

CHATHAM COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
March 4, 2008

The Chatham County Planning Board met in regular session on the above date in the multipurpose room of Central Carolina Community College in Pittsboro, North Carolina. A quorum was present to begin the meeting. The members present were as follows:

Present:

Sally Kost, Chair
B.J. Copeland
Barbara Ford
Jim Hinkley
David Klarmann
Judy Harrelson
Peter Theye
Delcencia Turner

Absent:

Warren Glick, Vice-Chair
Karl Ernst
Randall Sartwell

Planning Department:

Keith Megginson, Planning Director
Jason Sullivan, Assistant Planning Director
Lynn Richardson, Subdivision Administrator
Kay Everage, Clerk to the Board

- I. CALL TO ORDER: Sally Kost, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. She stated that Warren Glick was out of town; that Karl Ernst was ill with the flu; and that Randall Sartwell was absent due to family matters.
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Ms. Harrelson made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted. Mr. Hinkley seconded the motion but asked that the following item be added to the agenda: (noted in ***bold / italicized***)

VIII. B. Planning Board Members Items
3. May 6 Planning Board Meeting

Ms. Harrelson revised her motion to reflect Mr. Hinkley's request. There was no discussion. Mr. Theye seconded the revised motion and the motion passed unanimously.

- III. CONSENT AGENDA: Mr. Hinkley made a motion; seconded by Ms. Harrelson to approve the consent agenda with two (2) revisions to the February 5, 2008 Planning Board Minutes as noted below. The motion passed unanimously.

A. Minutes: Consideration of a request for approval of Planning Board minutes for February 5, 2008 meeting.

1. Mr. Theye requested that the minutes reflect his comments regarding the "Mann's Crossing" final plat request under Item III. B. He stated that during the discussion he asked if there had been an N.O.V. (notice of violation) issued on the project and he was told that there had not been one issued.

2. Mr. Copeland requested that Judy Sharman's last name be corrected to Harrelson on the first page of the minutes.

B. Final Plat Approval:

Request by Ticon Properties, LLC for subdivision final plat approval of "Valley View", consisting of 22 lots on 47 acres, located off SR-1526, Andrews Store Road, Baldwin Township.

There was no one present who wished to speak regarding "Valley View".

End Consent Agenda

IV. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION: Fifteen-minute time of public input for issues **not on agenda**. Speakers limited to three minutes each.

There were no requests to speak at this time.

V. PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL:

A. Request by Parker Springs, LLC for subdivision preliminary plat approval of "Parker Springs", consisting of 50 lots on 87 acres, located off SR-1700, Mt. Gilead Church Road, New Hope and Williams Township.

Ms. Kost stated that this is a continuation from last month's Planning Board meeting; and that Planning Board members had requested to hear from the Environmental Review Board (ERB) regarding their report.

Ms. Richardson noted that the following additional material was distributed tonight to Board members. Copies are filed in the Planning Department.

- additional staff recommendations (beginning with condition #6);
- letter from Monterrane Homeowners Association addressed to Ms. Sally Kost, Chair, Chatham County Planning Board; and
- response from Parker Springs, LLC' to the review by ERB of Parker Springs EA from Gray Styers

Some concerns of the Board

- insufficient time for review of additional material
- application came before the Board before review of the environmental assessment (EA) by the ERB of the environmental assessment
- be required to meet same standards as others
- only discuss the response by the ERB of the EA
- no representative of the developer attended the Environmental Review Board (ERB) meeting (to answer questions)

Development Team Members

Gray Styers, attorney, was present representing the applicant. Mr. Styers requested that the record reflect that he and other members of the development team (noted below) were present tonight to answer questions from the Board.

- Christina Breen, Wetland Service Team Leader, ECS Carolinas, LLP (author of the Environmental Impact Assessment),
- Scott Mitchell, PE, LSS, Mitchell Environmental, P.A. (soil scientist),
- Keith Roberts, P.E., Development Consulting Services, Inc. (engineer), and
- Karen Kemerait, Attorney, Blanchard, Miller, Lewis & Styers, P.A.

