



**Chatham County Planning Board
Approved Minutes
October 2, 2018**

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:

Carolina Siverson, Chair
George Lucier, Vice-Chair
Jamie Hager
Allison Weakley
Tony Gaeta
Bill Arthur
Gene Galin
Emily Moose
Jon Spoon

Absent:

Brian Bock
Clyde Frazier

Planning Department:

Jason Sullivan, Planning Director
Dan Garrett, Clerk to the Planning Board

- I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:
Mr. Gaeta delivered the invocation and afterwards everyone stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
- II. CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Siverson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:
Chair Siverson stated there is a quorum (9 members were present and 2 absent). Mr. Bock and Mr. Frazier were absent.
- IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Approval of the Agenda- Chair Siverson asked the board members if there were any issues with the Agenda. There was not and it was approved.

- V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Chair Siverson asked for consideration of a request for approval of the September 4, 2018 minutes. Some of the board members would like to add some questions and answers from the well and septic presentation and the September 4, 2018 minutes were not voted. Some board members are going to provide their notes and then they will be added into the minutes.
- VI. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION: There were no citizens signed up to speak.
- VII. SUBDIVISION:
 - 1. Request by F-L Legacy Owner, LLC for subdivision Final Plat approval of **The Legacy at Jordan Phase 4A2-B** consisting of 29 lots on 8.06 acres, located off SR-1716, Big Woods Road, parcel 92463.

Mr. Sullivan gave an overview from the staff notes and reported that the request before the Board is for final plat approval of The Legacy at Jordan Lake, Phase 4A2-B consisting of 29 lots on 8.06 acres with a financial guarantee. Phase 4A2-B received preliminary plat approval from the Board of Commissioners on September 18, 2017. The final plat conforms to the approved preliminary plat. The pre-2008 Subdivision Regulations allow a final plat to be submitted with a financial guarantee when a minimum of 40% of the total cost of improvement have been completed and when the public health and/or safety will not be endangered. Mitch Craig, PE, CE Group, submitted a cost letter with the final plat submittal certifying that 82% of the required infrastructure had been completed; that all roadways are private and will be constructed to NCDOT standards; that the waterline installation has been completed; and that the roadways are accessible to emergency vehicles. An updated cost letter may be submitted if additional work has been completed prior to recordation of the final plat to reduce the amount of the financial guarantee. The county attorney will review and approve the form of the contract and financial guarantee.

He continued to report that the roadways in The Legacy are private and to be constructed to meet NCDOT's Standards and Specifications, but not reviewed or approved by NCDOT. A third party testing agency has been retained to provide testing and certification. Those records will then be provided to the homeowners' association (HOA). Per Note 12 on the plat, maintenance of the private roads is the sole responsibility of The Legacy at Jordan Lake HOA, Inc. Per Note 13 the maintenance of all park, common and meadow areas are the sole responsibility of The Legacy at Jordan Lake HOA, Inc.

Mr. Sullivan informed that the Technical Review Committee met on September 12, 2018 to review the request. Staff had no concerns or questions. The submittal meets the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Sullivan concluded by saying that there was one condition of preliminary plat approval as follows:

1. The road name 'Two Creeks Loop' be shown on the final plat.

This condition has been met. The Planning Department recommends granting final plat approval of **The Legacy at Jordan Phase 4A2-B** with the following conditions:

1. The county attorney shall review and approve the contract and financial guarantee prior to final plat recordation.
2. The final plat shall not be recorded until the engineer has certified that the roadway providing access to the parcels are accessible to emergency vehicles.
3. The final plat cover sheet, shall include Phase 5A3.

Mr. Sullivan informed the Board that the developer, Mitch Craig from CE Group is available to answer questions.

