



Certified Recommendation

Raleigh Planning Commission

CR#

Case Information: TC-3-14 / Part 10 Revisions to Remove Conflicts with UDO

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

<i>Applicable Policy Statements</i>	Not applicable
<i>Action Items</i>	Not applicable

Summary of Text Change

<i>Summary</i>	Amends Sections 10-2131, 10-2141, 10-2142, 10-2143, 10-2144 and 10-2171 of the Part 10 Zoning Code to align them with the Unified Development Ordinance procedures for quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings, appeals of administrative decisions, variances, special use permits and the associated fee schedules.
----------------	---

Summary of Impacts

<i>Impacts Identified</i>	<p><u>Adoption of TC-3-14:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The adoption of the text change would align the procedural requirements for the Board of Adjustment and the City Council where quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings are concerned, regardless of the subject property's zoning (UDO vs. Legacy Part 10). <p><u>No Action:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There could be confusion for quasi-judicial evidentiary hearing applicants and review bodies as to the procedural requirements associated with similar cases as they would differ slightly based on the zoning on the zoning of the subject property (UDO vs. Legacy Part 10).
---------------------------	--

Public Meetings

<i>Submitted</i>	<i>Committee</i>		<i>Planning Commission</i>	
6-17-14	7-14-14,	Text Change Committee Recommended Approval	8-12-14	

Attachments

- Draft Ordinance

Planning Commission Recommendation

<i>Recommendation</i>	Approval
<i>Findings & Reasons</i>	Aligning the Part 10 Zoning Code with the UDO in regards to procedures for quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings, appeals of administrative decisions, variances, special use permits would be beneficial to those involved. Eliminating the fee schedule references from the Part 10 Zoning Code would give clarity that the Council approved Development Fee Guide is applicable, regardless of a subject property's zoning (Legacy Part 10 district or UDO district).
<i>Motion and Vote</i>	Approval: Unanimous

This document is a true and accurate statement of the findings and recommendations of the Planning Commission. Approval of this document incorporates all of the findings of the attached Staff Report.

Planning Director

Date

Planning Commission Chairperson

Date

Staff Coordinator:

Eric Hodge: eric.hodge@raleighnc.gov



Zoning Staff Report – TC-3-14

Part 10 Revisions to Remove Conflicts with UDO

Request

<i>Section Reference</i>	<p>Part 10 §10-2131 Permits, Applications, and Issuance During Pending Official Zoning Map Amendment. Part 10 §10-2141 Quasi-Judicial Evidentiary Hearings Conducted by the Board of Adjustment and the City Council Part 10 §10-2142 Appeals Part 10 §10-2143 Variance Part 10 §10-2144 Special Use Permits Approved by the Board of Adjustment Part 10 § 10-2171 Fee Schedule</p> <p>Zoning Code to align them with the Unified Development Ordinance Procedures for quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings, appeals of administrative decisions, variances, special use permits and the associated fee schedules.</p>
<i>Basic Information</i>	<p>Amends the Part 10 Zoning Code to align it with the UDO procedures for quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings, appeals of administrative decisions, variances, special use permits and the associated fee schedules</p>
<i>PC Recommendation Deadline</i>	<p>September 30, 2014</p>

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

<i>Applicable Policies</i>	Not applicable
<i>Action Items</i>	Not applicable

Contact Information

<i>Staff Coordinator</i>	Eric Hodge: eric.hodge@raleighnc.gov ; 919.996.2639
--------------------------	---

History/Overview

This text change was initiated by the City Staff to eliminate procedural differences in these matters based on the subject property's zoning (UDO vs. Legacy Part 10).

Purpose and Need

This text change would eliminate variations in procedural aspects where these matters are concerned and make it clearer to applicants, staff and review bodies what the rules are, regardless of a property's zoning (UDO vs. Legacy Part 10). It would also remove the language in 10-2071 (Fee Schedule). The City Council has approved a Development Fee Guide. Removal

of language in 10-2131 will alleviate a potential conflict with building permit issuance during the citywide rezoning.

Alternatives Considered

No alternative other than the No Action approach was considered.

Scoping of Impacts

Potential adverse impacts of the proposed text change have been identified as follows:

None.