Report of Environmental Review Board (ERB) Comments

Allison Weakley, Environmental Review Board Chair, gave a brief report of the peer review comments from the ERB regarding the applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment (EA). She stated that Section 5.2A of the Chatham County Subdivision Ordinance requires an Environmental (Impact) Assessment (EA) to address the following:

- a. The environmental impact of the proposed action;
- b. Any significant adverse effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;
- c. Mitigation measures proposed to minimize the impact;
- d. Alternatives to the proposed action;
- e. The relationship between the short-term uses of the environment involved in the proposed action and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and
- f. Any irreversible and irretrievable environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Some Insufficient EA information noted:

1. The Project Description is brief and inadequate to determine the scope of what is being proposed.
2. Purpose and Need is too narrow in focus.
3. Evaluation of all reasonable alternatives that address the project's need and purpose is needed.

4. Additional existing and proposed site conditions need to be described and addressed.
5. The EA states that impacts to terrestrial habitat include removal of most tree species (i.e. page 10 of the EA). Information is needed on the limits of disturbance on the site.
6. A significant portion of the site has been partially cleared and was not mentioned or described in the EA, i.e. potential environmental impacts; Also, stream determinations conducted on site suggests stream origins and classifications were not accurate for all streams on site; and that the ERB recommends that DWQ revisit the site to confirm all stream classifications and origins with the Environmental Resources Director.
7. Suitable habitat on site for threatened and endangered species not adequately described; based on suitable habitat present – species in addition to those noted (Carolina ladle crayfish and loggerhead shrike) are likely to occur (i.e. four-toes salamander, sweet pinesap); and was a survey for suitable habitat conducted?
8. Mitigation measures proposed to avoid, minimize or compensate for potential impacts are insufficient – only apparent mitigation proposed is an increase in stream buffer along Parkers Creek from 50 to 100 feet and the use of vegetated swales in road right-of-way. A description of all other mitigation measures considered to avoid impacts is needed.
9. The EA should address direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the project.

Ms. Weakley referenced Page 7 of the “Peer Review Report” regarding inadequate information on mitigation measures proposed to minimize potential environmental impacts. Some examples of mitigation could include:

- 1) avoidance of crossing of Parkers Creek,
- 2) avoidance of grading and developing steep slopes (15% and greater),
- 3) limited lot site disturbance with a restrictive covenant,
- 4) limiting impervious surfaces to 10% or less,
- 5) expanded stream buffers to protect water quality and wildlife habitat (a minimum 300 ft. buffer is recommended along each side of Parkers Creek given its importance for wildlife habitat and water quality; a 100 ft. buffer along each side of other perennial and intermittent streams, a 30 ft. buffer for each side of ephemeral streams, and 50 ft. around wetlands),
- 6) crossing streams with bridges or open bottom culverts, and
- 7) storm water management that allows for diffuse flow and infiltration near the source (Low Impact Development, or LID) prior to discharge.

Note: A copy of “Peer Review of Parker Springs Environmental Assessment by the Chatham County Environmental Review Board, February 21, 2008 Draft” is filed in the Planning Department.

Board Discussion

Some specifics noted:

- when is land clearing permitted on site
- when is an Environmental Assessment done
- impacts of proposed mitigation
- slopes, storm water, i.e. safeguard lacking in EA
- inadequate time to study the EA
- why issue of steepness of slopes / roads not included in EA

Fred Royal, Chatham County Environmental Resources Director, was present.

Gray Styers addressed the above concerns. He stated that the existing topography / slopes was part of the sketch design approved by this Board and by the current County Commissioners; that the sketch map showed the location of lots, roads and buffers; that these locations and topography of the land are consistent with and have not changed since sketch design approval; that septic system locations (with standards pertaining to slopes) and preliminary plat meet County, State, and NCDOT required specifications; that sedimentation / erosion control plans have been approved and are in place; that one notice of violation (N.O.V.) regarding clearing of brush and trees without a permit was issued but has since been addressed and corrected; and that he is not aware of any current problems.

