussing the items requested, the Board thanked Chief Ledford for attending.

Chief David Leath presented the FY16 Fire Department Budget Request including:

- Uniforms and turn-out gear
- Training and mileage
- Deputy Director Position- salaried working primarily Monday-Friday
- New Vehicle to allow both Chief Ledford and Deputy Director to have vehicles to respond to calls for service.
- Vehicle Maintenance for one or both vehicles
- 1 New Employee (This item was withdrawn by Chief Leath at the meeting)
- Holiday pay for full time employees, overtime pay and ladder truck payment
- Office supplies/electronics

After discussing the items requested, the Board thanked Chief Leath for attending.

At the conclusion of the department head presentations, Manager Welch provided the Board with an outline of funds requested from the various external agencies as well as his recommendation for FY16 funding for those agencies. Board members had previously been provided with applications from external agencies to review. Mayor Biggers suggested the Board discuss the requested/proposed funding for each agency and provide Manager Welch with the Board's recommendation.

The Mint Hill Athletic Association (MHAA) requested \$60,000 to provide programs at an affordable price to Mint Hill residents, maintenance/capital improvements, operational costs and help assist MHAA in providing scholarships to those in need.

The Mint Hill Historical Society (MHHS) requested \$201,200 to support the Carl J. McEwen Historic Village (specifically Phase One of The Barn), motion and fire sensors, day-to-day operations and attractions (grain bins, a chapel and a windmill).

The Idlewild Volunteer Fire Department requested \$197,000 to cover a portion of normal operating expenses plus \$40,000 for capital asset replacement and renovation.

Levine Senior Center requested a \$10,000 sustaining grant to assist with building repairs, staff salaries, utilities and office supplies.

The Mint Hill Chamber of Commerce requested a \$17,710 sustaining grant to assist with personnel, rent, utilities, office expenses and relocation packets.

Pottery 51 requested \$10,000 for a one-time project grant for interior/exterior lighting and temperature control systems.

Generation Nation (Kids Voting Mecklenburg) requested a \$2,500 sustaining grant to support the organization's civic education programs.

The Mint Hill Youth Football requested \$12,000 to assist with refurbishing helmets and to offset the cost of travel and other expenses. Manager Welch said they did not compete with MHAA.

Mint Hill Arts requested \$20,000 to assist with strengthening high quality programming that promotes arts in Mint Hill.

The Wounded Warrior Project (Order of the Purple Hearts) requested \$4,000 to assist with the purchase of a Purple Heart Monument.

Discover Mint Hill requested \$2,200 to allow the history, civic and cultural groups reach out to the surrounding community.

Following discussion, the Board made the following recommendations to be included in the Manager's draft budget for FY16 which will be brought to the Board for consideration:

- Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Austin, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$60,000 for the Mint Hill Athletic Association.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Newton, seconded by Commissioner Austin, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$60,000 for the Mint Hill Historical Society.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Ross, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend matching the contribution made by the Town of Matthews, up to \$237,000 for the Idlewild Volunteer Fire Department.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington seconded by Commissioner Austin, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$5,000 for the Levine Senior Center.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Austin, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$8,000 for the Mint Hill Chamber of Commerce.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Ellington, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$2,200 for Discover Mint Hill.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Newton, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$2,500 for Generation Nation (Kids Voting Mecklenburg).

- Upon the motion of Commissioner Ellington, seconded by Commissioner Austin, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$4,000 for The Wounded Warrior Project (Order of the Purple Hearts).
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Ellington, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$10,000 for Mint Hill Arts.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Ross, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$5,000 for Mint Hill Youth Football.
- Upon the motion of Commissioner Austin, seconded by Commissioner Newton, the Board unanimously agreed to recommend \$10,000 for Pottery 51.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was continued to May 12, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. at the Mint Hill Town Hall (Flex Room).

