



## Chatham County Planning Board Minutes March 7, 2017

The Chatham County Planning Board met in regular session on the above date in the Agriculture Building Auditorium, Pittsboro, North Carolina. Members present were as follows:

Present:

George Lucier, Chair  
Caroline Siverson, Vice Chair  
Bill Arthur  
Jim Elza  
Gene Galin  
Jamie Hager  
Jon Spoon  
Allison Weakley

Absent:

Brian Bock  
Tony Gaeta  
Emily Moose

Planning Department:

Jason Sullivan, Planning Director  
Cara Coppola, Planner I  
Lynn Richardson, Subdivision Administrator  
Angela Birchett, Zoning Administrator  
Kimberly Tyson, Clerk to the Board  
Kay Everage, Acting Clerical Assistant

- I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:  
Mr. Galin delivered the invocation and afterwards everyone stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
- II. CALL TO ORDER:  
Chair Lucier called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:  
Chair Lucier stated a quorum was present to begin the meeting (8 members were present at this time.)
- IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:  
No changes were proposed and the agenda was considered approved as submitted.
- V. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA:  
Minutes: Consideration of a request for approval of the December 6, 2016 and February 7, 2017 Planning Board minutes. ***This item was removed from consent agenda for discussion.***  
Modifications were as follows.

### **December 6, 2016 Minutes:**

Chair Lucier noted the following corrections:

- Page 123, paragraph beginning “Discussion Followed”, 5<sup>th</sup> sentence – delete ‘in the middle’ and replace with ‘off’ as follows: Mr. Galin stated one reason the Community College decided to put their health services training centers ~~in the middle~~ off US 15-501 Highway....
- Page 126, sentence top page, “He noted that here the sequence is”... #2 delete ‘~~Planning Commission~~’ - replace with: Joint Public Hearing

Ms. Weakley noted the following corrections:

- Page 119, Public Comments:
  - a) Cody Porter’s comments - change misspelled word ‘~~quite~~’ to quiet
  - b) Leslie A. Bunce’s comments - change misspelled word ‘~~impending~~’ to impeding
- Page 120, last paragraph ‘Revised Preliminary Plat/Final Plat’ – add wording, “There was discussion of un-permitted impacts to surface waters”.
- Page 123
  - a) Paragraph 6, “Attorney Nick Robinson was present representing General Shale.....” – add language that ‘Mr. Robinson handed out a proposed amendment and initiated the Zoning Ordinance proposed language’.
  - b) Paragraph 7 (last paragraph), Motion to approve proposed language – Passed

**Minutes read:** Following further discussion, Mr. Copeland made a motion; seconded by Mr. Wilson to adopt ~~the Commissioner’s proposed language~~ to the Zoning Ordinance.....

**Change to read:** Following further discussion, Mr. Copeland made a motion; seconded by Mr. Wilson to adopt to the Commissioners language proposed to the Zoning Ordinance by Mr. Robinson that states, If the Conditional Use Permit Division is adopted that it would not apply to operations that were in existence prior to the adopted text amendment.

**Add language:** Ms. Weakley voted against the motion (to approve proposed language) because of her concern that with text proposed by Nick Robinson existing quarries could expand without a Conditional Use Permit.

Ms. Weakley made a motion; seconded by Ms. Siverson to approve the December 6, 2016 Planning Board Minutes as submitted with the above changes. There was no further discussion and the motion passed 7-0-1 with all Board members present voting in favor of the motion; except Mr. Spoon who abstained. Mr. Spoon stated that his abstention was because he was not on the Planning Board at this time.

### **February 7, 2017 Minutes:**

Mr. Spoon noted the following corrections:

- Page 15, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph that states, “Mr. Gaeta motioned to approve the consent agenda with a unanimous vote to approve the consent agenda”. Mr. Spoon noted that he abstained from this vote. Ms. Hager stated that she also abstained from voting.
- Page 24, last paragraph that states, “For 3M, when this was proposed in 2007, their plan then didn’t have a need ~~for the~~ 1500 foot buffer.....” – change to read, For 3M, when this was proposed in 2007, their plan then didn’t have a need to use property within the 1500 foot buffer.....