Christina Breen, environmental scientist and development team member stated that an EA was not included because she did not think that one was needed since there was not an environmental impact issue as noted in Mr. Styers above comments; that sedimentation would be taken care of (with an erosion control permit); that the roadways had already met NCDOT standards and would not create an impact on the environment; and that clearing had not yet occurred when she did her site reconnaissance (March, 2007).

Mr. Megginson stated that in his discussion with Jim Willis, Chatham County Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Inspector regarding a notice of violation, Mr. Willis explained that there is a two (2) step process when getting erosion control approval before land clearing (1. plan approval, and 2. permit). Mr. Megginson noted that the applicant received the plan approval but not the permit that was the violation; and that he is not sure whether what was done on site is considered land clearing that would require a permit because it is not grading of the land and not exposing topsoil.

Keith Roberts, professional engineer and development team member, stated that the issue of when a grading permit is required is not new, that a logger in Chatham County does not need a permit to clear cut land because stumps are being left; and that a permit is not required unless you are creating sediment or runoff problems.

Ms. Harrelson noted that Ms. Breen stated earlier that her environmental assessment was done prior to any land clearing and Ms. Breen did not think that

the steepness of the slopes was an issue. Ms. Harrelson inquired if Ms. Breen had been back to the site since the land was cleared.

Ms. Breen stated that she had not been back to the site since the land was cleared; that the applicant is in compliance with regulations of the sedimentation and erosion control permit; and that she does not anticipate any impact.

Adjacent Landowners

- Emanuel Diliberto was present representing the Monterrane Property Owners Association.

Mr. Diliberto referenced his letter dated March 3, 2008 to Ms. Sally Kost, Chair, Chatham County Planning Board (and copied to Board members). A copy is filed in the Planning Department. Some concerns were:

- EIA deficient in its consideration of the various issues
 - a. assessing the impact of the proposed development on the unique and environmentally sensitive area that includes Parker's Creek and nearby Jordan Lake
 - b. protected watershed status of this area
 - c. impaired quality of both Parker's Creek and Jordan Lake
 - d. lower density and maintained buffers of the surrounding developments
- northeast section of the proposed subdivision in the area of the intermittent / perennial stream (Jacob's Creek) originating in Monterrane Phase II and flowing south into Parker's Creek
- numerous shortcomings in the preliminary plat and the documentation offered by the developer – some are noted below
 - a. Lot #32 – dwelling location, setback restriction, location of utility easement
 - b. Lots 28 & 40 – 100 foot riparian buffer improperly drawn and need to be increased in width, steep slope perpendicular to Parker's Creek
 - c. Lots 23 & 24 - stream buffer drawn on subdivision not accurately represented, stream buffer completely omitted from these lot evaluations, inclusion of buffer would severely restrict placement of structures on these lots
 - d. Lots 33 & 37 - excessive surface water runoff from road and cul-de-sac from steep slopes and threaten major stream below
 - e. Lots 32-35, 40-42 and 44-45 - septic fields extend into the 25-foot undisturbed tree buffer that borders the Monterrane trail easement and park areas
 - f. The 25 foot undisturbed tree buffer along the Monterrane border is not shown for the off-site septic area – clearing already occurred
 - g. Documentation not offered to evaluate: erosion control measures, clearing limits, structure locations, and damage from septic field installation

Wetlands

- Any measures taken to minimize the impact to the wetland areas, i.e. Environmental Assessment
- Between lots 28 and 29, i.e. are bottom forks considered perennial

Ms. Breen stated that these wetland areas are not impacted and are within the 100 foot buffer.

Mr. Styers stated that from a legal prospective DWQ and the Army Corps of Engineers have many pages of how to define a stream and wetland (what is an intermittent or perennial stream); that there are specific standards that defines and under permitting have to verify that the standards are met; and that defiance specifically is a legal prospective.