---

Michelle Wells Farrar, Town Clerk

TAX COLLECTOR'S REPORT FOR APRIL 2015

Please see attached reports from County regarding taxes collected on behalf of the Town of Mint Hill. The following is a summary of the collections during the month of April 2015:

Current/Prior Year Real Estate/Personal Property**:	\$37,292.42
Interest Collected on All Taxes:	\$2,224.98
Registered Motor Vehicle Tax (less 1.5%***):	\$518.59
Registered Motor Vehicle Fee (less 1.5%***):	\$46.72
Total Collected During April 2015	\$40,082.71

\*\* Personal Property other than registered motor vehicles.

\*\*\*In accordance with State Statutes, County receives 1.5% for billing/collecting vehicle tax/fee.

**TR-401F Net Collections Report**

NCPTS V4

**Report Parameters:**

Date Sent to Finance Start: **4/1/2015**

Date Sent to Finance End: **4/30/2015**

Abstract Type: **RMV**

Tax District: **MINT HILL**

Tax Year: **ALL**

Year For: **2014, 2013, 2012, 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, 2000, 1999, 1998, 1997, 1996, 1995, 1994, 1993, 1992, 1991**

Collapse  
 Districts: **N**

Default Sort-By: **Tax Year**

Grouping: **Tax District,Levy Type**

Tax Year	Orig. Billed Amt (\$)	Abs. Adj (\$)	Bill Releases (\$)	Disc. Levy (\$)	Net Levy (\$)	Property Tax (\$)	Penalties (\$)	Int. Collect. (\$)	1.5% Admin	Net Amt Due	Total Collect. (\$)	% Coll.	% Un-coll.
			Assessor Refunds (\$)	Additional Levy (\$)		Assmt Fees (\$)	Coll. Fees (\$)	Net Collect. (\$)			Unpaid Balance (\$)		
<b>TAX DISTRICT: MINT HILL LEVY TYPE: TAX</b>													
2014	3,294.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,938.96	3,320.91	0.00	6.26			75.71	95.54 %	4.46 %
			0.00	26.87		0.00	0.00	75.71			131.03		
2013	322,077.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	317,114.93	322,077.93	0.00	23.89			155.40	97.52 %	2.48 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	155.40			7,849.69		
2012	550,264.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	542,323.54	550,419.11	0.00	43.82			174.21	98.39 %	1.61 %
			0.00	154.92		0.00	0.00	174.21			8,727.59		
2011	513,213.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	506,501.35	513,307.88	0.00	14.48			58.31	98.82 %	1.18 %
			0.00	94.37		0.00	0.00	58.31			5,991.08		
2010	488,951.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	481,869.52	489,518.80	0.00	0.00			0.00	98.46 %	1.54 %
			0.00	567.72		0.00	0.00	0.00			7,417.57		
2009	501,368.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	494,162.07	502,170.92	0.00	0.00			0.00	98.58 %	1.42 %
			0.00	802.18		0.00	0.00	0.00			7,004.52		
2008	542,235.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	534,007.05	542,859.70	0.00	25.69			62.86	98.72 %	1.28 %
			0.00	623.87		0.00	0.00	62.86			6,842.21		
2007	570,743.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	555,961.15	573,148.45	0.00	0.00			0.00	97.92 %	2.08 %
			0.00	2,404.84		0.00	0.00	0.00			11,585.04		
2006	545,204.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	538,006.19	549,611.45	0.00	0.00			0.00	98.18 %	1.82 %
			0.00	4,406.78		0.00	0.00	0.00			9,782.54		

