

## SUMMARY OF MINUTES

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/HOUSING/GENERAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

3:00 P.M., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2008

COMMITTEE ROOM

ROOM 239, CITY HALL

---

*COMMITTEE MEMBERS:* Council Member Nelson L. Malloy, Jr. Chair  
Council Member Dan Besse, Vice Chair (in at 3:17 p.m.)  
Council Member Evelyn A. Terry  
Council Member Molly Leight

*OTHERS PRESENT:* Council Member Joycelyn V. Johnson

Chair Malloy called the meeting to order and stated that without objection, the Committee would first consider the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Ritchie Brooks, Director, Neighborhood Services, stated that the property at 328 W. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street had been repaired and no action was needed. He also stated that the owner of 1042 Rundell Street has agreed to a voluntary demolition agreement if all repairs are not completed within 90 days. He further stated that the owner of all accessory buildings at 517 Oak Summit Road will demolish the buildings himself. Mr. Brooks then stated that the owners of the following properties were in attendance and requested that those items be held for discussion: 1854 E. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 1713 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 109 N. Jackson Avenue, and 2025 Bertha Street.

Council Member Leight made a motion to approve the remaining properties under Item C-1. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Terry and carried unanimously.

#### CONSENT AGENDA

##### C-1. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS RELATING TO SUBSTANDARD STRUCTURES:

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V, SECTION 10-203(f)(1) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM: *[Repairs less than 50% of value of structure (-50) six months].*

- d. Garland & Terry Jones 316 W. 23rd Street
- f. James & Sherri Carey 1042 Rundell Street
- g. Mid Huff Ventures 1212 Rundell Street

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V, SECTION 10-203(f)(2) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM: *[Repairs more than 50% of value of structure (+50) six months]*.

- a. John & Patrica Jordan 1509 E. 22nd Street
- c. Mae C. Kershaw 2378 Greenway Avenue  
(Accessory Building)

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE HOUSING SERVICES DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM TO REMOVE OR DEMOLISH STRUCTURE UNFIT FOR HUMAN HABITATION AND, OTHERWISE, TO EFFECTUATE THE PURPOSE OF CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V OF THE WINSTON-SALEM CITY CODE: *[Repairs more than 65% of value of structure (+65)]*.

- a. Ray & Judy Joyner et, al 812 Rich Avenue
- b. Aaron & Linda Streetman 254 Stickney Road
- c. Timothy & Lisa Duncan 1911 E. 16th Street
- d. Wayne Pittman 5224 Pineview Drive
- e. Bridgetta I. Capers 2944 N. Patterson Avenue  
(Accessory Building)
- f. Wolfe Construction Inc. 517 Oak Summit Road  
(Accessory #1)
- g. Wolfe Construction Inc. 517 Oak Summit Road  
(Accessory #2)
- h. Wolfe Construction Inc. 517 Oak Summit Road  
(Accessory #3)
- i. Wolfe Construction Inc. 517 Oak Summit Road  
(Accessory #5)
- j. Wolfe Construction Inc. 517 Oak Summit Road  
(Accessory #6)

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V, SECTION 10-203(f)(1) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM: *[Repairs less than 50% of value of structure (-50) six months]*.

- a. Hallie M. Davis, heirs 1854 E. 4th Street

Mr. Bruce Bailiff, Code Enforcement, gave an overview of the property.

There was no one in attendance to address this property.

Council Member Terry made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Leight and carried unanimously.

- b. William F. & Annie Cox Jr. 1713 E. 5th Street

Mr. Bailiff gave an overview of the property.

*Council Member Besse in at 3:17.*

Mr. Blake Cox, 5385 Valleydale Road, Kernersville, stated that the property is currently under contract for a new owner and they are hoping to close on February 29.

Mr. Brooks stated that a purchase contract is under negotiation.

Council Member Johnson stated that the property has been in disrepair for several years and that a community development corporation in the area previously attempted to purchase the property.

Mr. Cox stated that he tried to sell the property to the City at tax value via the Atkins Foundation. He also stated that the proposed buyer is facing some difficulties due to the current housing market and the negotiation is taking longer than expected.

Council Member Johnson interjected that the Simon Atkins Community Development Corporation is not a part of the City.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Cox noted that the proposed buyer has placed a deposit on the property and secured a down payment.

Council Member Leight noted that the demolition order is on the property, not the owner, so whoever owns the property at the time of demolition will have to allow for it or make the needed repairs.

