

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 320

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina was held on Monday, April 13, 1970, at 3:00 o'clock p.m., in the Council Chamber, City Hall, with Mayor pro tem Whittington presiding, and Councilmen Fred D. Alexander, Milton Short, John H. Thrower, Jerry Tuttle, and Joe D. Withrow present.

ABSENT: Mayor John M. Belk; Councilman Sandy R. Jordan was absent at the beginning of the Meeting and came in during the discussion on the Civic Center site location as noted in the Minutes.

* * * * *

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by Councilman Jerry Tuttle.

MINUTES APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Short, seconded by Councilman Thrower, and unanimously carried, approving the minutes of the last meeting on Monday, April 6, 1970, as submitted.

PETITIONS NO. 70-42 BY LEX MARSH AND 70-43 BY DOROTHY A. POTTER, ET AL, FOR CHANGES IN ZONING DEFERRED.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated the subject petitions are on the agenda for a decision from Council; that one of the petitions requires six votes of Council and should have the seven members of Council in attendance, and he asked for a motion to delay the two petitions.

Councilman Tuttle stated Mr. Jordan is supposed to be here later in the meeting and he moved that decisions on the subject petitions be deferred until later in the meeting. The motion did not receive a second.

Councilman Alexander moved that decisions on the two petitions be deferred. The motion was seconded by Councilman Short.

Councilman Short stated he does not like to inconvenience the people and draw this out but he believes the idea of fairness necessitates that Council wait until the full Council is present.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

ENDORSEMENT OF RECOMMENDED SITE OF CIVIC CENTER BY CENTRAL CHARLOTTE ASSOCIATION OFFICERS.

Mr. Jim Hunter, First Vice-President of Central Charlotte Association, stated he is speaking for the officers of the Association; that he cannot speak for the Board as he has not had an opportunity to poll the Board.

He stated on November 10, last year prior to the December 12 bond vote the Board of Directors of the Central Charlotte Association unanimously adopted a resolution urging the Citizens of Charlotte to approve the construction of a \$10.7 million civic center and parking garage. The Board was, and is, primarily concerned with getting on with the job of building a better Charlotte, and specifically a better Central Charlotte area. They believe the primary considerations are that specific action be taken towards getting the civic center built in Central Charlotte, and that it be built in coordination and

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 321

in conjunction with other private developments. That they have been assured that other private developments will be compatible with the location now under consideration. He stated the Central Charlotte Association adopted a report in September 1966 calling for the construction of a civic center in Downtown Charlotte; the location recommended by the Committee for the Master Plan and proposed by the economic consultants - Hammer, Green, Siler and Associates - traffic consultants - Wilbur Smith and Associates, and architects A. G. Odell, Jr. & Associates, specifically outlined a site at the southeast corner of Trade and College Streets; the plan recommended further that "the new convention exhibition center should be located in the Downtown area, preferably within a five minute walk from the bulk of the hotel and motel accommodations; the site should be served by a grid of local streets with direct access to the central expressway". That was nearly four years ago. Four years of waiting for action, waiting for these recommendations to be implemented. They believe the time for action is now. The evidence they have seen in the last few days has Charlotte Development Associates' unqualified endorsement and assurance that they continue with their development plan for the central city using the site now being recommended, and the fact that what they believe to be a very qualified body of private citizens has studied the possible site of the civic center from many possible angles assured them the job of rebuilding the central city is now underway.

He stated as long as this criteria of access, downtown location, economics, traffic consideration and compatibility with the needs of private developers are met, then they endorse the civic center site as recommended and say "let's get on with the job of building a better city".

DESIGNATION OF BLOCK IN DOWNTOWN CHARLOTTE FOR CIVIC CENTER SITE.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated last Friday, Mr. Robert Lassiter and the Civic Center Committee made a report and site location and recommendations to Council.

Councilman Short stated he believes it was the actual intent of the public to approve a civic center in the immediate downtown area, and that few if any voters intended to limit us to a specific site. That because the law allows us to spend Bond monies as late as five years after approval by the public and because conditions can change drastically within five years or even a few months, the law, and he thinks good policy, puts upon the Council the authority and the duty to adapt to changed conditions in spending bond funds. He stated several sites have been thought of as the civic center site since 1965. The Second and Brevard site was the one being talked about at the time of the referendum. However, we now know that the CDA Brevard Street location presents substantial physical difficulties and the CDA College Street location presents financial and acquisition difficulties. He stated we should not ignore the assertion that Council might have found out about these difficulties before the referendum, and such comments have some validity, but at the same time these comments must be balanced against the question of how much public money should be spent on site analysis before the public expressed its willingness to have a civic center at all. Also at the time of the referendum, it was not possible to predict the outcome of downtown urban renewal, and we now have the outcome. Since the completion of the Greater Charlotte Area Plan in 1965, committees, architects, consultants and Council itself have agreed that an excellent site for the Civic Center would be in the block bounded by East Trade Street, South College Street, East Fourth Street and Southern Railway tracks. This site has only recently become available because of the approval of urban renewal for this area. That at a meeting on Friday, the Civic Center Committee recommended that we select this site.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 322

Councilman Short moved that the block bounded by East Trade Street, South College Street, East Fourth Street and the Southern Railway tracks be designated as the site for our Civic Center. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander.

Mr. Tom Sykes stated for the December 12 Bond referendum there was a button saying "Let's Do it"; that on December 12 we did do it, and now Council is going to do it again, and the citizens of Charlotte do not like what is being done - the politicians might, the CDA people possible do, all the powers that be which we limit to the "establishment" are going to approve of Council's actions - that personally he does not approve of Council's actions. He stated he was sold a bill of goods; that he was possibly lied to, probably mislead. He stated in 1967 Mr. Lassiter recommended the same site which Council is attempting to accept today and the voters turned it down in a bond issue - 15,500 to 15,200. The same Mr. Lassiter was Chairman of the Committee in 1967. That recently he asked that Mr. Lassiter not serve on this Committee again and Council did not see fit to replace Mr. Lassiter at that time, so we have the same Mr. Lassiter. Also on the Committee in 1967 was Mr. John Belk for the same site recommendation.