2005	228,095.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	223,747.26	229,740.47	0.00	0.00			0.00	97.77 %	2.23 %
			0.00	1,645.14		0.00	0.00	0.00			4,988.84		
<b>Subtot.</b>	<b>4,265,448.93</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>4,196,632.02</b>	<b>4,276,175.62</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>114.14</b>			<b>526.49</b>	<b>98.32 %</b>	<b>1.68 %</b>
			<b>0</b>	<b>10,726.69</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>526.49</b>	<b>7.90</b>	<b>518.59</b>	<b>70,320.11</b>		
<b>TAX DISTRICT: MINT HILL LEVY TYPE: VEHICLE FEE</b>													
2014	690.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	689.12	0.00	0.00	1.83			21.83	91.29 %	8.71 %
			0.00	10.00		700.00	0.00	21.83			60.00		
2013	111,822.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	110,798.20	0.00	0.00	14.85			95.98	96.34 %	3.66 %
			0.00	0.00		111,822.63	0.00	95.98			4,052.64		
2012	197,645.01	0.00	0.52	0.00	195,899.90	0.00	0.00	17.69			67.17	97.19 %	2.81 %
			0.00	30.00		197,675.01	0.00	67.17			5,505.53		
2011	193,644.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	192,190.64	0.00	0.00	6.63			26.63	97.83 %	2.17 %
			0.00	10.00		193,654.99	0.00	26.63			4,162.82		
2010	189,020.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	187,610.80	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	97.33 %	2.67 %
			0.00	80.00		189,100.83	0.00	0.00			5,016.13		
2009	189,032.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	187,555.64	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	97.46 %	2.54 %
			0.00	180.00		189,212.51	0.00	0.00			4,755.06		
2008	192,005.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	190,299.40	0.00	0.00	6.43			6.43	97.77 %	2.23 %
			0.00	170.00		192,175.00	0.00	6.43			4,251.20		
2007	192,756.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	190,799.54	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	96.77 %	3.23 %
			0.00	810.00		193,566.67	0.00	0.00			6,154.17		
2006	186,370.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	184,544.72	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	96.79 %	3.21 %
			0.00	708.33		187,079.18	0.00	0.00			5,923.20		
2005	74,844.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	73,872.50	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	96.26 %	3.74 %
			0.00	277.52		75,122.25	0.00	0.00			2,761.69		
<b>Subtot.</b>	<b>1,527,833.22</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1,514,260.46</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>47.43</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>46.72</b>	<b>218.04</b>	<b>97.18 %</b>	<b>2.82 %</b>
			<b>0</b>	<b>2,275.85</b>		<b>1,530,109.07</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>218.04</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>214.77</b>	<b>42,642.44</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,793,282.15</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5,710,892.48</b>	<b>4,276,175.62</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>161.57</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>159.15</b>	<b>744.53</b>	<b>98.02 %</b>	<b>1.98 %</b>
			<b>0.00</b>	<b>13,002.54</b>		<b>1,530,109.07</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>744.53</b>	<b>11.17</b>	<b>733.36</b>	<b>112,962.55</b>		

Signature (Tax Collector) \_\_\_\_\_

**Report Parameters:**

Date Sent to Finance Start: **4/1/2015**

Date Sent to Finance End: **4/30/2015**

Abstract Type: **BUS,IND,PUB,REI**

Tax District: **MINT HILL**

Tax Year: **ALL**

Year For: **2014, 2013, 2012, 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, 2000, 1999, 1998, 1997, 1996, 1995, 1994, 1993, 1992, 1991**

Collapse

Districts: **N**

Default Sort-By: **Tax Year**

Grouping: **Tax District,Levy Type**

Tax Year	Orig. Billed Amt (\$)	Abs. Adj (\$)	Bill Releases (\$)	Disc. Levy (\$)	Net Levy (\$)	Property Tax (\$)	Penalties (\$)	Int. Collect. (\$)	Total Collect. (\$)	% Coll.	% Un-coll.
			Assessor Refunds (\$)	Additional Levy (\$)		Assmt Fees (\$)	Coll. Fees (\$)	Net Collect. (\$)	Unpaid Balance (\$)		