- Page 25, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph that states, “Mr. Lucier asks for the vote. It is approved in an 8-2 vote, with ~~Ms. Hager~~ and Mr. Spoon opposed”. Change to read Ms. Moose instead of Ms. Hager.

Ms. Weakley noted the following:

- Page 20, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – define AWT (Agro-Waste Technology)

Ms. Hager noted the following:

- Page 25, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph should state that Ms. Moose (not Ms. Hager) and Mr. Spoon opposed – Mr. Spoon also referenced this as noted above.

Mr. Spoon made a motion; seconded by Ms. Siverson to approve the February 7, 2017 Planning Board Minutes as submitted with the above changes. There was no further discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

## VI. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION:

There were no requests to speak at this time.

## VII. SUBDIVISION:

1. Request by Joyce A. Remick, Trustee for a subdivision variance from the Subdivision Regulation, Section 7.4 B, (3), on parcel #70513 located off Andrews Store Road, SR-1528, to allow a sixth lot be served by a private easement.

Ms. Richardson reviewed the agenda notes for this variance request. She stated that the parcel (#70513) was created in 1996 as part of a major subdivision process to create 8 residential lots on 12 acres on the north side of Andrews Store Road (S. R. 1728 in Baldwin Township); and that the Board of Commissioners approved Baldwin Farm Subdivision on October 16, 1995 and the plat was recorded in 1996. She explained that in 1995 the request before the Board was:

- a) to allow five of the lots to be accessed by a private easement;
- b) two lots to have direct state road frontage with their driveways off Andrews Store Road; and
- c) one additional flag lot with ownership on Andrews Store Road.

Lots 1 and 2 were flag lots with each having 30 feet of ownership on Andrews Store Road. Lots 3, 5, & 6 were proposed to have a private easement over and across the two flag lots for ingress, egress, and installation of utilities.

Ms. Richardson used the large plat map to show the various lots. She reiterated that the private easement was proposed to serve five (5) lots (#'s 1, 2, 3, 5, & 6); and that Section 6.4 B (2) of the pre-2008 Subdivision Regulations states that,

*“Three (3) subdivision lots may be allowed provided that every lot has frontage on a perpetual easement not less than thirty (30) feet in width that meets a public road”.*

Ms. Richardson stated that the developer requested to be allowed to provide access to five lots with a private easement since two of those lots were flag lots with ownership on Andrews Store Road; and that the Board of Commissioners approved the request with a condition that reads, *“Due to the increase in the number of lots served by the private easement, that ‘Baldwin Farm Road’ be improved to the county’s private road construction standards”.* She explained that in 1995 the county private road standards

required in part a 60 foot wide right of way, a 16 foot wide travel way, and 4 inches of crush and run stone; that the Board did not require the lot sizes to meet the private road standards of a 3 acre minimum / 5 acre average; that the developer built the road to the county private road standards and recorded in Deed Book 694, Page 244 a Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions of Easement, Baldwin Farm Subdivision; and that Article IV of the Declaration stated in part "It is required that the road meet county standards for Private Roads". She noted that staff does not know if the road has been maintained to the county private road standards.

Ms. Richardson stated that this request is for a variance from Section 7.4 B (3) of the Chatham County Subdivision Regulations which states in part,

*"Up to four (4) subdivision lots may be allowed provided that every lot has frontage on a perpetual easement not less than thirty (30) feet in width that meets a public road. If additional subdivision lots are to be created and served by the easement, it shall be sixty (60) feet in width and meet other standards required unless a variance is granted."*

She explained that the applicant is requesting to subdivide lot 2 (parcel #70513 which is a flag lot) and to add one (1) additional lot on the easement; and that if approved, the easement will serve six (6) residential lots. Ms. Richardson referenced the following four (4) findings that must be made in order for the Planning Board to recommend an approval and for the Board of Commissioners to grant an approval for a variance. (Note: Findings are underlined followed by Ms. Richardson's comments italicized.)