Mr. Sykes stated he was for the bond issue and he is still for the bond issue. As of today the City's Traffic Engineering Department has not been consulted by Mr. Lassiter's Committee relative to traffic conditions on the new site. Why? He stated he has a complete file on what was promised to the Citizens of Charlotte to vote for this bond issue in December. That the sales pitch on December 12 said that CDA would develop \$50 million worth of evaluated property on the site that Council accepted. He asked what is wrong with the Trade Street site? How many parking spaces are going to be provided at the Trade Street site? Councilman Short stated on the site itself he understands there may be 250 to 300 spaces. Mr. Sykes stated the people on December 12 were promised 1200 spaces at an income of \$200 per space per year or a total of \$240,000 yearly to reduce the civic center portion of the bond issue. That included in the bond issue promises of December 12 was Item No. 7, Civic Center streets widening and improving; it promised to do what was necessary to College Street, from Stonewall to Fourth Street; Third Street, from College to Brevard Streets and Second Street, from College to Brevard and wanted \$1,200,000 to make these improvements. Will this be done on the Trade Street location? That he does not see how you can possibly spend \$1,200,000 on street improvements on Trade Street when the voters were told that it would be on College and Stonewall and on Third and College and on Second and College.

He stated in the sales pitch the citizens of this city were promised that this bond issue would cost very little because of additional income from the proposed construction of new facilities in this immediate vicinity; no such promises were made by Mr. Lassiter's recent recommendation.

Mr. Sykes asked why Mr. Odell was on this last committee? That the Mayor, Mr. John Belk, promised when he was elected he would put new names on Committees; that he has not seen any new names on Committees - that are important committees. He asked if any Department head has been consulted relative to Mr. Lassiter's recommendation for this civic center site. That he would say probably none have been consulted.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 323

He stated the people have remedies; they do not want to take those steps. They will if forced to do so. Misrepresentation suits possible; statutory remedy on taxes, possible; injunctive possibly, possible; on issuing bonds and on construction - this could amount to a considerable costly delay. In the sales pitches 172,000 square feet of building space was promised; we now find that we might wind up with 120,000 square feet. That he does not know why but possibly because Mr. Odell being an architect informed the committee that is all we could afford. The people did not vote for that, they voted for what they were told would be given for their dollars. He stated he is not alone in his opposition to the Trade Street site; that he does not intend to remain quiet on the issue; that he does intend to fight it all the way down the line, with his money if necessary, as he thinks he has been misinformed, lied to, and sold a bill of goods. That all the time we were trying to sell the public successfully the bond issue of \$36 million that in the back of the minds of some of the powers that be - that he does not regulate that to this particular body; but some people in this city who control the establishment - was the Trade Street site. That you can go back to 1967 and you will find that this was the intent and purpose of the 1967 bond issue which was refused by the taxpayers and it should be turned down by this city council.

Mr. Sykes stated Council cannot tell him that it will take \$1,200,000 out of the bond issue and improve streets other than those streets that the voters were told would be improved.

Councilman Thrower asked about the appropriations of the bond money thus far for these particular streets? Mr. Veeder, City Manager, replied there is no change anticipated. Councilman Thrower stated there will be a development down there that will demand the development of these streets. He stated he feels partly responsible for Mr. Sykes involvement in this as he personally called him and asked him to help; that he does not see where today we would gain anything by passing this particular motion; that he wishes Council could sit down with this group of people and explain this in its entirety the way Council sees it; that this Council has not tried to hoodwink anyone. Mr. Sykes stated he agrees with this; that he does not think it is the intent nor the purpose of this Council to hoodwink anyone, but he does not think it had the people in mind? Councilman Thrower replied that is all Council represents is the people. Mr. Sykes stated then he agrees let's sit down at a table and talk about it; talk to the people; don't talk to the powers that be.

Councilman Thrower asked if Mr. Odell was officially on this Committee, and he was advised that he was not. He stated the 172,000 square feet has been mentioned; to his knowledge this has not been completed and we cannot tell anyone how many thousands of feet; we just know that you cannot put 120,000 feet on the Brevard Street location. He stated he agrees that this should be more fully explained to the people because he is sure if they had the benefit of the knowledge that Council has that they would accept this and we could proceed, and everyone in the city would be happy and proud.

Mr. Sykes referred to material he had in which it says that the Civic Center package includes \$7.5 million for the building itself; a moderate size facility of about 172,000 to 202,000 square feet that will be located on a two block area bounded by Second, College, Third and Brevard Streets; \$700,000 will go to buy the land, and \$2.5 million to build a parking structure for 1200 automobiles. Mr. Sykes stated he loved this and he picked it up and ran with it because he could see the goal. That in addition to serving as a catalyst for spurring an estimated \$50.0 million in private development around it, the civic center also will be used as a public meeting place. He stated you cannot get any more definite than that and you cannot make any more promises to the taxpayers than that. That is what it says and that is what the people were told and that is what they voted on.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 324

Councilman Short stated every member of this Council has felt in some measure as Mr. Sykes when they discovered that our plans for the Brevard and Second Street site would not work; that what is proposed now will work, and he thinks the members of Council have found this out, and you just have to take at face value the reasons given in Mr. Lassiter's report. Mr. Sykes replied we did not accept Mr. Lassiter by vote in 1967, and he is not going to accept him by written report in 1970; the people turned down Mr. Lassiter's recommendation in 1967, and now he is going to turn down Mr. Lassiter's recommendation in 1970 as an individual, and he does not think that he will be alone in his reluctance to say that they will not accept it.

Mr. Sykes stated in November 3, 1969 Mr. Fennell made a report to Mr. Veeder relative to the income properties and the parking facility guesstimation of income for this bond issue. That they utilized that information to sell this bond issue to the public; and it was sold to the public. That he does not want to leave here thinking that the public has been sold down the creek.

Councilman Thrower made a substitute motion to postpone this decision for one week and get these people and give them the benefit of the knowledge that Council has had as he does not think this will hold it up as the machinery is working to clear the urban renewal property. The motion did not receive a second.