**TAX DISTRICT: MINT HILL LEVY TYPE: LATE LIST PENALTY**

2015	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,341.69	1,341.69	0.00	1,341.69	0.00	0.00	16.62 %	83.38 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	1,118.68		
2014	2,112.76	0.00	0.00	618.04	2,231.74	0.00	2,742.95	4.18	117.82	75.86 %	24.14 %
			0.00	12.15		0.00	0.00	117.82	538.76		
2013	1,746.82	0.32	0.00	737.20	2,425.68	0.00	2,487.29	0.36	3.06	81.00 %	19.00 %
			0.00	3.27		0.00	0.00	3.06	460.96		
2012	1,697.77	0.32	0.00	768.08	2,395.15	0.00	2,469.01	0.00	0.00	86.52 %	13.48 %
			0.00	3.16		0.00	0.00	0.00	322.96		
2011	2,129.19	0.32	0.00	3,171.44	3,898.33	0.00	5,301.44	0.00	0.00	91.44 %	8.56 %
			0.00	0.81		0.00	0.00	0.00	333.61		
2010	3,083.01	0.00	0.00	4,286.80	7,889.36	0.00	9,144.88	2.14	7.46	59.64 %	40.36 %
			0.00	1,775.07		0.00	0.00	7.46	3,183.91		
2009	2,072.67	0.33	0.00	209.41	1,753.13	0.00	2,291.43	0.00	0.00	84.81 %	15.19 %
			0.00	9.35		0.00	0.00	0.00	266.25		
2008	1,537.94	0.33	0.00	2,217.57	3,553.85	0.00	3,755.51	0.00	0.00	91.62 %	8.38 %

			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	297.95		
2007	1,562.60	0.00	0.00	554.83	1,883.60	0.00	2,117.43	0.00	0.00	91.59 %	8.41 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	158.47		
2006	1,859.22	0.00	0.00	7,511.65	9,045.91	0.00	9,370.87	0.00	0.00	97.59 %	2.41 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	218.14		
2005	1,220.48	0.00	0.00	395.41	1,583.99	0.00	1,615.89	0.00	0.00	89.57 %	10.43 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	165.22		
2004	1,167.95	0.00	0.00	132.15	1,293.46	0.00	1,300.10	0.00	0.00	91.68 %	8.32 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	107.65		
2003	909.62	0.00	0.00	509.91	1,334.00	0.00	1,419.53	0.00	0.00	91.27 %	8.73 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	116.47		
2002	135.80	0.00	0.00	137.86	244.85	0.00	273.66	0.00	0.00	69.90 %	30.10 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	73.69		
2001	131.41	0.00	0.00	4.13	114.50	0.00	135.54	0.00	0.00	5.87 %	94.13 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	107.78		
2000	119.41	0.00	0.00	5.72	106.84	0.00	125.13	0.00	0.00	17.18 %	82.82 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	88.48		
<b>Subtot.</b>	<b>21,486.65</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>22,601.89</b>	<b>41,096.08</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>45,892.35</b>	<b>6.68</b>	<b>128.34</b>	<b>81.61 %</b>	<b>18.39 %</b>
			<b>0</b>	<b>1,803.81</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>128.34</b>	<b>7,558.98</b>		

**TAX DISTRICT: MINT HILL    LEVY TYPE: TAX**

2015	0.00	250.29	0.00	14,894.68	14,644.39	14,894.68	0.00	0.00	38.07	8.85 %	91.15 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	38.07	13,349.08		
2014	5,791,215.02	914.52	0.01	12,837.46	5,631,381.70	5,812,976.97	0.00	1,400.84	34,977.46	98.85 %	1.15 %
			508.75	8,924.49		0.00	0.00	35,486.21	64,656.36		
2013	5,718,131.77	2,363.85	0.00	5,867.71	5,532,436.77	5,726,697.56	0.00	271.42	-380.47	99.42 %	0.58 %
			2,355.98	2,698.08		0.00	0.00	1,975.51	31,934.06		
2012	5,662,797.95	1,401.57	0.00	16,553.46	5,498,729.26	5,764,224.64	0.00	116.12	-605.63	99.51 %	0.49 %
			1,402.76	84,873.23		0.00	0.00	797.13	26,866.17		
2011	5,673,909.72	2,185.38	0.01	9,241.61	5,426,991.61	5,699,391.63	0.00	45.11	-1,969.51	99.60 %	0.40 %
			2,188.66	16,240.30		0.00	0.00	219.15	21,857.30		