1. That there are special circumstances or conditions affecting said property such that the strict application of the provisions of this ordinance would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of his/her land. *In 1996 when the lot was created, the Subdivision Regulation allowed three (3) lots to be accessed by a private easement; however, the original developer was granted an approval to provide access to five (5) lots with a road improvement. The current Subdivision Regulation allows four (4) lots to be accessed by a private easement. Baldwin Farm road already serves more lots than are allowed by the Subdivision Regulations, Section 7.4 B (3).*
2. That the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right of the petitioner. *The applicant currently has use of their land as a residential lot. Staff has advised the applicant that as an alternative to subdivision, that it may be possible to construct an accessory dwelling unit on their property that does not exceed 1500 square feet of heated area as long as there is suitable soil for a septic system and repair area and the structure can meet required setbacks from property lines and any stream buffer that may be on the property. Also, staff has told the applicant that if a separate easement can be obtained from an adjoining property owner that it may be possible to further subdivide the property with access to the new lot byway of the new easement.*
3. That the circumstances giving rise to the need for the variance are peculiar to the parcel and are not generally characteristic of other parcels in the jurisdiction of this ordinance. *There are other parcels of land in the county that are accessed by a private easement that cannot be further subdivided due to the number of lots already served by the easement.*

4. That the granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare or injurious to other property in the territory in which said property is situated. *In January, 2014, the County adopted stricter standards of construction for private easements serving more than one (1) lot in order to meet the requirements of the North Carolina Fire Code for emergency vehicle access. Attachment # 4 (in tonight's agenda packet) addresses the standards which require a compacted subgrade that will pass a proof roll with a fully loaded double axel dump truck or other equivalent weighted equipment (25-50 tons), 6" ABC compacted to 90% modified proctor density, a turn-around and/or a pull-out for safe passage of emergency vehicles depending on the length of the easement and certification by a licensed engineer that the roadway meets the requirements.*

Ms. Richardson stated that the Planning Department recommends **denial** of the variance request from the Subdivision Regulation, Section 7.4 B, (3), on parcel #70513 located off Andrews Store Road, SR-1528, to allow a sixth lot be served by a private easement. She noted that if the Planning Board recommends granting approval of the variance request, staff recommends the following three (3) conditions:

1. That the private easement, Baldwin Farm Road, be upgraded from Andrews Store Road to the boundary of the new lot to meet the current construction standards in Section 7.1 D (3), Design and Construction Standards for Private Roads.
2. That the road improvements/construction be made prior to a building permit being issued on the new lot.
3. That the applicant provide an opinion prepared by an attorney that the recorded easement document allows for an additional lot or provide a copy of a recorded amendment to the Declaration of Conditions and Restrictions of Easement allowing for the additional lot.

Board discussion followed. Ms. Weakley stated that 'reason for requested variance' was not included in attachments. After checking, Ms. Richardson realized that this information had inadvertently been omitted from Attachment #1 of tonight's agenda packets. Board members were provided copies within a few minutes, i.e., 3 pages titled, "Subdivision Variances".

Landowner/Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Remick, landowner/applicants were present. Mr. Remick stated that he plans to build a dwelling on the lot regardless; that the land has been perked and a septic system installed; that approval of this request would provide their youngest daughter a future lot; that the road is in the proper condition as required in previous Design and Construction Standards for Private Roads, Section 7.1D of the 1995 Subdivision Regulations. (Note: These standards were amended as noted in Section 7.1D (3) requiring 18 feet width road versus previous 16 feet width requirement). Ms. Remick stated that she and her husband have owned the property for 15 years; that in a perfect world the farmhouse on the land would be paid off but has been refinanced three times; that they have raised five (5) children (four are married and have their own properties); that their last child is not married and does not currently own property; that this request would provide her a separate lot from the farmhouse property; and that the proposed lot is in the far back of the parent tract lot and well screened from surrounding properties.