Councilman Tuttle stated he is unhappy with this new site, and has agonized on it and he sees no point in standing out against the wisdom of six other men; that he has finally become convinced of two things. First, in the original site we made an error - that he made an error as he does not think we had any real engineering of that project to convince us that this was the site for the Civic Center; that he went around and told the people everything that Mr. Sykes has read. But he thinks he erred. Councilman Tuttle stated we said we are going to build a civic center, we did not say specifically where; that he honestly thinks Mr. Sykes is wrong as he does not think the average citizen gives a hoot where it is going to be on this side of Fourth Street or that side of Fourth Street - what they voted for was a revitalization of downtown; they voted for a civic center. He stated to get it downtown there were only two other sites - that is a site that is not available and that is the site that the Mayor wanted - it is not across from his store but is between Third and Fourth Street; the Mayor wanted that site and Council wanted that site but it is owned by someone who would take a big tax profit and they will not sell it, and Council has been told reliably there is no legal way to swap land; this brought us down to the next most desirable site and that is the Trade Street site. He stated he is going to vote with the rest of the Council for it; that he is unhappy with it but he thinks it is a compromise and it is an adequate compromise and that when it is all over it will probably be the best site. As for the money for the streets, we are still going to spend the money; that you cannot simply widen a street around a civic center, you have to have the flow of traffic; so this work will be done; we will fulfill our commitment there. That he thinks the only thing we did was make an honest error in assuming this original site was feasible. Simply because it is not he does not think we should say let's chuck the whole thing and let Downtown die.

Mr. Sykes stated if this Council does approve this Trade Street site that he thinks we have seen the death mill for bond issues in Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte for a long period of time to come; that he does not think we will be able to come back and ask the citizens of this community to vote any more bond issues for any more facilities on any more promises by the same people who have reneged on the promises made on this \$36.1 million. Councilman Tuttle stated that has been said before, and he thinks it is simply a calculated risk. Mr. Sykes replied he agrees but he still maintains that

April 13, 1970
 Minute Book 53 - Page 325

he sees no reason to spend \$1.2 million of the taxpayers money to improve those streets due to our not placing the civic center there; that is a waste of taxpayers' dollars. Councilman Tuttle stated he is not finding fault with what Mr. Sykes said, and he agrees with him 100 percent but we have to build the civic center and this is the most logical spot; not only did Mr. Lassiter's committee make this decision but it was studied by our Engineering Department, Traffic Engineering Department and there have been a number of knowledgeable people in on this, and not just Mr. Lassiter.

Mr. Sykes asked who originally recommended the site that was accepted for the people to vote on in December? Councilman Tuttle stated he was a member of the Master Plan Committee. Mr. Sykes asked who investigated the site potentials and who recommended them to this Council? He asked if there was not a study made of the site? Did Hammer and Associates not make a study? Councilman Thrower replied this first came to Council in a form of a lease; that through technicalities we were not able to present this in a form of a lease; so Council had to revert back to what it came up with in the Bond issue; that he thinks it is just a matter of misunderstanding, and he would again ask Council to postpone this for one week.

Councilman Withrow stated he was new on City Council and had not studied the civic center proposal before he came on Council and it was his understanding when he voted on this issue that CDA proposed this site; that he did not go by any Committee when he voted on this site. He thought, from all honesty, because of the feasibility and the study of this site that CDA had proposed this was the cheapest place to put it, and that it would save the taxpayers the most money. He stated he admits he was wrong when he went out and told the people of Charlotte to vote for this on the Brevard Street site; but in studying the proposal and going through it and finding out the feasibility of it and the cost of it he is definitely wrong.

Mr. Sykes asked if Mr. Odell was a consultant in the most recent decision for this location? Mayor pro tem Whittington replied he is the architect engaged by the City. Mr. Sykes stated in the bond issue of December 12 we voted for the fourth time to complete the Coliseum which was handled by Mr. Odell; that he thinks we are still in the throws of the wrong people spending taxpayers dollars to benefit the wrong people; we are not benefiting the public.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated Mr. Sykes is a very valuable citizen to this community, and he has helped in many worthwhile projects, and he has been opposed to projects. That he came to Mr. Sykes and asked him to support this bond package and he does not think that he told him anything that was not a fact; that he may have talked in generalities because at the time we were getting ready for the bond package, and there was nothing to talk about except what it would do for Charlotte, and he does not think that has changed any today.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated this area, owned primarily by the North Carolina Railroad, the Southern Railroad and some individual property owners, of about 25 acres has been lying dormant as long as he has been a resident of Charlotte; that Southern Railroad had a big warehouse down there and a tremendous fire eliminated that building, and the only thing that has been put there since is a parking lot. Back in 1965 the Master Plan Committee made their recommendations to this Council, of which he was a member, and that Committee had worked for three years and came up with a Master Plan and the consultant was Mr. Odell; that this Committee recommended among many things for downtown that a civic center be built at the corner of Trade and College Streets; and that Trade Street would go under Tryon Street and you would have parking of buses and cars under The Square, and you would block off North bound traffic, or south bound traffic on Tryon Street, and you

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 326

would have a Mall from Fourth to Fifth and from College to Church Streets; this was what the Master Plan Committee recommended along with a football stadium on Irwin Creek and Interstate 77 on the west side of town, and a museum, a zoo and many other things. That all of this was tied in through the cooperation of the Traffic Engineering Department, the State Highway Engineering Department and the federal government; since 1965 it was also recommended that we put in a Convention Boulevard, from South Boulevard coming along the railroad tracks ending at 12th Street to tie in with the northwest expressway. That we were told this road would cost something between \$6.0 and \$7.0 million from Stonewall Street to Sixth Street, and we were considering putting that in the bond package. Council deleted the Convention Boulevard from the bond package because it was said then that this road started nowhere and went nowhere and we did not think we could justify that much money.

(COUNCILMAN JORDAN CAME INTO THE MEETING AT THIS TIME AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE SESSION.)