Board Discussion followed and some items discussed were as follows:

- Vice-Chair Lucier asked, why wasn't Phase 5A3 placed on the final plat? Mr. Sullivan stated that it is a question for Mr. Craig to answer, but assumed that it was the timing as to when the final plat was drawn and the actual recording of the approval from the BOC of Phase 5A3. Mr. Craig stated that was correct. Mr. Sullivan also stated that normally the developer will only show the final platted lots on the cover sheet.
- Vice-Chair Lucier asked, how many lots were on 5A3? Mr. Craig stated that there are 15 lots. Vice-Chair Lucier stated that it had been changed from the original proposal to reduce the number of lots. He also stated that Ms. Weakley had some issues as well with the steepness of slopes and the proximity to Parkers Creek. Vice-Chair Lucier inquired if that was in fact Phase 5A3. Mr. Sullivan stated yes.
- Mr. Spoon stated that the Planning Board allows for a lot of leniency in developments that put a huge amount of faith in the "to be determined" home owners associations to maintain roads. He stated he doesn't like to see roads get built and then turned over to a HOA that has never really forms and the roads fall apart and people get upset. Mr. Spoon asked if there was anything the Planning Board could do prevent that.

Mr. Sullivan stated, concerning HOA's and private roads, there doesn't seem to be an issue, but the public roads are the issue. Mr. Sullivan stated that there are subdivisions with public roads where the developer said that they will be responsible for road maintenance in the interim period between the development being finalized and DOT taking it over for maintenance. There have been several situations where the HOA was never really fully formed and the developer for whatever reason did not petition DOT to take over the maintenance when it met the threshold requirements for the DOT. Mr. Sullivan stated that Chestnut Crossing was a good example where the roads deteriorated, the residents bought the property, and saw the public Right-of-Way and thought it was accepted for maintenance, but it was not and the roads deteriorated.

Mr. Spoon asked if we could protect people against this issue. Mr. Sullivan stated that they have tried, but the legislature removed the authority. He stated that there was a road maintenance agreement that would have applied to new subdivisions, based on what other jurisdiction were already doing and it was to cover that interim period to have a financial guarantee in place, separate from the financial guarantee that is received for finalizing construction. There would have been two financial guarantees, but the legislature eliminated those and the ability to do that in 2015. Mr. Spoon asked, if it was buyer beware? Mr. Sullivan stated it was buyer beware. Mr. Sullivan also stated that it is a problem state wide and part of the legislation, there was supposed to be a study by NCDOT to evaluate this and to come up this recommendations, and as far as he knew, that part of the legislation has not been forward.

Mr. Sullivan stated that where there is a private road, and known that they are private, there is better compliance with the HOA truly being formed and taking over the maintenance. A board member asked, if they could require any kind of disclosure for continuing cost? Mr. Sullivan stated that they require a note be placed on the plat as to who is responsible for maintenance in the interim period, but it is a civil matter if their roads aren't taken over for maintenance.

Ms. Hager stated that every time this comes up that a statement should made about it so there is a record and it can be captured as public record.

- Mr. Spoon asked, is any of the private communities that are really close to each other, do they have any plans to connect to each other, or just rely on the roads that already exist? Mr. Sullivan stated that there are areas where there are roads to stub to adjoining tracts, but because it is a private road the disposition of how that road can be used is left to the developer. For example, the Legacy and the

Preserve, where there is the possibility of a connection, but doubtful if it will happen. Mr. Sullivan stated that there is water connectivity, but the staff doesn't get involved in who is driving over it.

Vice-Chair Lucier stated that there are other developments where they are close to connecting, but the connectivity is not there because you would have to cut through people's properties and we wouldn't want to do that. He also stated that there were some developments that were trying to have interconnectivity on Hatley Rd. Mr. Sullivan stated that there would have been both water and road interconnectivity from Hatley all the way to Big Woods, but that project expired.