Council Member Leight made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Terry and carried unanimously.

Chair Malloy stated that the new owner is obligated to make the needed repairs and will have 90 days to do so from the effective date of the ordinance.

Mr. Brooks noted that more deterioration or damage may have occurred to the property since the inspection and that the new owner will be required to make any and all repairs needed to bring the property up to code.

Council Member Terry noted that the Atkins Community Development Corporation is a non-profit group, not an extension of the City.

Council Member Besse stated that the voluntary demolition agreement (VDA) will require the property to be brought to code. In the absence of the VDA, the list of deficiencies must be completed in 90 days.

c. A. Stanley & Carol Mitchell 109 N. Jackson Avenue

Mr. Bailiff gave an overview of the property.

Mr. Stanley Mitchell, 4440 Gatlin Miller Lane, Clemmons, stated that if funding assistance is not obtained in 30 days, he will demolish the property himself.

Council Member Johnson noted that it has been a troubling property for some time.

Mr. Brooks noted that he would follow up on the VDA.

Council Member Terry made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Leight and carried unanimously.

Mr. Brooks distributed information from the Historic Resources staff regarding the properties.

Council Member Johnson noted that the property at 812 Rich Avenue was listed as part of the Reynoldstown Historic District. She also noted that the property is currently open and causing some concern to the neighbors and requested that staff contact the owners to secure the property.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Brooks stated that the owner of 328 W. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street has completed all needed repairs and the property was removed from the list prior to the vote. He also stated that the owner of 1042 Rundell Street will execute a VDA to make any needed repairs and was included in the previous vote.

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V, SECTION 10-203(f)(2) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM: *[Repairs more than 50% of value of structure (+50) six months].*

ADJOURNMENT: 6:00 p.m.

b. James Ronald McClamrock 2025 Bertha Street

Mr. Bailiff gave a brief overview of the property.

Mr. Ron McClamrook, 263 Wilkesboro Street, Mocksville, stated that he buys homes needing renovation and is just now in the position to begin work on the listed property. He also stated that he has completed all but four of the listed repairs. He further stated that the property was reinspected yesterday and that only a few more days are needed to complete repairs and comply with the request. He then provided an updated inspection sheet.

Mr. Brooks stated that the staff recommendation remains the same.

Council Member Terry made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Leight and carried unanimously.

Council Member Besse noted that the ordinance will not be effective until 90 days from the date of adoption.

#### ADDITIONAL ITEM

Council Member Johnson requested that staff review a property on Third Street between Cameron Avenue and Terrace Avenue that is in need of repair and was open until a few months ago. She stated that the property has recently been boarded up and that graffiti is a problem in that area.

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE HOUSING SERVICES DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM TO REMOVE OR DEMOLISH STRUCTURE UNFIT FOR HUMAN HABITATION AND, OTHERWISE, TO EFFECTUATE THE PURPOSE OF CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V OF THE WINSTON-SALEM CITY CODE: [*Repairs more than 65% of value of structure (+65)*].

b. Aaron & Linda Streetman                      254 Stickney Road

Mr. Brooks noted that the property owner of 254 Stickney Road is in attendance and would like to speak.

Mr. Aaron Streetman, 1156 White Road, Thomasville, stated that he has owned the property for one year and recently found a new contractor who is helping to repair the structure, and requested that staff allow 30 to 45 days to make needed repairs.

Mr. Bailiff stated that under the ordinance, he will have 30 days to comply.

Council Member Leight suggested that staff allow the property owner 30 days to make repairs, reassess the property and if most repairs have been made, accept in good faith that the remainder will be repaired. She also suggested that staff only bring the property back if it needs to be demolished.

Mr. Streetman stated that the inspector last visited the property approximately three weeks ago and that most of the unfit violations have been repaired.

Mr. Brooks noted that in some VDAs, if the owner completes a percentage of the repairs in a

specified period of time, then they are allowed to continue until the property is repaired.

Mr. Streetman stated that one third of the total repairs have been completed and one half of the unfit repairs have been completed.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Streetman stated that new front and back doors have been installed, new windows have been installed, a new deck was installed, new kitchen sink installed, electric lines have been run and need to be connected to a service panel, defective flooring has been replaced, joists have been replaced, sub-floor has been repaired, 2/3 of the vinyl siding is complete on the exterior of the property, sheetrock is being replaced and the exterior and interior framing has been inspected. He also stated that the property had extensive water damage.