2010	5,118,690.81	3.30	0.00	17,717.18	5,127,938.83	5,165,668.74	0.00	130.43	505.04	99.48 %	0.52 %
			0.00	29,260.75		0.00	0.00	505.04	26,686.60		
2009	5,012,669.43	3.30	0.00	1,119.79	5,005,982.23	5,021,015.15	0.00	3.72	13.63	99.73 %	0.27 %
			0.00	7,225.93		0.00	0.00	13.63	13,319.77		
2008	4,804,965.61	3.30	0.00	17,907.96	4,816,204.02	4,824,762.21	0.00	6.64	18.19	99.76 %	0.24 %
			0.00	1,888.64		0.00	0.00	18.19	11,756.07		
2007	4,503,833.29	0.00	0.00	4,529.97	4,462,509.20	4,508,363.26	0.00	12.23	30.84	99.80 %	0.20 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	30.84	9,119.93		
2006	4,144,511.82	0.00	0.00	34,034.25	4,161,985.14	4,178,546.07	0.00	34.88	54.65	99.79 %	0.21 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	54.65	8,610.18		
2005	3,895,131.33	0.00	0.00	15,803.93	3,903,099.02	3,910,935.26	0.00	9.76	21.31	99.80 %	0.20 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	21.31	7,948.49		
2004	3,631,356.78	0.00	0.00	28,923.83	3,651,252.24	3,660,280.61	0.00	10.80	22.35	99.84 %	0.16 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	22.35	5,947.58		
2003	3,533,766.80	0.00	0.00	12,524.77	3,531,443.74	3,546,291.57	0.00	1.46	9.58	99.84 %	0.16 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	9.58	5,811.08		
2002	77,647.79	0.00	0.00	516.10	77,620.98	78,163.89	0.00	8.15	15.46	96.22 %	3.78 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	15.46	2,935.13		
2001	23,357.80	0.00	0.00	16.11	23,073.62	23,373.91	0.00	7.59	13.89	89.32 %	10.68 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	13.89	2,465.03		
2000	29,281.21	0.00	0.00	70.94	29,169.23	29,352.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	89.24 %	10.76 %
			0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	3,138.08		
<b>Subtot.</b>	<b>57,621,267.13</b>	<b>7,125.51</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>192,559.75</b>	<b>56,894,461.98</b>	<b>57,964,938.30</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2,059.15</b>	<b>32,764.86</b>	<b>99.55 %</b>	<b>0.45 %</b>
			<b>6456.15</b>	<b>151,111.42</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>39,221.01</b>	<b>256,400.91</b>		

**TAX DISTRICT: MINT HILL    LEVY TYPE: VEHICLE FEE**

2014	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100 %	0 %
			0.00	0.00		100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2013	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100 %	0 %
			0.00	0.00		70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2011	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100 %	0 %

			0.00	0.00		10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2010	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100 %	0 %
			0.00	0.00		10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2006	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100 %	0 %
			0.00	0.00		10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2005	60.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100 %	0 %
			0.00	0.00		60.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
<b>Subtot.</b>	<b>260.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>260.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>100 %</b>	<b>0 %</b>
			<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>		<b>260.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>57,643,013.78</b>	<b>7,127.13</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>215,161.64</b>	<b>56,935,818.06</b>	<b>57,964,938.30</b>	<b>45,892.35</b>	<b>2,065.83</b>	<b>32,893.20</b>	<b>99.54 %</b>	<b>0.46 %</b>
			<b>6,456.15</b>	<b>152,915.23</b>		<b>260.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>39,349.35</b>	<b>263,959.89</b>		

Signature (Tax Collector) \_\_\_\_\_