Mr. Sullivan stated that, where there are public roads and public Rights-of-Way, where the dedication of right of way is required, occasionally those are able to be opened up. It is easier when it is a public Right-of-Way because we can force that issue as long as the grades work. Mr. Sullivan gave an example of two developments that are close and have a stub out, but the grades are too steep and it might not work to connect them. The developer will have to evaluate and prove why it won't work to connect the two developments. He stated that there is a fire station very close to the development and could be accessed quickly if the two developments were to be connected. If not, the fire department would have to go out of their way to get to the development because of road design.

- Ms. Weakley stated that the attachment that was e-mailed to the board did not entirely match the plat that was in front of them tonight. She was concerned about the stream buffer width not being noted, but was satisfied that it was displayed on the final plat in the packet and on the final plat. Ms. Weakley said that she was glad that note number 11 shows that all water boundaries are subject to change due to natural causes, because they will change, especially with all the stormwater.
- Ms. Weakley stated under note 13, maintenance of all park, common, and meadow areas shown here on, are the total responsibility of the Legacy of Jordan Lake HOA. She asked, isn't that true of the stream buffers as well, because the lot lines are not in the stream buffers? Shouldn't the stream buffers also be under the responsibility of the HOA? Mr. Sullivan referred the question to Mr. Craig with CE Group. Mr. Craig stated he did not know the answer to that question. Mr. Sullivan stated that maybe it is considered part of the common area. Ms. Weakley asked, if they are part of the common area to ask that stream buffers explicitly be stated as part of the common area.

- Ms. Weakley stated that the stormwater pond is not shown on the plan and not sure what plan it is shown on. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Phase 4-A2 preliminary plat showed a larger area and in more detail. Ms. Weakley stated that it was not shown on the preliminary plat as well. Her concern was that home owners deserve to know what infrastructure they will be responsible for and it should be shown on the plat. Ms. Weakley pointed to where the stormwater pond was located, but it was not shown on the plat. It was shown on the P.U.D. modification, but nowhere has it been shown on the preliminary plat. A board member asked, if they asked for approval for those sections where the pond was going to be placed. Ms. Weakley stated they asked for a preliminary plat from us and that back in August of 2017 that was approved. She stated she voted against it as with three other members of the Planning Board. Ms. Weakley stated she had the minutes from the August 1, 2017 meeting reviewing the Legacy 4-A2, which is what they are considering now, and it was approved.
- Ms. Weakley stated that this is an area with steep slopes. She stated the fact that they are only treating the first half inch of stormwater, and hurricane Florence brought us ten inches in four days. The stormwater is going directly into Jordan Lake along with everything it is carrying. Ms. Weakley stated in the minutes from August 1st when she voted against this phase, stormwater was a big issue, as was Parkers Creek and Jordan Lake. She also stated, this is a natural heritage, a natural area recognized by the State. Ms. Weakley stated if you look at the slopes in the phase we are considering tonight, there are a bunch of 25% or greater slopes. She stated she still has big concerns, especially since the lots are so tiny and the houses are going to be so big. Basically, it will be nothing but impervious surface on every one of these sites, with no stormwater management other than retaining the first half inch of rainfall. Not on the individual home site, but probably just the road that is being captured. Ms. Weakley reminded that this is right on Jordan Lake.

Vice-Chair Lucier wanted to be clear and asked Ms. Weakley what she was asking for exactly. He stated that the stormwater ponds need to be shown on the plat. Ms. Weakley stated, also the common areas, including stream buffers to be noted in the notes as a responsibility of the HOA. That way the HOA is aware that is their responsibility too.

- Vice-Chair Lucier asked if they could have any information from the developer on the stormwater pond as to where it is located. Mr. Craig stated that they can put the stormwater ponds on the plat. Ms. Weakley showed the Planning Board where the stormwater ponds are located on the plat for clarification.

Mr. Sullivan asked Mr. Craig if it was their intention to show the stormwater pond, because they are not done with construction in that area. Mr. Craig stated that it is not a pond yet, but an erosion control structure. He stated that there is phase 4A3 in that area. Ms. Weakley asked, will it be included in another phase? Mr. Craig stated, yes. Mr. Sullivan stated that is why there is Tract B, because they are not done in that area. Mr. Sullivan stated there is 114 acres.