In response to Chair Malloy's questions, Mr. Streetman stated that financing is in place to complete the remainder of the repairs and it should take no longer than 60 days.

Council Member Terry made a motion to reconsider the previous motion. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Besse and carried unanimously. Council Member Terry made a motion to allow one third of the repairs to be made within 30 days under a VDA, then a subsequent 30 days will be granted to complete the work if in compliance. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Leight and carried unanimously.

A citizen was in attendance to address Item C-2 and it was pulled for discussion.

Council Member Leight made a motion to approve Items C-3, C-4, C-5 and C-6. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Terry and carried unanimously.

- C-3. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE LEASE OF JOE WHITE TENNIS CENTER TO THE RANDY PATE TENNIS ACADEMY, INC. [*Receipt of \$21,600 per year.*]
- C-4. ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 38, SECTION 25 OF THE CITY CODE ENTITLED "MISCELLANEOUS OFFENSES" REGARDING POLITICAL SIGNS AND POSTERS.
- C-5. RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BASEBALL CONCESSIONS BUILDING IN HANES PARK.
- C-6. ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE III OF THE CITY CODE BY DELETING DIVISION 11, THE GREATER WINSTON-SALEM SPORTS COMMISSION.

Mr. Derwick Paige, Deputy City Manager stated that staff would like to pull Item C-5 pending a neighborhood meeting.

- C-2. RESOLUTION APPROVING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM AND WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY FOR THE USE OF SALEM LAKE FOR COLLEGIATE ROWING.

Mr. Steven Lyda, 3262 Luther Street, stated that the docks at Salem Lake are too high for kayaks, canoes and some rowboats. He also stated that this agreement will benefit everyone who uses Salem Lake and will be low-maintenance for the City. He further stated that he hopes the contractor is in place on February 19 to begin construction.

Mr. Lee Garrity, City Manager, noted that the City Attorney's Office and the contractor have worked out all legalities within the contract.

Mr. Tim Grant, Director, Recreation and Parks Department, stated that he contacted the vendor for installation of the dock and the agreement/contract will be in place shortly after the item is approved. He also stated that it will take a maximum of five days to install the dock.

Council Member Terry made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Besse and carried unanimously.

#### GENERAL AGENDA

##### G-1. ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 6 OF THE CITY CODE ENTITLED "ANIMALS AND FOWL".

Mr. Brooks stated that the distance currently allowed between an animal dwelling and an adjoining property line is 150 feet for horses, mules, goats, sheep, cattle, chickens or other fowl or pigeons. He also stated that the proposed ordinance will reduce that distance to 50 feet for horses, mules, goats, sheep and cattle. He further stated that the 150 foot distance for chickens, other fowl and pigeons will remain unless a special use permit is obtained for the keeping of pigeons via the *Unified Development Ordinance* (UDO) process.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Glenn Simmons, Planning, stated that a special use permit may be obtained based on the affected property through the elected body or the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA).

Chair Malloy noted that in previous times, it has been the consensus of the Committee to move through the elected body.

Mr. Garrity noted that the permit would have to go through the Planning Board process to have the UDO set up the permit.

Mr. Paul Norby, Planning Director, noted that this item would be a text amendment to the UDO. He also noted that the text amendment would have to go to the Planning Board for a public hearing and recommendation, then to the full Council for a public hearing and recommendation to adopt the amendment. He further noted that there will be an application for the special use permit, and a public hearing to determine on a case by case basis who will qualify.

Mr. Garrity assured the citizens that while a text amendment is in process, there is no enforcement until the item is approved.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Norby stated that permit fees issued by elected officials are much higher than permit fees issued by the ZBA. He also stated that a fee from the ZBA would be around \$100, while a fee from the elected body would be around \$1,000.

In response to Council Member Leight's question, Mr. Simmons stated that each case would come before the ZBA and would be reviewed based on a specific set of criteria, such as hardship situations and problems that may be caused to adjoining property owners. He also stated that the earliest the item would come before the Planning Board would be April, and it would probably be May before a UDO Amendment is drafted.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Simmons stated that signs advertising the public hearing will be posted at the affected properties.

In response to Chair Malloy's inquiry, Mr. Norby stated that fees for the ZBA are substantially less than an elected body's fees because each step of the process is housed in the Planning Department, from public hearings to inspections.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Garrity noted that if the Council wishes to overrule a decision by the ZBA, the item must be taken to court.