The adverse impacts of taking no action (retaining the existing regulations) have been identified as follows:

There are variations in the procedural aspects regarding these matters. Applicants could be confused as to which rules they are supposed to follow.

Impacts Summary

Adoption of Proposed Text Change

The adoption of this text change will result in a single approach to these matters, regardless of the subject property's zoning (UDO vs. Legacy).

No action

The status quo will be maintained and there will be two sets of regulations related to these matters.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2014 – 340 TC 360
TC-3-14**

**AN ORDINANCE TO REVISE PART 10, ZONING CODE,
OF THE CITY OF RALEIGH CODE OF ORDINANCES TO
REMOVE CONFLICT WITH THE RECENTLY ADOPTED
UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**

**BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RALEIGH,
NORTH CAROLINA that:**

Section 1. Revise Raleigh City Code Section 10-2131 to read:

**“Sec. 10-2131.
PERMITS, APPLICATIONS, AND ISSUANCE DURING PENDING
OFFICIAL ZONING MAP AMENDMENT.**

Applications for permits for use or construction *shall* be made as other building permits are applied for, to the Planning and Development Department ~~Department of Inspections~~, which *shall* have authority to pass on them, issuing permits for those that conform to the provisions of this chapter.

~~No permit for the construction of a *building, sign* or use on any *property* shall be issued during the pendency of an application for an **Official Zoning Map** amendment of such *property* unless the proposed construction meets all the provisions of the existing zoning district(s), and also all the provisions of the proposed zoning district(s).”~~

Section 2. Revise Raleigh City Code Section 10-2141 to read:

“All quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings conducted by the Board of Adjustment shall comply with the standards contained within Part 10A, Article 10 of the City Code, otherwise known as the Unified Development Ordinance. Quasi-judicial evidentiary hearings conducted by ~~and the City Council~~ *shall* be subject to the *following* provisions:

(a) Procedures.

- (1) All applications, including applications for rehearing, *shall* be accompanied by a filing fee in accordance with the Development Fee Schedule contained in ~~§10-2171~~. This fee partially defrays the *City's* expense in keeping records relating to the application, verifying the application, advertising a public hearing on the

~~application, and performing other services required by statute or ordinance in processing the application to its conclusion. No refund of the fee or any part thereof shall be made unless the application is withdrawn prior to hearing. However, in the case of applications brought challenging the decision, determination, order, requirements or interpretation of the administrative official pursuant to [§10-2142](#), this filing fee and any civil penalty will be returned to the applicant if the Board of Adjustment decides that the position of the City official is erroneous; except as stated herein no civil penalty shall be reduced by the Board. A fee shall not be required if the application is made by the City or any agency created and appointed by the Raleigh City Council to perform governmental functions.~~

~~To the extent not in conflict with the provisions of this Code, applications to the Board of Adjustment shall be in accordance with the rules of procedure adopted by the Board of Adjustment.~~

- ~~(2) No quasi-judicial hearing shall be heard until at least seven (7) days prior to the hearing notice of the time, place, and subject of the hearing is published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City. No publication shall be made more than twenty five (25) days before the date fixed for the hearing.~~
- ~~(3) The City will post a sign or signs either upon the subject property or at convenient locations as it deems appropriate. Such posting shall advise that a proceeding has been filed and direct further inquiry to a listed telephone number. All postings are for the convenience of the public and any defective posting shall not invalidate the proceeding.~~
- (2) The City will make a reasonable attempt to notify, by first class mail, the applicant and all persons shown on the county tax abstract at the time of filing, as the property owners of:
 - a. the subject property; and
 - b. properties immediately adjacent to or directly opposite across the street from the subject property.

Such mailings shall advise that a petition has been filed affecting the subject property, the general nature of the question involved, and the time and place of the hearing. All notices made by mail shall be deemed completed upon mailing. All mailings are for the convenience of the public and any defective mailing shall not invalidate the proceeding.