- Mr. Spoon asked, the water from the lots that we are to approve is going to a place that is not shown on the map? Ms. Weakley stated the water is going straight into a stream. No treatment, no volume control and everything that is coming off of a roof drain is going directly down a steep slope into a stream. This is why it is really important and she stated she has asked Legacy to consider this in their design because it is a big problem. If you look at a map where this stream drains to, there is Jordan Lake right there. The critical area for Jordan Lake for the drinking water is close. This is as close as you can get to Jordan Lake with developing and it is on very steep slopes.
- Ms. Weakley asked if Mr. Sullivan could pull up the conservation map on Chatham GIS. Ms. Weakley stated that Mr. Sullivan had turned on the 25% slopes and greater. She stated that steep slopes are 15% or greater, so this isn't even showing all the steep slopes. Mr. Sullivan reminded the Planning Board concerning the steep slopes that this is all built and this is the final plat. The houses are not there, but the infrastructure footprint and the road is all in. Ms. Weakley stated that she voted against the preliminary plat for these reasons and she stated she is not going to vote for the final plat.
- A board member asked for clarification of the problem with the steep slopes. Ms. Weakley informed that there needs to be volume control and treatment, before it runs into the streams. Mr. Arthur asked, how do you fix this? Ms. Weakley stated that the stormwater pond is only treating the road runoff, it is not treating the runoff from all the houses on steep slopes. Every single one of these houses is going to have roof drains that go directly towards the stream. That is a lot of volume of water going on steep slopes and into the stream. She continued saying over time you get a lot of erosion, and the water coming off the roof is a

straight shot to the stream. Cumulatively it is really destructive to streams and areas adjacent to streams.

Mr. Arthur asked, what is the solution? Ms. Weakley stated, to capture the runoff and treat it, slow it down so it is not running down the steep slope. Chair Siverson stated that we can't enforce that. Mr. Gaeta stated that Ms. Weakley has brought up some very serious issues and asked, how would the stormwater be captured? Ms. Weakley stated that the stormwater could be redirected so it will flow into the stormwater pond instead of eroding the steep slopes.

Mr. Gaeta asked, what kind of authority do we have, if any to require that? Ms. Weakley stated that this is a pre-2008 development and a constant problem with older developments. Mr. Gaeta asked, if this was a newer development, they would have to redirect that stormwater runoff to a pond? Ms. Hager stated that there would need to be some sort of strategy that demonstrated either in filtration, or slowing it down.

Vice-Chair Lucier stated that prior to 2008 they did not have a stormwater ordinance and this development was initially approved in 2005 or 2006. Mr. Gaeta stated that we are sort of stuck then.

Mr. Craig stated that it was approved without having to do any of that, but they gave a concession that they would do something. He stated it was more than what they are required to do. Chair Siverson stated they put an extra 50 feet on the buffer. Mr. Craig added, and the ponds that they are building are not required. Ms. Weakley stated that was a concession because there was a lot of out pouring of public input including her as well.

- Mr. Gaeta asked, what if this Planning Board voted by majority against this final plat. Then what would happen? Ms. Weakley stated that the BOC makes a decision. Vice-Chair Lucier stated that the Planning Board is recommending to the BOC their decision. Vice-Chair continued stating that it has always been a struggle for him and shared with the Planning Board when this development was approved, the Planning Board voted against it 7-3. He stated he voted against this development because of its proximity to Jordan Lake and concerns with stormwater. The BOC at the time did not take our recommendation and voted to let them proceed. He also stated, to the developers credit they did some things that they were not required to do, to lessen some of the problems with it.

Vice-Chair Lucier stated he still believes this development should have never been approved.