Council Member Terry stated that due to the administrative process and costs involved, she would lean toward the ZBA as the chosen body to handle the permits. She also stated that the request for the permit is not likely to recur multiple times.

Council Member Terry made a motion to allow the ZBA to issue the permits. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Besse and carried unanimously.

Staff will bring a draft item back to Committee in March.

Council Member Johnson requested that staff highlight permit items in the agendas of ZBA meetings and note where signage will be placed.

Council Member Terry suggested that staff extend the distance to 75 feet from an adjoining property line.

G-2. DISCUSSION REGARDING GRAFFITI.

Mr. Brooks reviewed the draft ordinance and stated that there is no provision in the City Code to address graffiti on private property. He also stated that the proposed ordinance addresses graffiti on public and private property, allowing for removal of the graffiti and holding the perpetrator responsible to remove the graffiti. He further stated that if the perpetrator does not remove the graffiti, the City will remove it. Mr. Brooks noted that there is a provision in the proposed ordinance to hold an adult guardian responsible if graffiti is administered by a minor. He also noted that if the perpetrator is unknown, the property owner will be held responsible for removal. He further noted that 10-15 days will be allowed to remove the graffiti, although 24-48 hours is ideal. Mr. Brooks commented that access to a defaced property will be sought through the property owner or the courts. He gave a brief description of abatement fees based on the frequency of occurrences. The fees will help recover supplies and materials needed to remove the graffiti.

In response to Council Member Besse's concern, Mr. Garrity stated that the Winston-Salem Chamber of Commerce (WSCC) opposes any fee to the property owner.

Mr. Jake Cashion, WSCC, expressed concern that victims of graffiti will have to pay to have it removed and stated that as graffiti is a public nuisance, a resolution should be sought that is equitable to all involved.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Cashion stated that regulations imposed on the business community should protect them, not cost them. He also stated that it doesn't cost to remove trash from your own yard, and any fines imposed due to that trash being present are an unintended consequence. He suggested that the City utilize WSTV-13 and Crimestoppers to seek out perpetrators or possibly provide a reward for anonymous tips. He also suggested that volunteer groups could be called on to monitor more graffiti-prone areas or a tax credit could be provided in clean-up efforts.

In response to Council Member Johnson's question, Mr. Cashion stated that no one wants graffiti to remain on their building for extended periods of time and that staff should look at more equitable solutions as far as removal and fees are concerned. He also stated that repair groups should be sought out to fix graffiti damaged areas and note that it may take longer than 10-15 days.

Mr. Brooks noted that Graffiti Busters is currently being advertised as part of the Trash Busters program and that citizens can report instances to the graffiti hotline and received a reward.

Council Member Terry requested that staff review the item so as not to impose a hardship on business owners. She also requested that staff work with the WSCC to identify businesses for graffiti removal, seek any recommendations to jumpstart these efforts, and to look at cost sharing opportunities.

Council Member Leight expressed concern that dumping is not simply a trash removal issue, and that it is a much bigger problem than graffiti.

Mr. Cashion stated that he would provide the names of graffiti removal companies. In response to Council Member Besse's question, he stated that when his business was defaced with graffiti, it cost \$100 to remove and that the perpetrator was recently caught. He also stated that while \$100 is not a large sum, it is large enough to impact small-business owners. He further stated that the principle of the matter is that business owners will have to pay the consequence and perpetrators will continue to deface properties, driving up the cost for removal. Mr. Cashion urged the Committee to continue to work to find an equitable solution.

Council Member Besse requested that staff prepare a draft ordinance to be shared with all interested parties and brought back to the Committee for discussion and review.

Council Member Terry requested that staff consider the comments that were shared by citizens.

Chair Malloy requested that staff review court-ordered community service or the social services work program as possible removal solutions.

Council Member Johnson requested that staff review the judicial process and that any fines or fees paid, come back into the graffiti removal program.

Mr. Brooks stated that there is a wealth of information on graffiti that staff is currently reviewing and they will review graffiti removal programs in other cities and report back to the Committee.

Chair Malloy requested that the item be brought back to the March Committee meeting.

#### G-3. RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE AMENDED GRAFFITI REMOVAL PROGRAM GUIDELINES.

Mr. Brooks stated that assistance would be offered to families within the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) that are 80% or more below the median income, up to \$500 to remove graffiti. He also stated that the proposed guidelines would remove the NRSA requirement to help meet the needs of low-income individuals within the City.

Council Member Besse made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Terry and carried unanimously.