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated when this happened the site that CDA recommended to the Lassiter Committee and to the Council on Brevard Street, between Second and Third was the least desirable of all the property they had. He stated the reason this site was less feasible was with the Convention Boulevard taking out of this 25 acres this leaves the railroad tracks in there and to build the Civic Center on this site, according to Mr. Odell and his organization, then the building would be about three stories up in the air because of the railroad tracks; the CDA people did not see fit to pay for pedestrian walkways that would connect this building with the Jefferson First Union Towers, or any other building that would go in the governmental plaza downtown. That Mr. Paul Buck said that you must have a building with at least 120,000 square feet of floor space on one floor and it must be built so that vans loaded can drive in off the street, unload and leave. That if you are going to have a building that sits three stories up in the air, it would be very difficult to get vans in there unless you use ramps or freight elevators again adding to the expense of the building, plus the fact to get 120,000 square feet on one floor at that location, the building would have to span Second and Third Street, and this would be additional expense because of the tiers and piling. He stated this is the reason the site at Second, Third and Brevard was not favorable by this Council, by Mr. Lassiter and his Committee, and the Associates.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated in 1965, Phil Hammer, of Hammer, Green and Associates and since 1965 hired by this City Council and by the Redevelopment Commission, made an economic and feasibility study of what this building would do for Downtown Charlotte, and they were in accord with this site in 1965 and are in accord with this site today. But because of Mayor Belk and because this Council was trying to keep this site in this 25 acres, we then tried to get a site on College Street between Third and Fourth; obviously they do not want to sell it and have said that it was not for sale. Then we had only one site to come back to where we could get a minimum of 120,000 feet of floor space on one level, and that is at this site at College and Trade. This is the reason for this site.

He stated the parking is not there; this is a mistake of this Council; but the parking will be provided either by local government or by private enterprise. The important thing to understand is that no one has lied - perhaps we made an honest mistake and someone mislead you; the only thing this Council and this Mayor and the former Mayor have tried to do is to revitalize Downtown because about 12 percent of all the revenue that this city produces in ad valorem taxes come from there. That every time we lose a building or a tenant we are losing more revenue. Through all of this, this Civic Center, regardless of where it is put, Downtown will do what

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 327

CDA said it would do, what Phil Hammer said it would do and what the Master Plan said it would do, and that is to revitalize Downtown to create new jobs, new buildings, new tax base. That he thinks it will do this. That when Mr. Sykes was down here recently and he discussed it with him, he thought Mr. Sykes said that it does not matter where it goes as long as it is built, and as long as it is put Downtown because we both agree it will serve the same purpose to revitalize downtown.

Mr. Sykes stated we are not getting what we voted for. No where in Mr. Lassiter's report does he say anything about 1200 parking places or \$240,000 a year income. He stated in a release they were promised 170,000 to 202,000 square feet; they were promised \$1.2 million to be spent for roads on this particular site. Mayor pro tem Whittington stated the \$1.2 million includes Fourth Street with a new bridge and widened street which will be adjacent to this property; Third Street will be needed; Second Street will be needed and Brevard and College Streets will be needed to take care of this traffic. Mr. Sykes stated College Street from Stonewall to Fourth was mentioned; Third Street, from College Street to Brevard and Second Street, from College to Brevard; nothing was said about Fourth Street in this \$1.2 million except that it would stop at Fourth Street - from College to Fourth Street. Mr. Sykes stated they were also promised that this location would make a lot of income for this city; that no such promise was made in Mr. Lassiter's recommendations for his site; we have not been promised anything in Mr. Lassiter's report except that we are going to get less for our money. He stated he is being told that we are going to take \$10.7 million from one location and put it on another and get less for it. That he does not like to buy deals like that. He stated it does not make sense and does not add up and he does not think that anyone who wants to study the file he has can come to any other conclusion.

Councilman Withrow asked Mr. Sykes if he thinks the voters of Charlotte would want Council to place a building just because it was voted for when they know it is wrong and that it will cost more money there; does he think the people of Charlotte really want Council to do that? Mr. Sykes replied the people of Charlotte probably would say that they were told one thing and are being delivered another; if you are not going to deliver what you sold us and the loaf is not full, then let us vote on it again. This might be the answer.

Mr. Albert Pierson stated the people have been mislead; they were mislead by Mr. Fennel in the original bond election; they were mislead in 1967; they were not only mislead, but were mislead when Mayor Belk appointed a committee which from the beginning of this sham battle all over again was to come up with what the power structure already wanted. The trouble in Charlotte is that we spend thousands and thousands of dollars for so-called outside advice of the expert; that the experts in this matter are the people. That the Downtown Charlotte Association has said they will take it no matter where it is; they have been that way all the time; there is no change there; they have never considered the people in Downtown Charlotte except a few. He stated if you are going to build this Convention Center Downtown the old location as originally planned in this last bond issue - that he just does not believe the facts given to Council - that it is a sham; that he knows Council sat and looked at thousands of figures but they did not have anything to compare it with. He stated Mr. Thrower has made a suggestion that will not cost one cent; that the people will be glad to tell what they think about it. Mr. Pierson suggested that Council accept Mr. Thrower's suggestion to postpone this and go into this with the people. He stated he was against the original proposal because he thought it limited Downtown Charlotte, and now you put it right back where it was. He asked that they not think of the next ten years but think of the next hundred or two hundred years. He stated the people have been mislead and they were mislead on the whole thing and they are being mislead now.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 328

Mr. W. J. Elvin stated he has appeared before Council frequently, but he has never appeared in favor of the Civic Center; it was conceived in error by a Committee of a hundred; that it is not needed and it is in the wrong location. That it is not a civic center but is a convention hall, and will bring the most objectionable people into town - the unattached men and ladies of easy virtue. That on Friday night Mr. Phil Hammer made a number of mis-statements, and no one made reference to these mis-statements.

Mr. Elvin stated what has been said today by Mr. Sykes and Mr. Pierson is factual, and it is time that Council set down and took cognizance of what was said and give the people a chance.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU TO MEET WITH CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY MANAGER TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL REGARDING THE LICENSING OF ITINERANT PEDDLERS.

Mr. Hamrick, Executive Director of the Better Business Bureau, stated he would like to talk about something that affects all legitimate business and consumers - that is transit and itinerant peddlers. He stated his office is receiving a tremendous amount of inquiries and complaints from people victimized by these people and some of these people have license more or less to steal. They have been given licenses without too much inquiry into their background, and not knowing too much about what they do. That the local police department's hands are tied when they are called because the peddlers do have a license and there is nothing the police can do about it.