Ms. Weakley stated that where this is going to continue to come into play is Jordan Lake water quality, it is degraded and it is not getting better. State legislature has postponed rules year after year. So everyone in this development is drinking water that is coming out of Jordan Lake and she stated that we need to do what we can do to stop the bleeding.

- Mr. Gaeta stated he is of the mind to move it to the Commissioners and vote against it and let the BOC make a decision. He also asked, is there County Commissioners today that would say, stop Legacy? Chair and Vice-Chair stated that there are some issues with that and it is too far developed. Ms. Weakley stated that it is also making a statement. This is problematic and ultimately who is going to pay for this, these home owners, and the people drinking Jordan Lake water and recreation at Jordan Lake.

Ms. Moose stated, recognizing that this is likely going to be approved because of legal reasons, is there anything that can be done to mitigate the stormwater impacts that would improve this? Ms. Weakley stated that she raises this concern every time and we need to do better for stormwater management and to stay off the steep slopes. They have the ability to redesign, reconfigure, and make changes. Ms. Weakley stated, when they hear the concerns of adjacent landowners, they make changes, but when they hear the Planning Board concerns of stormwater and steep slopes, nothing is done.

Ms. Moose asked, do the updated stormwater management requirements have calculations that would meet current regulations and do we know what this pond will treat? Ms. Weakley and Mr. Craig stated that the pond will treat a half inch of stormwater. Ms. Weakley stated that the State regulation is one inch in 24 hours, which is not much at all considering the weather patterns we have been seeing.

Ms. Moose stated that the Planning Board needs to at least introduce a statement that shows that they are concerned about stormwater management. That it is not shown on the map or any calculations is being demonstrated to the Board that it would be in these times, as you are building new construction, no matter when this development was approved. She continued saying, this is going to cause problems and a reason to vote against it. Should those phases that are falling into the pre-2008 ordinance, want to get approval from the Planning Board, they need to demonstrate compliance when it comes to stormwater

management, or some kind of statement to that effect, that at least addresses these concerns. She continued stating that she believes that this will be approved because as far along as it is, but if nobody says anything or talks about it enough it will go unnoticed. Ms. Weakley stated that she talks about this every time. Ms. Moose stated that we had a statement that says what we as a Planning Board wants to see.

- Ms. Weakley stated that you don't get grandfathered by Jordan Lake Rules even if you are pre-2008, you have to meet them today, period. That is what we should be requiring. It is too late for Legacy. The developments that phase out over decades should have to meet the current requirements of the time they are applying for the preliminary plat. A Board member stated that he understands the concerns, but feels that they are setting up the Commissioners to fight the State and they are going to lose on that every single time to the developer.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it is not fighting the State, it is fighting the established Case Law on vested rights.

- Mr. Spoon asked, what is the purpose of the common area in the middle of the plat, is it just a field? Mr. Craig stated that it is a park. He didn't know if it was going to be a dog park or just benches and trees and bushes, but there will be some kind of mulch walkway. Chair Siverson asked if it has been cleared. Mr. Craig stated it has been cleared.

Ms. Weakley stated that in the Big Woods Conservation Guidelines in the new Plan, and this is in the Big Woods area. If this development would have had to deal with that guideline, this open space wouldn't just be this cleared flat area in the middle of houses and roads. She continued stating, near this stream buffer area would have been the open space because that is the most valuable natural resource area.

- Chair Siverson asked, how much longer does this have to be build out, how many more lots will they be bringing to the Planning Board? A Board member stated that they are 14 years in and have 2 years left. Mr. Craig stated that they have 180 lots left to be developed, somewhere in that range. There was some discussion between the Board and Mr. Craig as to how many lots are left to be developed, being 463 lots total.

- Mr. Spoon stated that his concerns is that there is a lot to get done considering the pace of the project in the last two years. He doesn't want things to get sloppy in the next two years because of rushing, trying to get finished. He stated as he understands, December 31, 2020, they need to be completed or else they are going to ask for new approval? Mr. Sullivan stated that they would have to request for an extension. That is a decision ultimately for the BOC. The Planning Board reviews those, but it is the BOC to make the final decision.