In response to Council Member Johnson's question, Mr. Brooks noted that businesses or landlords will have to rent to individuals living 80% below the median income to qualify for assistance.

#### G-4. UPDATE ON INFILL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.

Mr. Norby stated that Council Member Johnson requested that staff review a modular home on East First Street to provide some guidelines on how to prevent infill development from being incompatible with the surrounding properties.

Mr. Simmons gave the presentation on infill development regulations and reviewed proposed modular infill development standards along with North Carolina standards for modular homes. He also reviewed modular designs that will work well with narrow lots. He further noted an alternative compliance provision for modular infill.

In response to Council Member Terry's question, Mr. Simmons noted that vertical townhomes and flats have different grades, and he would have to research the property to know if West End Village was built on a grade.

Mr. Norby noted that new urban residential developments have a higher grade to give residents some privacy rather than being built level to retail space.

Council Member Johnson noted that residences built close to the street tend to want more privacy and may be built on a higher grade.

Mr. Norby stated that he would provide a few simple descriptions of compatible infill standards. He stated that the standards must be applicable to the surrounding area in which it is utilized and that expenses towards the developer and the Inspections Department be minimized. He also stated that staff would like to have some stakeholder meetings with the development community and various neighborhoods. He further stated that the Planning Board should have an item ready for review in the next one to two months and staff will keep Council updated on the project.

Council Member Johnson requested that staff reach out to the individual neighborhood presidents when scheduling these meetings.

Council Member Terry thanked staff for their dedication to this matter and for bringing perspective and order to the situation.

#### G-5. NO PARKING ON FRONT LAWNS UPDATE.

Mr. Brooks stated that staff developed a few options to address the parking on lawns situation based on the City of Concord Ordinance. He stated that option one would allow no parking at all on laws, and the property owner will have to find other parking. He stated that option two would allow no parking on the lawn, but would establish an area from the street to the front of the house as a parking surface, not to exceed 30% of the front yard, and that the material used for paving could not create adverse conditions such as runoff, standing water or stormwater runoff. He also stated that the area would allow for a minimum of two cars to be parked there. He stated that a third option would require the property owner to go through the Inspections Department to obtain a permit to install a driveway. He also stated that plans for the driveway would need to be approved along with the surface material. He further stated that parking would be enforced through Neighborhood Services, exceptions would be made for emergency vehicles and a permit could be obtained for lawn parking at certain time periods.

In response to Council Member Besse's questions, Mr. Brooks stated that staff would review problem areas within the City and to specify certain zones for parking would be unfair. He also stated that the largest occurrence of lawn parking is surrounding Wake Forest University, but there are other problem areas within the City.

In response to Mr. Paige's question, Council Member Besse suggested that neighborhoods apply for zone designation and that any enforcement should be applied City-wide or that no restrictions be imposed at all.

Mr. Paige stated that staff would review the concerns and bring an item back to the Committee.

Council Member Leight noted that the problem tends to arise quickly and that she would prefer a city-wide restriction, a restriction within Growth Management Area 2, or wherever it would be most profitable.

Council Member Besse expressed concern that some of the options suggested by staff may work against stormwater management efforts.

Council Member Leight expressed concern that continual parking on lawns compressed the ground and creates additional stormwater runoff.

Council Member Terry noted that a city-wide ordinance based on a specific set of criteria may be most beneficial, but the problem tends to expand quickly. She also noted that parking on lawns creates the same problem as the installation of an impervious surface. She also suggested that rental properties note in the lease that parking on lawns is prohibited.

Council Member Johnson expressed concern that creating a permit for special events parking may cause problems because events are often a spontaneous occurrence.

Mr. Brooks stated that staff could limit the number times that permit issuance is allowed, and that a set of criteria may need to be developed to control the issue.

Council Member Johnson expressed concern with long-term parking on lawns. She also stated that she would support a City-wide ordinance.

Council Member Besse expressed concern that the ordinance would be unenforceable without constant monitoring and that there is no way to differentiate everyday parking from special event parking.

In response to Council Member Besse's concern, Council Member Johnson noted that neighbors would report repeat occurrences.

Council Member Terry requested that staff develop a standard to prohibit lawn parking and to use the Community Appearance Commission or a similar commission to help monitor the situation or to develop resources for enforcing the ordinance.

Mr. Robert Vorsteg, 3620 Marlowe Avenue, questioned whether or not an existing driveway will count towards the 30% restriction to prevent properties from adding additional parking.