Adjacent Landowner: Kenneth Bass, 175 Prestonwood Dr., Pittsboro, NC 27312 stated that he doesn't have a problem with the Remick's building a house on the proposed lot but was concerned about water runoff. Mr. Bass's property was indicated on the large plat map along with a small existing water feature. Ms. Richardson stated that a riparian buffer review was done on the existing stream in 2008; and that another riparian buffer review would be required should the variance be approved.

Discussion followed. Some specifics noted were:

- upgrade existing road width and depth of road surface
- limit of no more than four (4) lots on a private easement (currently has 5)
- lots created by a Will are exempt from subdivision by law
- accessory dwelling
- County water line exists along Andrews Store Road

*Motion for Denial - Passed*

Ms. Siverson made a motion; seconded by Ms. Weakley to follow staff recommendation for denial. Ms. Siverson stated that she was sympathetic to the situation but thinks that with the option of taking care of the issue by legal document (Will) it could possibly alleviate the applicant's concerns. There was no further discussion and the motion to recommend denial passed 7-1 with all Board members present voting in favor of the motion; except Ms. Hager who voted against.

VIII. ZONING:

***Item from 2/20/17 Public Hearing***

1. A request by the Chatham County Alcoholic Beverage Control Board for a general legislative rezoning on Parcel No. 11417 located on the Moncure Pittsboro Road from R-5 and R-1 Residential zoning to NB Neighborhood Business, being approximately 0.957 acres, Haw River Township.

Ms. Birchett reviewed the agenda notes for this rezoning request. She stated that a legislative public hearing was held for this request on February 20, 2017; that Planning staff introduced the request and the applicant's attorney, Patrick Bradshaw provided the presentation; and that no one signed up for public input. She noted that at the end of last year the applicant received rezoning approval by the Commissioners for (2) parcels, #11503 of 1.57 acres and #11505 of 1.46 acres, from R-5 and R-1 Residential zoning to NB (Neighborhood Business) for the location of a new package store. She reviewed the following four (4) standards that must be addressed for this type zoning map amendment as outlined in Section 19 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.

1. *In response to any alleged error in the Ordinance, if any, which may be remedied by this proposed amendment, the applicant claims none.*
2. *The changed or changing conditions, if any, in the area or in the County generally, which make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary for the promotion of the public health, safety, and general welfare. There are currently five other parcels in this immediate area that have received non-residential rezoning approvals that include B-1, Business and NB, Neighborhood Business. Because the area in which*

*this property is located has been viewed as having potential for business use, as noted in the Land Use Development Plan, properties have been rezoned to business classifications.*

She noted that Mr. Bradshaw stated at the public hearing that the applicant attempted to negotiate a contract for this property when the other two properties were placed under contract; that the landowner was not ready to sell; and that this parcel could be used as an access drive that would move it away from the US 1 interchange which is safer and provides better traffic flow.

3. *The manner in which the proposed amendment will carry out the intent and purpose of any adopted plans. The adopted Land Conservation and Development Plan encourages the creation of Economic Development Centers. The Moncure-Haywood area is specifically noted as a location to build on access to highways and existing industry, and commercial uses. This property is adjacent to the property that was rezoned to Neighborhood Business in October 2016 and that fronts on US 1, and has access to the county water system.*

She stated that the property is also located within the RCSA (River Corridor Special Area) watershed district and is limited to 36% impervious surface without the use of curb and gutter; that the RCSA district does allow for up to 50% impervious surface with approval of a special non-residential intensity allocation (SNIA); that although the properties are located within 2,500 feet of a major river, this is a less restrictive than RC (River Corridor), and as a result, there are fewer limitations on the types of non-residential uses allowed than are listed in River Corridor district; and that the impervious surface limitations aid in the protection of water resources and environmental protection.