Mr. Spoon asked, if that is the time to implement more stringent controls on the development? Mr. Sullivan stated that this is a condition use permit and if they are requesting an extension it's not reopening the conditional use permit. They are really just voting to grant the extension or not. If it is denied, then they will have to reapply and start over with whatever is still remaining.

- Chair Siverson asked, how many developments are left that are still under the pre-2008 rules? Mr. Sullivan stated Westfall, Briar Chapel, and The Legacy, projects around Chapel Ridge, Parks of Meadowview, Chapel Ridge Phase 3, and Laurel Ridge. He also stated that there are a lot of projects bundled under one umbrella completion date, which he believes is somewhere in 2021. Mr. Sullivan stated that there is good number of them left, but they are slowly coming to an end.
- Chair Siverson asked if there was anybody to make a motion and to include these two conditions. The stream buffer to be noted as part of the common area and the stormwater pond to be shown on the final plat.

Mr. Galin made a motion to approve this item with the three conditions as noted in the request and to add two additional conditions, stating the stream buffer be noted as part of the common area and the stormwater ponds be shown on the plat; seconded by Mr. Arthur.

Chair Siverson asked if there was any more discussion.

- Ms. Weakley stated, she can't vote to support this.
- Ms. Moose stated, she felt the same way, and hopes that future phases will have more awareness of the steep slopes and stormwater issues.
- Ms. Hager said, she agrees with Ms. Weakley and Ms. Moose. She stated, just because the law has relaxed rules we know aren't effective, doesn't mean you can't provide strategy that works and be able to demonstrate it with solid science background to say what will work. She stated she can't support it because of that reason.

- Mr. Gaeta stated, he always voted in favor, but he will not vote in favor of this one. He stated that Ms. Weakley made a compelling point and at some point you need stand up and say enough is enough, that is how he feels right now.
- Vice-Chair Lucier stated that he agrees and he struggles with this every time.

Chair Siverson called for a vote:

Motion did not pass with 2 in favor and 7 opposed.

Those opposed: Chair Siverson, Vice-Chair Lucier, Ms. Weakley, Ms. Hager, Ms. Moose, Mr. Arthur, and Mr. Gaeta

- Chair Siverson stated to the CE Group that when you come to the Planning Board with another preliminary, even though it is not in the rules, the Planning board would like to see them much more proactive.
- Vice-Chair stated that the issue was that this used to be an R-5 area. There were three developments that were approved along Big Woods Rd. one after another. The zoning was changed for The Preserve from an R-5 to an R-1 to get the approval. He stated it never should have been done that close to Jordan Lake. Next was the Homestead, it wasn't called Legacy at that time. That was approved for rezoning from an R-5 to an R-1. The next one was The Windfall, which did honor the R-5 designation and that was approved and still is an R-5 area. Chair Siverson stated that the zoning should have never been changed back then and these are the problems that get carried along.

VIII. ZONING: No Items

IX. NEW BUSINESS:

- Chair Siverson stated that it was nice having the presentation by Anne Lowry on wells and septic last meeting and everyone learned a lot. With having light agendas meetings, it would be great to have Rachael Thorn to give a presentation on stormwater and watershed issues.
- Mr. Sullivan stated that he has touched base with Ms. Thorn and if the Board had specific areas of interest, to let him know, because it is such a broad topic. This would help Ms. Thorn to refine her presentation.

Vice-Chair Lucier stated it would be nice to see the difference between the Jordan Lake Rules and the Watershed Protection Ordinance. It is an issue that needs to be clear in our heads as to what those are.

- Ms. Weakley asked, areas in the Jordan Lake watershed, does the staff go by the soil streams and the USGS maps? Mr. Sullivan stated any lot that is pre-2008, USGS and NRCS are used. Anything post-2008, NRCS and USGS are a screening map, but it is an on-site determination. Ms. Weakley asked, even in the Jordan Lake watershed? Mr. Sullivan stated that there are people with certification in stream methodology, so if it doesn't exist on the ground then it doesn't exist.