Mr. Brooks noted that a parking area can be no more than 30% of the front lawn.

Mr. Vorsteg expressed concern that adding additional parking areas will be unattractive and cover most of the yard space. He stated that landlords are indifferent to the issue or absent in many cases and many of the residences allowing lawn parking are rental properties. He requested to know what type of exceptions staff would recommend and how often those exceptions would be made. He also stated that there should be a penalty for the automobile owners as well as a minimum condition to which the front yard must be maintained. He further requested to know the maximum number of cars that can be parked at a residence.

Ms. Helen Edders, 3620 Marlowe Avenue, noted that many driveways will easily accommodate four cars, but it is inconvenient to have to move cars, so the residents park on the lawn instead.

Mr. Kent Stroup, 1409 Polo Road, stated that his property is surrounded by rental properties and it appears that more people stay at a residence than it can accommodate. He also stated that when gravel is brought in as a parking surface, it is not contained and becomes impacted into the ground. He further stated that he is petitioning for historical designation within his community and that lawn parking is deteriorating the property and historical value. Mr. Stroup encouraged staff to choose option three to control the issue.

Ms. Clarice Nago, 809 Minorcas, stated that she is in favor of option three as it is more manageable and easier to enforce. She also stated that when multiple cars are parked on the lawn, the individual cars could be ticketed. She further stated that the property owner should be responsible for restoring the lawn after parking has deteriorated it.

Mr. Stroup stated that many of the lots have a large back yard that would easily accommodate the parking of multiple cars.

Council Member Terry requested that staff incorporate the specifics of citizen suggestions when developing the ordinance.

Mr. Brooks stated that staff would bring various documents back to Council to include different requests and they will review other documents in the process.

Chair Malloy requested that citizens contact Mr. Brooks with other suggestions, questions and information.

Mr. Brooks stated that staff would contact various neighborhood groups and work with the Community Appearance Commission.

Chair Malloy suggested that the Committee hold Item G-6 until the March Committee meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 5:51 p.m.

RECONVENED: 5:55 p.m.

A citizen was in attendance to discuss a property matter and requested to be heard.

ORDINANCE ORDERING THE HOUSING SERVICES DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM TO REMOVE OR DEMOLISH STRUCTURE UNFIT FOR HUMAN HABITATION AND, OTHERWISE, TO EFFECTUATE THE PURPOSE OF CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V OF THE WINSTON-SALEM CITY CODE: [*Repairs more than 65% of value of structure (+65)*].

d. Wayne Pittman 5224 Pineview Drive

Mr. Bailiff provided an overview of the property.

Mr. Wayne Pittman, stated that he has obtained a permit to repair the house and noted that the estimated cost of repair is incorrect. He also stated that to obtain the permit, he had to provide proof that there was no structural damage to the property and noted that the fire damage was on the front porch of the property, not within the property. He further stated that he can make needed repairs to the house for much less than was assessed and he disagrees with the proposed 65% repair value.

Mr. Brooks stated that Mr. Pittman received a notice of public hearing regarding the property along with a request to meet with Mr. Bailiff. He also stated that the original 30 day order has expired and Mr. Pittman was sent another notice to contact Mr. Brooks to discuss an extension.

Mr. Bailiff stated that this is the first communication he had with Mr. Pittman.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Pittman noted that the fire damage to the property was the result of arson, not faulty wiring. He also noted that there was some wiring damaged along the front wall of the property that is in need of repair. He further noted that the Fire Department removed a portion of the foundation at the front of the house. Mr. Pittman stated that he is unsure of how the toilet, sink and lavatory were assessed due to a no trespassing order after the fire. He also stated that there was no running water in the house, so one would not be able to determine if the items were in working order or not.

Mr. Bailiff stated that City staff did not enter the property while the no trespassing order was in effect and the Housing Inspectors Office is notified by the Fire Department each time a no trespassing order is issued.

In response to Council Member Leight's question, Mr. Bailiff stated that this property was near an Operation Impact area and was to be assessed at a later date.

Mr. Brooks noted that the property has been in disrepair for several months.

Mr. Pittman noted that the arson investigation is still ongoing.

Council Member Leight made a motion to reconsider the previous motion. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Terry and carried unanimously. Council Member Leight made a motion to allow one third of the repairs to be made within 30 days under a VDA, then a subsequent 30 days will be granted to complete the work if in compliance. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Terry and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: 6:11 p.m.