Mr. Hamrick stated on the 10th of April, two wholesale men in watches called him and told him about a person selling watches, and an article appeared in the Sunday Observer explaining how this works. These people have a license. He stated his complaint is that some of these people are given license of this type without the license office knowing what the peddler is doing. That he thinks the city ordinances should be strengthened or else place a fine if the peddlers operate without a license. That it should be made strong enough so that they will listen. He stated Mr. Charles Dudley and he spoke to the City Manager sometime ago about the transit Hong Kong Tailors coming into our town and taking out our money. He stated they at the Better Business Bureau are trying to protect both the consumers and the legitimate firms.

Mr. Hamrick requested the Council to give some consideration for a stronger city ordinance or requiring some type of license to operate for itinerant peddlers.

Mayor pro tem Whittington suggested that Mr. Hamrick and Mr. Dudley meet with Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, and Mr. Veeder, City Manager, to see what can be suggested to add to the present code as it relates to the itinerant peddlers, and from that meeting perhaps Council will have something to consider.

Councilman Short requested Mr. Underhill to state for the record the provisions in the Code for Council examining persons who buy such a license.

Mr. Underhill replied at present the City is authorized by state statute to regulate itinerant peddlers, merchants, hawkers and solicitors and people who sell goods immediately upon receipt of the purchase price. Council has the authority and has used such authority to adopt certain sections of the City Code. The City Code presently requires that itinerants pay for license in sums of per quarter \$37.50; per week \$15.00 and per day \$4.50. That a license can only be issued to an itinerant when he has been approved by the

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 329

police department. Also in the city code is a provision - Section 11-3 - that certain trades of which itinerants are one, may be required to appear personally before city council, and Council has the right to hear evidence under oath from these people as to the manner in which they will conduct their business, the place they will conduct their business, and other facts Council deems necessary. If Council feels the applicant or person appearing before them is not of good moral character, nor a fit and proper person to conduct such business, then Council on its own motion may refuse to grant such an individual a license.

At the request of Councilman Tuttle, Mr. Underhill read Section 11-3(b) entitled "Refusal".

Councilman Short suggested that Mr. Hamrick provide Mr. Underhill with facts his investigation revealed concerning one or more of these individuals; and with these facts this matter then be put on Council's agenda for consideration along the lines of whether Council would ask the licensing bureau to withhold licenses from such persons, and direct them instead to come to this Council to seek his license. Mr. Hamrick stated he will be happy to meet with anyone at their convenience.

Councilman Alexander asked how Council will determine a person who is fit and proper. Mr. Underhill replied these applicants must also receive approval of the Police Department before a license is issued; this is mandatory. The action City Council might take of requiring an individual or an applicant to appear before them so the City Council may conduct some examination into the manner and conduct of his business is the second step available to the city presently.

Councilman Short stated the fact situations as presented to him by some of the Better Business Bureau people would not make this a particularly difficult decision, compared to some decisions Council has to make; the facts are rather positive in some of the situations.

Councilman Tuttle asked how many come in for one, two or three days? Mr. Hamrick replied he has no knowledge of exactly how many, but it is increasing every year. Councilman Tuttle stated the very fact that the itinerant might hit Charlotte on Tuesday and have to come before Council at its next meeting would deter a lot of them. Mr. Hamrick stated that is right and they know that for a fact; they would go somewhere else.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated Council is sympathetic to the problem and if Mr. Hamrick will get in touch with Mr. Underhill, he will meet with him, and the ordinance will be brought back to Council.

BLUE HEAVEN COMMITTEE TO PRESENT REPORT TO COUNCIL AFTER CLOSE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING ON APRIL 20, 1970.

Mr. Jack Pentes, Chairman of the Blue Heaven Committee, stated today he has brought the Blue Heaven Committee report to the Mayor and City Council. In July, 1969 the Mayor was requested to appoint a citizens committee for the purpose of studying the Blue Heaven site, and that he appoint professional people and with Councilman Alexander's modification also representatives of the poor. He stated the Committee after being organized October 21, 1969 has worked for the past five months to investigate Area 4 of the urban redevelopment property known as Blue Heaven and with the permission of the Mayor also Area 3, the land that has been reserved for a post office site.

Mr. Pentes stated the report is in writing and they would like for Council to study it. That on March 9 they presented their graphic presentation and

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 330

a verbal presentation of the work of the Committee and while it is still under advisement they would like for Council to go through the report which is broken into three sections.

The Committee believes that prompt action by the City Council on the Committee's March 9th report to the City Council is imperative. The Committee believes that it would be unfortunate for urban renewal land to remain unused and unsold a day longer than is absolutely necessary. The Committee also believes that it would be tragic for the Blue Heaven and Post Office sites to be sold for unrewarding uses. For these reasons, the Committee makes the following requests:

- (a) The City Council appropriate \$15,000 for a professional feasibility study of the conceptual proposals presented by the Committee.
- (b) The City Council request the Redevelopment Commission to withhold the sale of the Post Office site pending the results of the feasibility study.
- (c) The City Council request the Redevelopment Commission to direct its staff to begin preparation of the material necessary to designate the post office site for use as a privately developed park and to take such other steps as the Commission and its staff deem necessary to implement the Committee's report.

Mr. Pentec stated the Committee requests an audience with the Mayor and Council at its next meeting on April 20 at the end of its business so that the Committee might re-present an updated and revised graphic presentation; at that time it is the Committee's hope that Council will have had time to review the written report and at that time discuss with the Committee the entire project, and give a decision.

After further discussion Councilman Tuttle moved that Council grant the audience as requested on the 20th of April after the close of the regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilman Thrower, and carried unanimously.

PETITION FILED BY RESIDENTS EAST OF TRYON STREET IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC HOUSING SITES EAST OF TRYON STREET.

Dr. Malcolm Hendry, of 3500 Haverstick Place stated he is present representing some 20 odd people visiting Council today, and presented a petition signed by some 33 residents, which reads as follows:

"We are Christians who reside east of Tryon Street who wish to make our positions known to Council:

It is essential that all citizens be permitted decent housing, the best education available and human dignity.