~~(5) All parties in interest shall have the right to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses, as to any competent, material, and relevant facts, inspect documents, and make oral argument.~~

~~(6) The review body shall act as an impartial decision-maker. No member shall participate in or vote on any quasi-judicial matter on a matter that would violate affected persons' constitutional rights to an impartial decision-maker. Impermissible conflicts include, but are not limited to, a member having a fixed opinion prior to the hearing of the matter that is not susceptible to change, undisclosed ex-parte communication, a close financial business or other associational relationship with an affected person, or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter. If an objection is raised to a member's participation and that member does not excuse himself or herself, the remaining members of the board shall by majority vote rule on the objection.~~

~~State Law Reference: G.S. 160A-388 (e1).~~

~~(7) The reviewing body shall act as a fact-finding body and shall approve or disapprove the application in accordance with the evidence presented before it which is substantial, competent, relevant, and material. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not preclude reliance by the decision-making board on evidence that would not be admissible under the rules of evidence as applied in the trial division of the General Court of Justice if (i) the evidence was admitted without objection or (ii) the evidence appears to be sufficiently trustworthy and was admitted under such circumstances that it was reasonable for the decision-making board to rely upon it. The term "competent evidence," as used in this subsection, shall not be deemed to include the opinion testimony of lay witnesses as to any of the following:~~

- ~~i. The use of property in a particular way would affect the value of other property.~~
- ~~ii. The increase in vehicular traffic resulting from a proposed development would pose a danger to the public safety.~~
- ~~iii. Matters about which only expert testimony would generally be admissible under the rules of evidence.~~

~~State Law reference: G.S. 160-393(k)(3).~~

~~(8) The burden of proof is upon the party who files the application, and if the party fails to meet its burden, the reviewing body shall deny the request.~~

~~(9) Every decision shall include the vote, abstention from voting, or absence of each member. The decision of the quasi-judicial proceeding, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, shall be filed in the Office of the City Clerk. A written copy shall be delivered to the applicant, the owner of the subject property and to any person who has filed a request for such copy with the Office of the City Clerk or with the chairperson of the review board at the time of its hearing of the case. Delivery shall be by any of the following means: personal service, registered mail, or certified mail, return receipt requested or electronic mail if electronic notification is requested.~~

~~(Ord. No. 509-TC-230, §§6-8, TC-278, 9-5-88; Ord. No. 662-TC-253, §§5-9, 11-5-85; Ord. No. 783-TC-153, §1, 11-3-81; Ord. No. 519-TC-132, §§3-5, TC-E-80, 11-4-80; Ord. No. 705-TC-78, TC-112, §§1, 2, 7-7-78; Ord. No. 239-TC-322, §§1, 2, TC-19-88, 10-25-88; Ord. No. 1995-695-TC-116, §2, TC-19-95, 8-1-95; Ord. No. 1997-137-TC-153, §2, TC-18-96, 6-17-97; Ord. No. 1999-536-TC-177, §§1, 2, 4-6-99; Ord. No. 2005-939-TC-276, §1, 12-6-05; Ord. No. 2006-104-TC-293, §3, TC-18-06, 10-3-06; Ord. No. 2010-706-TC-331, §20, TC-1-10, 2-16-10)~~

~~(b) General Facts To Be Considered:~~

~~Uniform rules and standards are set forth in this chapter, which regulate the interpretation of the text of this chapter and the Official Zoning Maps, §§10-2002(a), [10-2163](#), the appeal from administrative decisions [§10-2142](#), the issuance of variances [§10-2043](#), and the issuance of special use permits approved by Board of Adjustment (§§10-2144, [10-2146.3](#)) or approved by City Council [§10-2145](#). Under this authority, the reviewing body is required to determine the applicability of facts to a particular case. It is recognized that the required facts are not reducible to any precise formula, but rather they must be gathered from the varying circumstances of the actual cases as they arise.~~

~~In passing on any case the reviewing body shall determine that the request meets all applicable requirements of this Code, and if there are conflicts between the Code provisions, the more restrictive shall apply unless a lesser standard is authorized by an overlay district.~~

~~In passing on any case, and as a further guide to its decision-making, the reviewing body may also consider, among other things the following, if relevant to the requested interpretation, appeal, variance, and special use permit:~~