Ms. Weakley stated that the watershed protection ordinance says that streams will be field identified using those screening tools, but other streams are often present that are not on those maps. She stated that in her municipality they use a detailed map that they have put together and also based on hydrology and drainage areas. She stated that those are local rules, not Jordan Rules, but still subject to rules. Mr. Sullivan stated that anything that is post-2008 is field identified and if it is wetland, intermittent, ephemeral, or perennial and it meets the score, then it has to be buffered either 30, 50, or 100 feet.

Mr. Sullivan continued to say, regardless of Jordan or non-Jordan, we still have to meet the minimum. Jordan Rules, if there are impacts to buffers, then we have to follow the table in the Jordan Rules, but if it's non-Jordan, then the table doesn't apply. Mr. Sullivan continued by saying there are four sets of Rules that are used in the office. Pre-2008 outside of Jordan, pre-2008 inside Jordan, and the standard rules that apply to anything post-2008 inside and outside of Jordan. There are four sets of standards depending on when the lots are created.

Ms. Weakley stated she thinks it would be very helpful to have Ms. Thorn come in with a presentation.

- There was some discussion as to if it is needed to make a motion to deny the item Legacy 4A2-B. It was determined to leave it the way that it was voted upon.

X. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

1. Update from the Planning Board liaisons.

- Vice-Chair Lucier stated that he attended the Pittsboro Planning Board meeting. There were two minor items and the UDO. They are going to change the zoning from residential to commercial in the area where the old Pittsboro Family Medicine was. The line was split, some residential and some commercial, now it will all be commercial all the way to Thompson Road. They are also going to change the parking lot configuration at Northwood to accommodate the additional entrance and exit road. Vice-Chair Lucier stated that they had already had a public hearing on the UDO and they had made some revisions on it related to things that were already in the ordinance to achieve consistency. He said they also talked about Green building features that should be incorporated into the UDO. They also talked about the design standard for commercial facilities.

Mr. Spoon asked how long it has taken to adopt the UDO and cost. Vice-Chair Lucier stated that it has taken about four years, but they are close to the end.

Mr. Gaeta asked if there was any knowledge about the Northwood's High school entrance towards Hwy 64, he had seen some surveyors in that area. Vice-Chair Lucier stated that has been approved for a development as a major mix use development with about 90 acres. He stated that the plan is to put in a traffic circle and change the entrance.

- Chair Siverson stated that Siler City meeting will be next Monday.
- Ms. Moose stated the Agriculture Advisory meeting was cancelled due to hurricane Florence.

- Ms. Weakley stated that the Chatham Conservation Partnership will be hosting a meeting on October 18th from 9-12 at the new Agriculture building and the topic is State of our Water. Guest speakers will be talking about water quality and quantity and discussing about their research. She stated that UNC studies are showing that Haw River is contributing more to Jordan Lake than previously thought. Ms. Weakley stated it should be a great meeting and so thankful for the people that are coming to these meetings with updates and it is a great forum.

Chair Siverson asked if there is a way to view the meeting materials if a person can't make the meeting. Ms. Weakley stated that they are currently looking for a new platform to post information and presentations.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

Mr. Sullivan reported on the following:

1. *Minor Subdivisions/Exempt Maps* - Information was included in tonight's agenda packet for your review.

GENERAL PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Chair Siverson asked what was coming up for Public Hearings.

Mr. Sullivan reminded the Planning Board members of the upcoming Carolina Meadows Public Hearing that was rescheduled due to the weather. He also stated that there will be text amendments that are tailored to the oil and gas development for fracking moratorium. Mr. Sullivan stated that they are adding a special study requirement to the text. He also stated that he will be providing a presentation and that Glen Dunn will be at the meeting to answer questions.