The absence of decent housing for all in Charlotte is potentially explosive and must be solved.

Charlotte has been partitioned into two halves, one black and one white. This split has prevented equal education for all and has made full integration of schools frustratingly difficult.

We strongly urge that open housing become both our law and practice. We endorse the building of this basic right into our City-County Charter and urge that it be enforced.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 331

In the interest of progress, we have chosen to tear down several thousand residences in recent years for urban renewal or public projects -- only a few hundred have been replaced. We owe it to those displaced Charlotte residents to provide housing for them within their means. Additional thousands of Charlotte citizens are living in squalor and misery from which they cannot escape. This in turn causes many of Charlotte's most serious problems, including our very high crime rate.

As a C.L.C. group we have studied the Charlotte planning charts and federal requirements for low income housing. It is obvious that the most feasible low income housing sites are east of Tryon Street. No one wants low income housing in their neighborhood but for the future of Charlotte and all of its citizens, low income housing must be disseminated through the City.

We support Mayor Belk's recent statements that all low income housing be well designed and have trees, landscaping and recreation facilities to create a decent environment for living and to blend into the existing homes in these areas.

We commend you for your recent selection of two low income housing sites east of Tryon Street. We urge you to select and start as soon as possible many more such sites to provide an adequate number of low income housing units to fill this critical need.

We wish to offer our support to City Council for developing a city of opportunity for all of its citizens."

Mrs. Tom Moore asked the status of location of public housing. That she understood it was possible to locate some of the housing within a ten mile perimeter, outside the city limits; that she was recently told this is not true. Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, replied it is legally possible; the jurisdiction of the Charlotte Housing Authority extends ten miles outside the corporate limits of the city. Councilman Withrow stated the trouble is with transportation and job opportunities. Councilman Tuttle stated the government will not approve them without the necessary transportation and job opportunities.

Councilman Alexander stated he would like to commend these citizens for their courage and the nerve to come down today and say they have no objections to Council considering housing on the east side of town. That this is the first group to appear before Council to give any idea of the sentiment in this direction; that he appreciates their presence and commends them for coming.

Dr. Hendry stated they realize that the location of low income public housing in anyone's neighborhood is not popular; but they are also convinced that the Mayor and Council will be the leaders and statesmen who look forward to the future of this city.

REQUEST FOR USE OF PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM ON WEST TRADE STREET IN FRONT OF POST OFFICE BUILDING ON WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON GRANTED.

Mr. Bob Williams requested permission from the City Council for the Charlotte Peace Coalition to use a public address system Wednesday afternoon, April 15, in front of the Post Office, from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m.

Councilman Tuttle stated 4:30 is a little early and asked if it is necessary to start that early? Mr. Williams replied it can be postponed until 5:00 p.m.; he stated the system will be for speeches.

Councilman Alexander moved that the request of Mr. Williams be granted. The motion was seconded by Councilman Jordan, and carried unanimously.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 332

**AGREEMENT WITH GRIFFIN REALTY COMPANY FOR THE EXTENSION OF TAGGART CREEK
OUTFALL, AUTHORIZED.**

Councilman Thrower moved approval of an agreement with Griffin Realty Company for the extension of Taggart Creek Outfall, from its present end at Denver Avenue to the north side of Interstate 85 at an estimated cost of \$85,000 with the City to reimburse the Company for the sewer lines after April 1971. The motion was seconded by Councilman Jordan.

The City Manager advised this is contemplating doing that which will be paid for by a bond issue.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

**SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH EASTERN AIRLINES, DELTA AIRLINES AND PIEDMONT
AIRLINES FOR SPACE IN NEW NORTH CONCOURSE AT THE AIRPORT.**

The following supplemental agreements for space in new North Concourse were presented for Council action:

- (a) Agreement with Eastern Airlines for an additional 3,112 square feet of space for a term of 15 years at \$3.38 per square foot for the space and an additional \$2.25 per square foot for maintenance and upkeep, or a total of \$5.63 per square foot per annum.
- (b) Agreement with Delta Airlines for 4,556 square feet of space for exclusive use of Delta and 4,818 square feet of baggage claim area to be used in common with Piedmont Airlines for a term of 15 years at \$3.38 per square foot for the space and an additional \$2.25 per square foot for maintenance and upkeep, or a total of \$5.63 per square foot per annum, and Delta to pay 60% of the shared cost and Piedmont 40%.
- (c) Agreement with Piedmont Airlines for 1,556 square feet of space for exclusive use of Piedmont and 4,818 square feet of baggage claim area to be used in common with Delta, for a term of 15 years, at \$3.38 per square foot for the space and an additional \$2.25 per square foot for maintenance and upkeep, or a total of \$5.63 per square foot per annum, and Piedmont to pay 40% of the shared cost and Delta 60% of the shared cost.

Council was advised that the cost per square foot for maintenance and upkeep will be adjusted annually.

Councilman Withrow moved approval of the three agreements. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander.

Councilman Tuttle stated there is an adjustment clause on the maintenance and asked if there is no way to adjust the \$3.38 per square foot for space? Mr. Veeder, City Manager, replied the airlines agreed to pay for the total cost of this building over a 15 year period, and this is the instrument through which they will do it.

The vote was taken on the motion, and carried unanimously.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 333

APPRAISAL CONTRACTS AUTHORIZED.

Upon motion of Councilman Tuttle, seconded by Councilman Jordan and unanimously carried, the following appraisal contracts were authorized:

- (a) Contract with Henry E. Bryant for appraisal of 20 parcels of land for Inverse Condemnation - Airport Area, Whippoorwill Drive and Bella-Oaks Drive, at fees ranging from \$125.00 to \$250.00.
- (b) Contract with Wallace D. Gibbs, Jr. for appraisal of 20 parcels of land for Inverse Condemnation - Airport Area, Whippoorwill Drive and Bella-Oaks Drive, at fees ranging from \$125.00 to \$250.00.

CONTRACT WITH FROEHLING AND ROBERTSON, INC. FOR SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION ON DOWNTOWN STREETS IMPROVEMENT.