- ~~(1) The character and use of *buildings* and structures adjoining or in the vicinity of the *property* mentioned in the application.~~
 - ~~(2) The number of *persons* residing, studying, working in or otherwise occupying *buildings* adjoining or in the vicinity of the *property* mentioned in the application.~~
 - ~~(3) Traffic conditions in the area and accessibility of the *building* for fire and police protection.~~
 - ~~(4) Accessibility of light and air to the *premises* and to the *property* in the vicinity.~~
 - ~~(5) The location, kind and size of surface and subsurface structures in the vicinity of the *property* mentioned in the application, such as water mains, sewers and other utilities.~~
 - ~~(6) Materials of combustible, hazardous, explosive, or inflammable nature to be sold, stored, or kept on the *premises*.~~
 - ~~(7) Protection of occupants of the *building* from stormwater, noise, dust, on *street* parking, odor, vibration, and gases.~~
 - ~~(8) The type of electric illumination for the proposed use, with special reference to its effect on nearby structures and the glare, if any, from such illumination in surrounding sleeping quarters.~~
 - ~~(9) The public records and other competent testimony concerning the location of the zoning district boundary lines.~~
 - ~~(10) The relation of the proposed application to conditions in the vicinity which have changed since the zoning district was originally determined.~~
- ~~(Ord. No. 1992-111-TC-42, §58, TC-19-92, 12-8-92)~~

(b) General Conditions and Limitations.

When passing on any case authorized in this chapter, the reviewing body is authorized to impose reasonable conditions and safeguards that limit the request as *may* be necessary or appropriate. Such limitations and conditions and safeguards *may* include, but are not limited to, the *following*:

- (1) Access with respect to pedestrian and automotive safety, traffic flow, emergency service.
- (2) Appearance including architecture, fenestration and materials.
- (3) Dedication of *street* and utility rights-of-way to the public, and facility improvements.
- (4) Drainage with respect to erosion, siltation, pollution, flooding.
- (5) Duration of the variance or special use for either a limited or an indefinite period of time.
- (6) Intensity including such considerations as size, location, hours and/or conditions of operation, and number of participants.
- (7) Landscaping, screening, fencing with respect to protecting affected *properties* from anticipated noise, loss of privacy, and glare; preserving of important natural features; or harmonizing the request with affected *properties*.
- (8) Location and character.
- (9) Control or elimination of noise, dust, vibration, and lighting.
- (10) Off-*street* parking.
- (11) Provision of recreational space and facilities.
- (12) Signage, if any, with respect to type, size, placement, illumination, compatibility, *property* values of the *affected area*.
- (13) Use restrictions.

(Ord. No. 684-TC-257, §§1, 2, TC-31-85, 12-3-85)

(c) Review Proceedings for Quasi-Judicial Proceedings ~~by the City Council or the Board of Adjustment.~~

All quasi-judicial decisions of the Board of Adjustment and the City Council, whether or not such decision contain limiting conditions, may be set aside or modified upon a finding that:

- (1) Fraud, material, misrepresentation or other misconduct occurred at the proceeding before the reviewing body ~~City Council or Board of Adjustment~~; or
- (2) Violation of any limiting condition imposed in accordance with subsection (c) above or violation of any provision of this chapter exists on the subject *property*.

No decision *shall* be set aside or modified until the landowner and tenant is sent *written* notice and a hearing on the matter is first held.

If a review proceeding is held to determine that the applicable conditions and provisions of this chapter are being met, special attention to the impact of the original action on adjoining *properties* and the extent financial investments were made in reliance of the decision, particularly for decisions made prior to the application of this provision. After the hearing the prior decision *may* be reversed, modified, or affirmed.

After the application of this provision, all quasi-judicial decisions ~~of the Board of Adjustment and of the City Council~~ *shall* include a statement that its decision is subject to review for fraud, material misrepresentation, or other misconduct at the proceeding or for violations on the subject *property* of either any provision of this chapter or an imposed limiting condition, and upon such a determination the decision *may* be reversed, modified, or affirmed. The warning statement *shall* also contain the *following*: "If any of the conditions affixed hereto or any part thereof *shall* be held invalid or void, then this decision *shall* be void and of no effect."

Editor's note: This subsection was first applied to special use permits issued by the Board of Adjustment on December 3, 1985, and all other quasi decisions on January 1, 1992.

Note: Judicial review of decision of administrative agencies, Local Rules of Court, 10th Judicial District.

Section 3. Revise Raleigh City Code Section 10-2142 to read:

Sec. 10-2142. APPEALS.

Appeal of any administrative decision shall be processed in accordance with Part 10A, Article 10 of the City Code, otherwise known as the Unified Development Ordinance.

~~(a) Right of Appeal.~~

~~Any person aggrieved or any agency or officer, department, board, including the governing board of the City of Raleigh affected by any decision, order, requirement, or determination relating to the interpretation, compliance, or application of chapters 1 and 2 of this Part and made by an administrative official charged with the enforcement of these chapters may file an appeal to the Board of Adjustment. If an administrative official charged with enforcement of chapter 1 and 2 of this part is unable to make a decision because of vagueness or ambiguity in the meaning or application of these chapters or the zoning map, determine a lot or zoning district boundary line, determine whether a proposed use is allowed within a zoning district, or resolve similar questions or uncertainties, the official is hereby authorized to bring an appeal to the Board of Adjustment.
(Ord. No. 1997-137 TC 153, §2, TC 18-96, 6-17-97)~~

~~(b) Filing of Appeal.~~

~~Appeals shall be taken within times prescribed by the Board of Adjustment rules by filing with the Sessions Reporter, Office of the City Clerk, 222 West Hargett Street a notice of appeal and by specifying the grounds therefor on forms provided by the City. The official from whom the appeal is taken shall forthwith transmit to the Board all papers constituting the record on which the decision appealed from was taken.~~

~~(c) [Basis of Appeals.]~~

~~All appeals shall be subject to the provisions of [§10-2141](#).
Cross references: Interpretation of the Zoning Code [§10-2002\(a\)](#); interpretation of the Official Zoning Maps, [§10-2163](#); refund of filing fees, [§10-2141\(a\)\(1\)](#).~~

Section 4. Revise Raleigh City Code Section 10-2143 to read:

Sec. 10-2143. VARIANCE.

Variations shall be processed in accordance with Part 10A, Article 10 of the City Code, otherwise known as the Unified Development Ordinance. When a variance is considered in conjunction with a *Preliminary Site Plan*, the City Council shall use the showings contained within Part 10A , Article 10 of the City Code.

~~(a) In accordance with [§10-2141](#), the Board of Adjustment will hear and decide requests for variances from the requirements of Part 10 chapter 2. Before a variance request is granted the Board must find all of the following:~~

~~(1) That practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship would result if the strict letter of the zoning law were followed.~~

~~(2) That the variance is in accordance with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance.~~
~~(3) That public safety and welfare have been secured and that substantial justice done.~~
~~(4) No change in permitted uses may be authorized by variance.~~
~~(5) Appropriate conditions, which must be reasonably related to the conditions or circumstances that give rise to the need for a variance, may be imposed on any approval issued by the Board.~~
~~The Board may not grant a variance which is not in accordance with the statutory and decisional law of this state.~~
~~The Board may not, absent specific authority, grant a variance which would modify, alter, change, or suspend the requirements of §§10-2144 and 10-2145, and §10-2146.3, or would change the district boundary or zoning classification of the property in question.~~
~~In granting a variance, the Board of Adjustment is authorized to attach safeguards and conditions to the approval as is necessary and appropriate in order to protect established property values in the affected area or to promote the public safety and general welfare. Those conditions may include limitations listed in §10-2141(c).~~
~~Cross reference: Variances to preliminary site plans approved by the City Council in accordance with §10-2132.2(c) require the reapproval of the City Council, §10-2132.2(f)(3)p.~~
~~(Ord. No. 194 TC 312, §4, TC 7-88, 6-26-88; Ord. No. 2005-939 TC 276, §2, 12-6-05)~~

Section 5. Repeal Raleigh City Code Section 10-2171:

~~“Sec. 10-2171 Fee Schedule.~~

~~In order to partially cover the cost to the City of checking the specifications of a development application, keeping records relating to the application, verifying the application, advertising a public hearing on the application, and performing other services required by statute or ordinance in processing the application to its conclusion for any proposed certificate of appropriateness, site plan, master plan, quasi judicial evidentiary hearing, vested rights hearing, zoning amendment or Comprehensive Plan amendment, relative to all standards, regulations and policies as stated in this Code, the following allocation and plan review service fees shall be payable to the City. If a development plan qualifies as a site plan as well as a group housing development, an infill project or a preliminary subdivision per §10-3013(a), only one fee shall be charged based on the highest applicable fee.~~

Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)	
Minor Work—Administrative	\$ 28.00
Major Work—Public Meeting	142.00

~~Major Work—New Building Construction/Additions greater than 25% of the building square footage285.00~~
~~Demolition of Contributing Historic Resource569.00~~
~~Post-approval COA Issuance, Re-review of Conditions of Approval85.00~~
~~Comprehensive Plan Amendment569.00~~
~~Historic Landmark Designation285.00~~
~~Preliminary Site Plans per set of submitted plans~~
~~Site plans on less than 2 acres340.00~~
~~Site plans between 2 and 4 acres909.00~~
~~Site plans greater than 4 acres1,763.00~~
~~Re-review fee (initial application fee includes 2 reviews)Same fee structure as above~~
~~Group housing development854.00~~
~~Post-approval name change petition57.00~~
~~Sunset extension letter57.00~~
~~Planned Development District Master Plan per submittal~~
~~Post-approval revisions allowed by the master plan1,423.00~~
~~Post-approval name change petition57.00~~
~~Quasi-judicial Evidentiary and Vested Rights Hearings~~
~~Board of Adjustment200.00~~
~~City Council200.00~~
~~Zoning~~
~~Conditional use case1,139.00~~
~~General use case569.00~~
~~Planned Development District Master Plan2,847.00~~
~~Text change Code amendment\$285.00~~
~~Waiver petition171.00~~
~~Zoning verification letter28.00~~
~~Except for the fees relating to quasi-judicial evidentiary and vested rights hearings, all the fees appearing on the fee schedule above will be adjusted annually on July 4th based on the average annual prior calendar year United States Department of Labor Consumer Price Index—All Urban Consumers.~~
~~(Ord. No. 2006-104-TC-293, §8, TC-18-06, 10-3-06; Ord. No. 2007-165-TC-299, §2, TC-1-07, 2-6-07; Ord. No. 2008-422, §1, 7-1-08; Ord. No. 2010-706-TC-331, §21, TC-1-10, 2-16-10; Ord. No. 2010-753, §1, 6-28-10; Ord. No. 2011-918, §1, 6-21-11; Ord. No. 2012-65, §1, 6-18-12; Ord. No. 2013-184, §1, 5-7-13, eff. 7-4-13)~~
~~**State law reference:** 1997 Session laws chapter 450, the Wake County Public School System and nonpublic schools of Wake County with 20 or more students qualified under G.S. 115C-555 are exempt from development charges.~~

Section 6. Revise Raleigh City Code Section 10-2144 to insert the following language directly under the section heading:

“The procedure for review of all special use permits *shall* conform to Part 10A, Section 10.2.9 of the City Code, otherwise known as the Unified Development Ordinance. The standards enumerated below in subsection (b) *shall* be applied and reviewed by the Board of Adjustment for all special use permit requests located within Legacy zoning districts, as described in Part 10A, Section 1.3.4 of the City Code.”

Section 7. Repeal Raleigh City Code Section 10-2145 and place the list of alphabetical special uses in section 10-2144.

Section 8. Repeal Raleigh City Code Section 10-2146 in its entirety.

Section 9. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of said conflict.

Section 10. If this ordinance or application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the ordinance which can be given separate effect and to the end the provisions of this ordinance are declared to be severable.

Section 11. This ordinance has been adopted following a duly advertised joint public hearing of the Raleigh City Council and the City Planning Commission following a recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Section 12. This ordinance has been provided to the North Carolina Capital Commission as required by law.

Section 13. This ordinance shall be enforced by law as provided in N.C.G.S. 160A-175 or as provided in the Raleigh City Code. All criminal sanctions shall be the maximum allowed by law notwithstanding the fifty dollar limit in G.S. 14-4(a) or similar limitations.

Section 14. This ordinance shall become effective five (5) days following its adoption.

ADOPTED: September 2, 2014
EFFECTIVE: September 7, 2014
DISTRIBUTION: Planning – Bowers, Crane, Hodge
City Attorney – Botvinick, Hargrove
Department Heads
Transcription Svcs – Taylor