4. *Other circumstances, factors, and reasons which the applicant offers in support of the proposed amendment. Neighborhood Business is the least intensive business district provided in the Zoning Ordinance and the RCSA watershed district also allows more flexibility than River Corridor. The use also continues the promotion expanding businesses in the Moncure-Haywood as provided in the Land Conservation and Development Plan.*

Ms. Birchett stated that it is the opinion of the Planning Department all standards are being or will be met through permitting requirements and therefore the rezoning request should be approved; that the Planning Board is requested to review this rezoning and make a recommendation for approval or denial to the Board of Commissioners; and that the Planning Board has up to three (3) meetings in which to provide that recommendation. She noted that should the Board recommend approval of the request, staff proposes the following consistency statement:

***It is the opinion of the Planning Board that the rezoning request to rezone Parcel No. 11417, being 0.957 acres, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Land Use Plan of Chatham County. Specifically, the Plan seeks to support the creation of Economic Development Centers in the Moncure-Haywood area and further supports efforts in the protection of surface and ground waters by limiting the amount of impervious surface allowed on the properties.***

Ms. Birchett distributed a copy of Mr. Harold Taylor's written comments dated March 7, 2017. It was noted that Mr. Taylor is a resident of this community and not an adjacent landowner. Some of his concerns were:

- a liquor store would impact the quality of life for his livable community
- residents want to remain proud of their homes and community and maintain a safe haven for their families and neighbors
- encourages Board members to reconsider being the conduit for a liquor store owner or franchise to construct a facility that does not support or add value to their community.

A copy of Mr. Taylor's comments is filed in the Planning Department.

Mr. Harold Taylor was present. Mr. Taylor reiterated his concerns referenced above. He noted that some neighborhood residents were unaware of a potential liquor store. Chair Lucier explained that rezoning action occurred last October for the ABC store (as referenced earlier tonight).

Attorney Patrick Bradshaw was present representing the applicant. Mr. Bradshaw noted that he would not restate everything he presented at the recent public hearing but that some key points addressed earlier by Ms. Birchett were:

- property is located exactly in an area that the existing Land Use Plan calls for the designation of an economic development center
- existing zoning will not allow the use of the property for uses consistent with the economic development center
- access to highway, structure and county water.

Regarding particular uses, Mr. Bradshaw stated the issue before the Board is whether this property is appropriate for the Neighborhood Business (NB) zoning and not whether it is appropriate for a liquor store; that the applicant is obviously the ABC Board; that the Planning Board has to consider all the potential uses that are allowed in the Neighborhood Business District and whether it is the appropriate location for this proposed zoning; and that the existing Chatham County Land Use Plan indicates that the proposed zoning area is appropriate for the Neighborhood Business zoning.

Board discussion followed. Ms. Birchett used the large plat map to indicate existing commercial properties in the proposed area. Ms. Weakley stated that she voted against the rezoning (i.e., last September - Parcels No. 11503 of 1.57 acres and No. 11505 of 1.46 acres totally 3.03 acres) because it was currently zoned R-5 for a reason; that the zoning classification protects the river from more intensive uses; and that the Land Use Plan also states, 'in addition to supporting economic development in this area, also supports protection of surface and ground waters'. Ms. Weakley cited that this is a big concern in this area of the Deep River; that she is concerned about standard #2 addressed above; that she has a big issue with perpetuating Neighborhood Business or any other zoning other than low density residential within close proximity to the Deep River to protect our water resources; and that 36% impervious surface is way too much to protect surface waters. Mr. Elza stated that he supports general zoning so we don't have to come back frequently to decide usage for a particular property (i.e., grocery store,



antique shop or ABC store); and that this is somewhat of a compromise between an interchange and the river.

Attorney Bradshaw addressed the above concerns. He stated that the front of this property is zoned R-1(residential); that the property is in a 'river corridor special area' watershed that has a higher level of protection; and that this area has already been considered appropriate for commercial uses by Chatham County. It was noted that the area is not in a flood zone.

Motion to Approve Consistency Statement - Passed

Ms. Siverson made a motion; seconded by Mr. Spoon to approve the consistency statement as proposed by staff as follow

***It is the opinion of the Planning Board that the rezoning request to rezone Parcel No. 11417, being 0.957 acres, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Land Use Plan of Chatham County. Specifically, the Plan seeks to support the creation of Economic Development Centers in the Moncure-Haywood area and further supports efforts in the protection of surface and ground waters by limiting the amount of impervious surface allowed on the properties.***

There was no further discussion and the motion passed 7-1 with all Board members present voting in favor of the motion; except Ms. Weakley who voted against.

Motion for Approve Request - Passed

Mr. Spoon made a motion; seconded by Mr. Arthur to grant approval of the request by the Chatham County Alcoholic Beverage Control Board for a general legislative rezoning on Parcel No. 11417 located on the Moncure Pittsboro Road from R-5 and R-1 Residential zoning to NB Neighborhood Business, being approximately 0.957 acres, Haw River Township, as submitted and as recommended by staff. There was no further discussion and the motion passed 7-1 with all Board members present voting in favor of the motion; except Ms. Weakley who voted against.

3 Minute Break

IX. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN Update and Discussion:

Mr. Sullivan presented a 14 minute video, 'Plan Chatham Presentation February 2017' prepared by Mr. Jake Petrosky, AICP, associate with LandDesign. This PowerPoint was also shown at the recent community meetings.

Following the video, Chair Lucier stated that the Comprehensive Plan review is a multi-step process for the Board; that currently Planning staff are meeting with a number of other advisory boards trying to get comments before the draft is submitted for public hearing; that after public hearing the Planning Board will revisit the proposed Plan and make recommendation to the Board of Commissioners; and that the idea of having a subcommittee to formalize responses is probably a good idea. He noted that after tonight's discussion Board members would have a chance to submit written comments to the subcommittee that would be transmitted (along with other advisory board comments) to the Planning Department; and that after the draft is completed the Planning Board would make a recommendation to the Commissioners.

Cara Coppola began the discussion and her summation of the Board's review is as follows: **Blue Text** = questions for Planning Board to discuss

Straight Text = perceived consensus from the Boards discussion

*Italicized* = discussion points to be considered further

**1. Looking through the Future Land Use Map, the future Land Use map descriptions, the Parks and Rec Map, and the Transportation Map, are there any changes or additions?**

a. Future Land Use Map

**i. How should 3M be reflected on the Map?**

1. Consensus from Board that 3M should be designated Heavy Industrial. CAM and Moncure Site should match because intended uses do not fall within the description of employment center. (New designation created for those areas to Heavy Industrial with additional consideration to the description to reflect the mix of uses that could occur).

ii. Crossroads Community designations:

1. Consensus to remove Bells Landing node from the Map to limit development near the Lake

2. *Remove Asbury from the Map?*

3. Consensus remove Terrell's from the map due to visibility and safety concerns of the roadway handling a large amount of commuter traffic. Instead, add a crossroad community designation near the intersection of Castle Rock Farm Rd and NC 87 where there is existing Light Industrial

4. Add community crossroad where Frosty's Trading Post is located at the intersection of Jones Ferry Rd and Crawford Dairy Rd

iii. Briar Chapel should be designated "Compact Mixed Use" not "Commercial Center" on Map.