Councilman Alexander moved approval of the subject contract with Froehling and Robertson, Inc., in an estimated amount not to exceed \$3,400.00 for subsurface investigation on Downtown Street Improvement - College Street, Second Street, Third Street, Fourth Street and Trade Street. The motion was seconded by Councilman Jordan, and carried unanimously.

CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SANITARY SEWER, AUTHORIZED.

Motion was made by Councilman Thrower, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried, approving contracts for the construction of sanitary sewer mains and trunks as follows:

- (a) Contract with John Crosland Company for the construction of 3,445 linear feet of 8-inch trunk and main to serve Coventry Woods IV, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$27,256.00. All cost of construction will be borne by the applicant whose deposit in the full amount has been received and will be refunded as per terms of the agreement.
- (b) Contract with William Trotter Development Company for the construction of 1,560 linear feet of trunk and mains to serve Eastbrook Woods, Section V, Phase II, inside the city at an estimated cost of \$15,037.79. All cost of construction will be borne by the applicant whose deposit in the full amount has been received and will be refunded as per terms of the agreement.
- (c) Contract with Ed Griffin Construction Company for the construction of 850 linear feet of trunk and 8,560 linear feet of mains to serve East Forest Phase II and Monroe Road Apartments II, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$68,087.00. All cost of construction will be borne by the applicant whose deposit in the full amount has been received and will be refunded as per terms of the agreement.
- (d) Contract with Urban Builders for the construction of 7,020 linear feet of trunks and 6,045 linear feet of mains to serve a subdivision on Capps Hill Mine Road, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$118,786.33. All cost of construction will be borne by the applicant whose deposit in the amount of \$17,300 to cover engineering and right of way costs has been received and will be refunded as per terms of the agreement. The amount required for construction will be deposited by Applicant within thirty (30) days after receiving bids for the work.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 334

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS, AUTHORIZED.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Withrow and unanimously carried, the following property transactions were approved.

- (a) Acquisition of 15' x 269.81' of easement at 4616 Tuckasegee Road, from Damron C. Owen and wife, Myrtle B., at \$270.00 for the Taggart Creek Outfall.
- (b) Acquisition of 82,250 square feet (87.5' x 941' x 87.5' x 940') of property on Old Dowd Road, RFD 4, from Ernest M. Payne and wife, Lucy W. Payne, at \$3,500.00 for the Airport Expansion project.

WATER MAINS INSTALLATIONS, AUTHORIZED.

Motion was made by Councilman Thrower, seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and unanimously carried, approving contracts for the installation of water mains, as follows:

- (a) Contract with Urban Builders for the installation of 10,065 feet of mains and five (5) fire hydrants, to serve Tanglewood Subdivision, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$49,500. The city will finance all construction costs and the applicant will guarantee an annual gross water revenue equal to 10% of the total construction cost.
- (b) Contract with Urban Homes, Inc. for the installation of 910 feet of mains to serve Clawson Village Subdivision, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$1,800.00. The City will finance all construction costs and the applicant will guarantee an annual gross water revenue equal to 10% of the total construction cost.
- (c) Contract with Salem Baptist Church for the installation of 600 feet of main in Salem Church Road, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$1,320.00. The City will finance all construction costs and the applicant will guarantee an annual gross water revenue equal to 10% of the total construction cost.
- (d) Contract with Ed Griffin Development Corporation for the installation of 8,756 feet of main and five (5) fire hydrants to serve East Forest Subdivision, inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$40,600.00. The City will finance all construction costs and the applicant will guarantee an annual gross water revenue equal to 10% of the total construction cost.

TRANSFER OF CEMETERY LOT.

Councilman Tuttle moved that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute a deed with Mrs. Helena G. Houston and Miss Mafalda Gabriel, for Lot No. 452, Section 6, Evergreen Cemetery, at \$320.00. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 335

CONTRACT AWARDED SAFETY TEST & EQUIPMENT COMPANY, INC. FOR TRAILER MOUNTED LIMB CHIPPING MACHINE.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Tuttle and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder, Safety Test & Equipment Company, Inc., in the amount of \$3,350.00, on a unit price basis for one trailer mounted limb chipping machine.

The following bids were received:

Safety Test & Equipment Co., Inc.	\$ 3,350.00
Baker Equipment Engineering Co., Inc.	3,554.00
Western Carolina Tractor Co.	4,750.00

NOMINATION OF MR. EVERETT SUDDRETH FOR FIVE YEAR TERM ON THE AUDITORIUM-COLISEUM AUTHORITY.

Councilman Tuttle placed in nomination the name of Mr. Everett Suddreth to succeed himself for a five year term on the Auditorium-Coliseum Authority.

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF FRANK A. MCCLENEGHAN.

Councilman Thrower read into the record the following resolution, which was adopted by Council standing in silent prayer after the reading:

WHEREAS, it was with profound sorrow that the Mayor and City Council learned of the passing of Frank A. McCleneghan on April 11, 1970; and

WHEREAS, Mr. McCleneghan was a highly respected member of the legal profession and an influential community leader, having served on the boards of a number of charitable and civic organizations; and

WHEREAS, in 1958 he was appointed to the Auditorium-Coliseum Authority, and served as its legal advisor; and at the time of his death, was preparing the Authority's presentation to the Charter Commission studying consolidation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Mayor and City Council of the City of Charlotte, do, by this resolution and public record, recognize his significant contribution to the Auditorium-Coliseum Authority, and recognize further that his death is a distinct loss to the City in which he worked and won deep respect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Council and a copy thereof be sent to the family of Mr. McCleneghan in recognition of his respected place in this community.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF THE PROPOSED REBUDGETING ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS OF THE CHARLOTTE MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated Mr. Paul Jones, Executive Director of the Model Neighborhood Commission, reported to Council during the Conference Session on the rebudgeting of the model cities activities.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 336

Councilman Alexander moved adoption of the subject resolution and the proposal as submitted in the Conference Session with the understanding that further consideration will be given to the possibility of housing as was discussed in that session. The motion was seconded by Councilman Thrower.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated it is understood that the City Manager will schedule a meeting with the necessary agencies to discuss this.