Scott Mitchell stated that from an environmental prospective the branch on the southern side of the property is considered an overflow flood plain channel (Parker's Creek is closer to lot #29); and that he questions whether it would be classified as an intermittent stream by the strict rules of DWQ and Corps of Engineers.

Runoff

Mr. Diliberto voiced concern regarding the negative impact of the quality of water going into Parker's Creek.

Environmental Assessment

Mr. Copeland stated that, at sketch design approval, the Board of Commissioners requested an environmental statement with peer review prior to preliminary plat approval; that he would argue that we do not have this statement; that important specifics were not addressed and, therefore, is not complete, i.e. density, terrain.

Ms. Kost referenced Section 5.2 A. "Impact Assessment" of the Chatham County Subdivision Regulations that states,

"The failure to provide reasonably adequate or accurate information under any item specified shall be cause for disapproval of the preliminary plat".

Some concerns voiced by Mr. Theye were:

- was the Environmental Assessment used as a planning tool
- what changes in the plat were made from sketch to preliminary
- what has the Environmental Assessment done to change the plat
- how many wells are planned on site
- street lights planned, i.e. impacts to wildlife and plants taken into consideration
- storm water, i.e. roads.

Comments from Development Team members regarding above concerns

Ms. Breen stated that the Environmental Assessment was used as a planning tool; that she wasn't sure if street lights are planned; but that there would not be an impact particularly to the crayfish if it were present, i.e. 100 foot buffer around these areas. Mr. Mitchell indicated from the large overview map primary changes that have occurred from sketch approval to preliminary plat design. He stated that storm water would be conveyed through channels recognized as best management practice in the "Division of Water Quality, Storm Water Best Management Practices Manuel"; that no initial drip systems are proposed although the map does indicate such; that there are 16 off-site septic areas (out of 50 sites); and that it is estimated that approximately 14 of the off-site septic areas would be conventional and 2 would be LPP and would be shown on the final plat map (i.e. numbers could possibly change after completion of Environmental Health's soil evaluations).

Some specifics discussed

- design poorly done, i.e. appears to be a rush job
- severe terrain
- density – too many lots planned
- off-site septic systems – which lots are being served
- stream crossings by off-site septic areas
- soil suitability
- under current Subdivision Regulations the request could be denied by the Commissioners at preliminary plat if the EA is not adequate – then what happens, i.e. what can the Board legally do
- recommend a new sketch plan that is based on the environmental assessment, staff field work, and ERB Peer Review comments
- road system doesn't work, i.e. steep slopes
- consider RA-90 (from 1 acre to 2 acres) and utilize County water

Motion to deny

Mr. Copeland stated that the condition placed on this subdivision at sketch approval by the Board of County Commissioners was not met (i.e. an environmental statement with peer review prior to preliminary plat approval); that it would be irresponsible of the Planning Board to recommend preliminary plat approval based on an inadequate environmental assessment.

Mr. Copeland made a motion to not approve the preliminary plat request until an adequate environmental assessment is completed and approved by peer review. Discussion followed. Mr. Megginson stated that typically the Board makes motions to either deny a request, to approve a request, or to approve a request with conditions. Mr. Copeland restated his motion to deny the request for preliminary plat approval until an adequate environmental assessment is completed and approved by peer review. Mr. Theye seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-1 with all Board members present voting in favor of the motion for denial except Mr. Klarmann who voted against the motion.

5 Minute Break:

Ms. Harrelson left the meeting at this time.

VI. ZONING AND ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

Mr. Megginson stated that items A – D listed below are scheduled for March 17, 2008 Public Hearing; and those Board members were provided the application packets at tonight's meeting.

- A. Public Hearing request by Sears Design Group, P.A. on behalf of Galloway Ridge, Inc., located off US 15-501 N, Williams Township, for a revision to the existing conditional use permit (CU-PUD for Fearington Village) for an expansion of services and renovations to existing buildings.
- B. Public Hearing request by Winter Custom Yachts, Inc. on behalf of Apex Nurseries, Inc., located off Holland's Chapel Road, New Hope Township, to rezone approximately 11.54 acres from an RA-40 (residential/agricultural) district to a CU-Ind-L (conditional use light industrial) district.
- C. Public Hearing request by Winter Customer Yachts, Inc. on behalf of Apex Nurseries, Inc., located off Holland's Chapel Road, New Hope Township, for a Conditional Use Permit for light manufacturing or processing with associated retail sales for boat assembly and boating and fishing supplies.
- D. Public Hearing request by Christopher M. Fortunes, dba Evergreen Companies, Inc. for a Conditional Use Permit "renewal" for a landscaping business, lawn and garden shop, and florist shop located on Parcel No. 71030, at 11115 US 64 E, New Hope Township.

VII. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Major Corridor Ordinance Task Force

The following members of the Major Corridor Ordinance Task Force (MCOTF) were present: John Graybeal, Chair
Caroline Siverson
Sally Kost
Barbara Ford, and
Paul Black, Triangle J. Council of Governments, facilitator.

Ms. Kost suggested the following schedule for tonight's discussion of "Draft, Proposed Text Amendments to the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance Related to Major Corridors, updated February 27, 2008".

- Mr. Black give overview of difference type of nodes (what they all mean)
- Discuss where the location of the nodes are
- Discuss proposed text amendments (insert comments from ERB)

It was noted that comments from the Appearance Commission had not yet been received.

10.9.5 Types of Nodes

Mr. Black addressed the different nodes (Crossroads, Neighborhood, Community, Regional, and Special) and why the various scales were created. He stated that there are many places where commercial might be appropriate but there is often neighborhood backlash; and that it was thought that it would be more effective to create the different scales of commercial development. The nodes were briefly discussed as follows:

Crossroads Activity Center

- much smaller scale and performance, i.e. gas station, antique shop, convenience store, ancillary grill or restaurant (with residential encouraged as an ancillary use)
- must be a minimum of three (3) miles apart

Neighborhood

- not mapped on the “Proposed Corridor Overlay Zoning Districts”
- permits retail, office, research and civic uses (up to 40,000 sq. ft. each to a maximum of 160,000 sq. ft. of non-residential space in any given contiguous node)

Community

- up to two large retail or grocery anchors (up to 80,000 sq. ft. each to a maximum of 320,000 sq. ft. of non-residential space in any given contiguous node)
- permits retail, office, research, and civic uses (residential uses are encouraged as part of an overall, mixed-use development, but not as a stand-alone use)

Regional

- large-format retailers
- square footage not limited

Special

- for nodes that are all special and not one that is necessarily alike
- do not fit a standard mix of non-residential uses
- primarily non-retail, i.e. corporate campus, research campus, industrial use, or a node with a significantly different character

Mr. Black noted two specifics:

- shading requirements
- reduction of the parking requirements

Scenic Overlay District

Mr. Black stated that the scenic corridor acts as a slightly higher bar on the major corridor. Some differences from the node districts are:

- deeper buffer requirement from the corridor – 150 ft.
- Single-use buildings no larger than 65,000 sq. ft.

- Only one access along corridor unless additional access is required for public safety reasons (right-in, right-out only)
- Fewer, smaller signs on corridor (only at entrances)
- Require unified sign plan that limits the color palette of the development to earth-tones and no more than three (3) colors

Map

The “Proposed Corridor Overlay Zoning Districts” map showing the above district areas was reviewed. Mr. Black noted that the map shows three (3) “Community” nodes that are distinct and separate because of the size limits (most represents existing or already approved development). The “Special” node in the Moncure area was discussed and it was noted that limiting the size of retail was not addressed but is conditional use. The “Regional” node in Bear Creek was discussed, with the possibility of the location being further south.

Environmental Review Board [ERB] comments

Ms. Kost stated that the ERB endorses that development along the corridors is by conditional use but that most of these major highway corridors in Chatham County follow ridge lines; that this means that these are at the beginning of streams; and that the Board needs to be aware (as plans are approved) that this is an issue.

87 North

Ms. Kost noted that the Highway 87 North node is a “Neighborhood” node and the exact location was not designated. Mr. Black stated that this area was designated on the plan but that the MCOTF was not comfortable designating an actual regulatory district for where it should be yet.

Watershed and Topography

Mr. Klarmann recommends that the Board looks at the watershed and topography of where these nodes are going, i.e. storm water, conditional use, site specific.

Design Standards

- 10.9.7.1.4 Parking Lot Shading

Mr. Black stated that the MCOTF would like to see 50% coverage of the parking area shaded with tree canopies (within 15 years of acquisition of a building permit). Identifying Champion trees was discussed with concern that these trees survive.

- 10.9.8 Building Design and Layout Standards

Mr. Black noted that during the last workshop meeting of the MCOTF it was decided that Section 10.9.8.1.1 “Crossroads Villages” would be deleted from the proposed text amendments. Following discussion it was decided that only the first sentence should be deleted that reads, “Buildings are to be sized and massed in a proximity to the roadway that recognizes the possibility of future road widening”.

- 10.9.8.3.2 Standards for All Non-residential and Multifamily Residential Buildings in Nodes Other Than Crossroads

(5) “Generic corporate prototype buildings are prohibited; all structures should be built with “individual architectural merit” to allow for adaptive re-use and avoid future empty or abandoned structures”.

The issue of whether we want to limit generic corporate prototype buildings was discussed and it was determined that this issue be revisited.

- 10.9.9.2 Location of Buffers

Mr. Black stated that Dennis McKenna, MCOTF member, worked with an arborist from the City of Durham on “Landscaping and Buffering”; that ideas were discussed with local builders and developers; that one issue (from a retail standpoint) was that these revisions make structures less visible from the highway; but that extra signage would make up for this.

Mr. Graybeal suggested the following revisions:

- Page 28 – Location of Buffers, 1st sentence that states, “Required buffers shall be designed and located to provide necessary visual screening of the development from the major corridor and any other public roads that it fronts, as well as along its ~~periphery with shared uses~~”.

Delete “periphery with shared uses” and replace with “***perimeter as provided herein***”.

- CRZ – defined as “Critical Root Zone” for the trees

- 10.9.9.3 Types of Buffers

- Page 29, - 10.9.9.3.1 Existing vegetative buffers, and
- Page 31, - 10.9.9.3.2 Newly planted vegetative buffers (last paragraph, 3rd sentence that states, “The goal is to achieve a buffer that will provide 80% opacity to a ten-foot height above the ground within a five-year growth period after planting”

Mr. Graybeal noted that under section, “Existing vegetative buffers” there is no opacity requirement referenced. Ms. Siverson was concerned about requiring the 80% opacity to existing vegetative buffers. It was suggested that this issue be further considered.

- Page 30 – 1st paragraph, “NC Native Plant Society, ~~part of the NC Botanical Garden~~”

Ms. Kost noted that Ms. Weakley states that this is not part of the NC Botanical Garden.

- 10.9.9.4.2 Installation

- Page 34 – 2nd paragraph, last sentence that states, “A re-inspection fee of \$100 will be paid to the Planning Department in advance of any re-inspection”.

Mr. Graybeal stated that it was his understanding that this sentence had been omitted earlier in the review process. Ms. Kost noted that the Board had already agreed to this change but was never omitted from the proposed text.

➤ Page 35

Per Ms. Weakley, a list of ground covers is not included. Mr. Black stated that a list would be on file in the Planning Department.

• 10.9.9.4.3 Irrigation

- Page 37, 2nd paragraph that states, "Irrigation systems shall use treated wastewater from onsite treatment plants whenever possible, or be installed in such a way that they can be easily retrofitted should recycled wastewater become available. Without recycled wastewater (or in CACs without irrigation) any plantings done shall use drought-tolerant vegetation wherever possible".

Following discussion, it was suggested that language be considered that drought resistant vegetation is encouraged and to require the use of collection systems on site for irrigation purposes, i.e. rainwater/barrels.

Ms. Kost stated that signs would be addressed during next month's Planning Board meeting along with review of the list of proposed revisions summarized and recapped below:

1. Crossroad Activity Centers – Revisit whether these should be five miles apart, or three miles apart. Currently the PB has included that the CACs be three miles apart.
2. The location of the node on 421 South – Revisit the location of this node which is currently at the 902 in Bear Creek. The suggestion is that this node be moved further south towards Goldston.
3. Have we incorporated green building standards, and the Green Building Task Force?
4. Do we want to identify champion trees?
5. What provisions do we have if the vegetative landscaping dies?
6. Page 21, delete "Buildings are to be sized and massed in a proximity to the roadway that recognizes the possibility of future road widening."
7. Page 24, item #8, do we want to be specific regarding the names of the retailers?
8. Page 24, #5 - Revisit whether we want to limit generic corporate prototype buildings.
9. Page 28, 1st sentence under Location of Buffers - change "along its periphery with shared uses" to "along perimeter as provided herein."
10. Page 29 - Existing vegetative buffers" revisit whether we should require further planting to screen the development from the roadway.
11. Page 34 - we had previously agreed to delete the reference to fees and this was overlooked.

12. Page 37 Irrigation - consider changing this to add a line that “drought resistant vegetation is encouraged”; and to further require the use of collection systems on site for irrigation purposes (such as rainwater/barrels).
13. Page 35 – Include the list of ground covers.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Planning Director’s Report
 - a) *Communication Towers Annual Review*

Mr. Megginson stated that the County Commissioners set May 19th, 2008 as the date for the cell tower public hearing for the annual cell tower review; and that the Planning Board would discuss the requests during the May Planning Board meeting.
- B. Planning Board Members Items
 - a) *Briar Chapel - Site Visit*

Ms. Kost reminded Board members of the special Planning Board meeting scheduled for Saturday, March 29, 2008 to visit the Briar Chapel site; and that those attending should meet at 10:00 a.m. at the Briar Chapel / Andrews Store Road construction entrance. Ms. Kost stated that she plans to take minutes at the meeting; that there would be no decisions made; that this was a site visit; and that she is coordinating the visit with the developers.
 - b) *Major Corridor Forums*

Ms. Kost stated that the need to have Planning Board representation at each of these meetings. Board members stated the meeting/s they plan to attend as noted below.

 - Tuesday, March 11** -Moncure
(Mr. Hinkley, Mr. Theye, and Ms. Ford)
 - Tuesday, March 18** - Silk Hope
(Ms. Ford and Mr. Klarmann)
 - Monday, March 24** - Bear Creek
(Mr. Hinkley, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Copeland)

Ms. Kost plans to attend each of the forums.

Ms. Kost stated that as part of the mission of the Planning Board is an educational one and that it is important that Board members attend as many of the meetings as possible. It was noted that Board members would attend the meetings to listen and hear comments from the public.

- c) *May 6, 2008 Planning Board Meeting – change date*

Mr. Hinkley suggested that the May Planning Board meeting not be held as scheduled (May 6th) since this is a Primary Election in Chatham County and some Board members are involved in campaigns.

Since this item was not on tonight’s agenda, Mr. Theye made a motion; seconded by Ms. Ford to suspend the Planning Board Rules and allow the Board to consider this item. The motion passed unanimously.

Following discussion, Mr. Hinkley made a motion; seconded by Mr. Theye that the scheduled Tuesday, May 6th Planning Board meeting be changed to **Wednesday, May 7th**. Discussion followed. Ms. Ford asked that Board members are reminded of this change by E-mail. The vote on the motion was unanimous.

- IX. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Ms. Ford made a motion; seconded by Mr. Theye to adjourn tonight's meeting. There was no discussion and the motion to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Sally Kost, Chair

Date

Attest: _____
Kay Everage, Clerk to the Board

Date