iv. *Historic Old Pace's Mill at the crossing of Jones Ferry above 15-501 could be a potential preserve or historic site. (There is historic category designation on the Parks & Rec Map – should this site be added?)*

v. *Board had a general discussion on Agricultural Areas & Subdivision options. Question will be posed to the Ag Advisory Board as well. Do we want to drive down the number of lots or allow the same number of lots with requirement of Ag Friendly design? Consideration to well water and traffic impacts.*

vi. *Board had general discussion about Conservation Areas: should subdivision design be encouraged (i.e. density bonus) or required?*

vii. Consensus of Board emphasized the importance of the area between Farrington and Bynum to remain Rural and Conservation designation to avoid all of 15-501 becoming a strip of commercial development.

viii. *Consider vertical development in more concentrated areas?*

**2. Looking through the Goals & the Boards of Recommendations (to achieve those goals). Do you see anything missing or overlooked?**

- i. Median Price should be used for information about Affordable Housing instead of Average Cost of Home Built in Q1. Additionally Sources should be included.
3. **What other design recommendations would you want to see illustrated in the plan? (only 1 additional illustration)**
- a. Ag Friendly Development – redo? Consideration to how this type of development is friendly farms in terms of density and showing operating farms in illustration.
  - b. Moncure Village Center
  - c. ? 15-501 mixed use, other additional?
4. **What do you see as the Priorities for Chatham in the next 1 -3 years? What things will have the greatest impact?**

Discussion followed. Mr. Sullivan stated that the subcommittee should have ample time to evaluate and compile comments from Planning Board members prior to next month’s meeting (April 4, 2017); that the April meeting would be a good time to wrap up comments submitted and forward to the consultants to make adjustments; and that we could then begin moving to the next step. Ms. Siverson and Chair Lucier volunteered to serve on the subcommittee (there were no other volunteers from the Board). Mr. Sullivan stated that staff would send Board members an Email with questions rewritten and a summary of tonight’s feedback. Mr. Galin stated that the video earlier tonight mentioned that the average sales price of a home in Chatham County for the first quarter was \$436,000; and that he suggests the current ‘Median Listing Price’ in Chatham County of \$296,000 be added. Chair Lucier requested that Board comments be forwarded to Ms. Siverson by March 20, 2017. He reiterated that the Planning Board would review the Comprehensive Plan again following public hearing.

X. NEW BUSINESS:  
None

XI. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

- **Chatham County Conservation Partnership** - Ms. Weakley informed the Board of the next scheduled meeting as follows:

April 20, 2017 from 9:00 am to 12:00 noon  
Chatham County Agriculture & Conference Center (new Ag. Center)  
Topic – Nature Based Economic Development

- **Pittsboro Planning Board** – Chair Lucier stated that he attended last night’s meeting of the Pittsboro Planning Board; that only four (4) of their nine (9) members were present; that Chatham Park was discussed (phasing plan, lighting, signage and etc.); and that their Board voted on some items. Chair Lucier explained that he is liaison to the Pittsboro Planning Board and that Mr. Brian Taylor (Pittsboro Planning Board member) is liaison to our Planning Board; and that staff would begin sending Mr. Taylor a copy of our monthly Planning Board packet. Mr. Taylor indicated that he plans to attend our Board meetings.

- **Sewer Connections for Bynum** – Ms. Hager stated that some citizens had asked about possible sewer connections coming to Bynum. Mr. Sullivan noted that he was not aware of any plans.

XII. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

- **Minor Subdivisions/Exempt Maps** – Mr. Sullivan noted that this information was included in tonight's agenda packet.
- **Westview at Norwood Estates Site Visit** – Mr. Sullivan stated that staff received a First Plat submittal for 49 lots on 107 acres; that site visits are scheduled for Tuesday, March 14 at 5:30 pm and Thursday, March 16 at 10:00 am; that this proposal is located off Mann's Chapel Road, south of Fieldstone on north side of road, next to Heartland Grove Subdivision; and that staff would Email Board members additional information later this week. He noted that application material is also available on the County's website.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:23 pm.

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
George Lucier, Chair                      Date

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
Kimberly J. W. Tyson, Clerk to the Board                      Date  
Kay Everage, Acting Clerical Assistant