Mr. Veeder stated there are some ladies present who would like to know that one of the items included is for the Domestic United, Incorporated. Mayor pro tem Whittington stated Council is approving this request; but Council wants to see if the first item which has to do with pedestrian bridges can be diverted into housing in the Villa Heights-Parkwood area.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 7, at Page 74.

CUTTING OF ANCIENT LILAC BUSH TO BE GIVEN TO CITY FOR APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT.

Councilman Tuttle stated Mrs. Sarah Houser has an ancient lilac bush that came from the premises where this city hall is built, and she is anxious to give a rooting or cutting for either these premises or perhaps the new park downtown. He stated it does have significance and historical value coming from these grounds.

He requested the City Manager to have Mr. Ted Hinson or Mr. Don Bryant's Committee to contact Mrs. Houser.

CITY MANAGER REQUESTED TO ADVISE COUNCIL THE PORTION OF TWENTY-EIGHTH STREET CHANGED TO MORETZ AVENUE.

Councilman Short stated that Moretz Avenue and 28th Street name change has been brought to his attention several times this past week by citizens who have businesses there. That approximately a year ago this issue was before Council, and Council decided that the street would be called Moretz Avenue. Apparently the business interests along there are not satisfied with this, also he recalls that the residential people wanted the change.

He asked that Mr. Woody Woodward get into this matter and go out and talk with these people. He stated he is sure what Council wants to do is what the people out there desire; that this seems to be a public relations matter, and he has talked with Mr. Woodward and he says he will be glad to go out and visit a few of the people and see if he can mediate the matter.

Councilman Alexander stated if after having a public hearing and deciding this issue and then sending our public relations man back into the area, would it not be re-opening the issue; would it be illegally moving into an area that we cannot move in? Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, replied there is nothing illegal about this procedure.

Councilman Jordan asked how much of this street was affected; was it not from Tryon Street west? Mr. Veeder, City Manager, replied there was a public hearing and there were some strong feelings; that this was the recommendation of the Planning Commission to change the name.

Councilman Jordan requested the City Manager to bring this back to Council at its next meeting on the area that was changed.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 337

RESOLUTION TO HOUSING AUTHORITY REQUESTING THAT HOUSING PROJECTS BE DESIGNED SO THAT THE PROJECTS WILL BE AESTHETICALLY PLEASING.

Councilman Short stated if possible the City should avoid cutting down all the trees at the Shamrock housing site as well as the Wyanoke site as was done on West Boulevard; there are a number of real nice trees, particularly on the Shamrock property. He stated he feels that Council should contact the Housing Authority and ask them to try to work this out with the developer. That the public has an interest here and a number of people have mentioned this to him.

Councilman Tuttle stated he understood that an architect will be used on these projects, and an architect will not let them cut a tree down.

Councilman Short moved that Council adopt a resolution to be prepared by Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, and sent to the Housing Authority that it is the desire of this Council if at all possible, that they work with the developers to avoid needlessly cutting the trees on both of these sites. The motion was seconded by Councilman Thrower.

Councilman Alexander stated in that Council members have committed themselves to be concerned with all possible aesthetics of the physical environment regarding housing projects, should this resolution not also include requesting the Housing Authority to remind the developer that not only is Council concerned with the trees but also building design.

Councilman Short asked that wording be added to the effect that the complete project be aesthetically pleasing.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REQUESTED TO REPAIR CURB AND DRAIN AT SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SENIOR DRIVE AND KELLER AVENUE.

Councilman Alexander requested the Engineering Department to check the southeast corner of Senior Drive and Keller Avenue where street repairs have been made and the curb and drain foundation has been broken and needs to be repaired.

CITY MANAGER REQUESTED TO HAVE DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR HUNTINGTOWN PARK INVESTIGATE COMPLAINTS REGISTERED BY RESIDENTS OF THE AREA.

Councilman Thrower stated there has been a lot of trouble in Huntington Park, and some of the neighbors have taken on the specific job of policing the area. It seems they have cook out pits with no trash cans, and on numerous occasions they have called both the city and county police because of fights in the park. The county police maintained they did not have any jurisdiction in the park, and the city police did not respond.

He requested the City Manager to have whoever is responsible to have this looked into immediately as papers are blowing everywhere and there is no particular pick-up point and apparently no cooperation.

CITY MANAGER REQUESTED TO HAVE WILBUR SMITH & ASSOCIATES TO PROCEED WITH NECESSARY WORK IN CONNECTION WITH THE CIVIC CENTER LOCATION.

Mayor pro tem Whittington stated today Council has resolved the site of the Civic Center, and it has been mentioned by Mr. Veeder and his staff that as soon as this was done, Wilbur Smith and Associates would be put to work on the origin and destination survey and parking needs for Downtown. He asked that whatever needs to be done now with them let them move posthaste.

April 13, 1970
Minute Book 53 - Page 338

CITY ATTORNEY REQUESTED TO ADVISE COUNCIL IF DEED RESTRICTIONS WOULD APPLY TO KINDERGARTENS OR DAY NURSERIES.

Mayor pro tem Whittington requested the City Attorney to advise Council if deed restrictions in a particular subdivision or on a particular street would exclude or include kindergartens or day nurseries. That this seems to be a business and he does not see how that business can operate under deed restrictions in a residential zone.

COUNCIL ADVISED THAT MR. JACK BOYETTE, ARCHITECT, HAS OFFERED ASSISTANCE IN PRESERVING CHAPEL ON OLD THOMPSON ORPHANAGE SITE.


Mayor pro tem Whittington stated Council members have received a letter from Mr. Jack Boyette, the Architect, regarding Mr. Alexander's request about the old Thompson Orphanage Chapel; that Mr. Boyette said he will do anything he can to help Council in restoring and keeping that site. He stated he thinks Council should request him to do that if the need arises as all of Council wants to do what it can to preserve the Chapel.

Mr. Bobo, Administrative Assistant, stated Mr. Edwin Clarkson has a group of members of the Episcopal denomination who are looking into preserving the Chapel and to actually using the Chapel as a church; that Mr. Clarkson has contacted Mr. Rozier who is the developer of the property and who has agreed to cooperate in this.

Councilman Jordan asked if the Chapel will remain where it is as far as the highway is concerned? Mr. Bobo replied it will; that Third Street will miss the property.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.


Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk