



**Chatham County Planning Board
Minutes
July 7, 2020**

The Chatham County Planning Board met in regular session on the above date as a remote meeting due to the current health restrictions for the COVID-19 virus. Members present via GoTo Webinar meeting were as follows:

Present:

George Lucier, Chair
Clyde Frazier
Bill Arthur
Cecil Wilson
Jon Spoon

Caroline Siverson, Vice-Chair
Jamie Hager
Emily Moose
Franklin Gomez Flores
Allison Weakley

Absent:

Gene Galin

Planning Department:

Jason Sullivan, Planning Director, Kimberly Tyson, Subdivision Administrator, Angela Plummer, Zoning Administrator, Janie Phelps, Zoning Official, Hunter Glenn, Planner I, Chance Mullis, Planner I, and Daniel Garrett, Clerk to the Planning Board.

- I. CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Lucier called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- II. VIRTUAL MEETING GUIDELINES:
Mr. Sullivan gave an overview of the virtual meeting guidelines provided by PowerPoint.
- III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:
Chair Lucier stated there is a quorum, (8 members present, Mr. Spoon was having technical issues and joined the meeting via telephone listening to the meeting. Mr. Wilson joined the meeting via telephone at 8:15.)
- IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Approval of the Agenda - Chair Lucier asked the board members if there were any issues with the Agenda. There were no objections and the agenda was approved.
- V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:
Chair Lucier asked for consideration for approval of the June 2, 2020 minutes. There were minor corrections by Board members and the June 2, 2020 minutes were approved. Motion was made by Vice-Chair Siverson to approve; second by Mr. Frazier. Motion passed with a vote of 8-0,
- VI. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION:
No citizens raised their hand or signed up to speak.

VII. SUBDIVISION:

1. Request by Patrick Bradshaw for a **twenty-four (24) month extension of preliminary plat to extend the current preliminary plat expiration date for The Legacy at Jordan Lake Subdivision Phase 3 from May 31, 2021 to May 31, 2023, consisting of 69 remaining lots**, located off Big Woods Road, S. R. 1716, Williams Township, parcels #92463 and 89438.

Ms. Tyson stated this subdivision is reviewed under the Pre-2008 Subdivision Regulations. The Legacy at Jordan Lake received Sketch Plan approval on March 15, 2004 as a Planned Unit Development for a cluster development. Modifications were made to the plan in 2005 to add 50.6 acres and change the number of lots to 463. The project is approved for 463 lots on 626 acres with an amenity center. Phase One received final plat approval in December, 2005 for 105 lots. Phases Two and Three, consisting of 114 lots received preliminary / final plat approval in 2006. In 2011, the developer submitted a request to the Board of County Commissioners to relinquish the final plat approvals for Phases Two and Three (undeveloped); to recombine the 114 lots with the remaining undeveloped portion of the property into one parcel of land containing 402 acres; and to allow Phases Two and Three to revert to their approved preliminary plat status as of November 20, 2006. The BOC approved the request on November 7, 2011. The Resolution Accepting The Voluntary Relinquishment of Final Plat Approvals of The Legacy at Jordan Lake, Phase Two and Three is recorded in Deed Book 1593, Page 272. The recorded recombination plat can be viewed at Plat Slide 2011, Pages 199 & 200 and at Plat Slide 2012, Page 10. The resolution stated that the recreation fees and the water availability fees previously paid by the developer would be retained by the county and credited toward any similar fees incurred by the developer in future submittals until December 31, 2015 or any later date required by an amendment to the Permit Extension Act. To date 334 lots have received final plat approval. The tennis courts, playground, clubhouse and pool have been completed. The clubhouse and pool opened to the residents on September 9, 2017. The current preliminary plan for the remaining 69 lots will expire on May 31, 2021 unless an extension request is approved by the Board of Commissioners. If the current preliminary plat expires, any future development of the property will be reviewed and approved under the current Subdivision Regulation.

Ms. Tyson also stated the previous deadline for submission of the final plat was December 31, 2020. That time was extended by the adoption of Senate Bill 704, adopted by the General Assembly and approved by the Governor in response to COVID-19 crisis, for five months to May 31, 2021. The request before the Board is for a twenty-four month extension of preliminary plat to extend the preliminary plat expiration date from May 31, 2021 to May 31, 2023. The developer, F-L Legacy Owner, LLC, has stated in the extension request letter, the reason for the extension request is based on lot sales to homebuilders and consumers, the sales have rapidly grounded to a halt. To complete the infrastructure development necessary to finalize 69 lots by May 2021 would impose a financial hardship. If the extension request is granted, it will give the developer a reasonable opportunity to weather the current difficulties and find a market for the remaining 69 lots. Phase 3 preliminary plat was approved by Board of Commissioners on January 21, 2020. Ms. Tyson stated in closing the Planning Department is not making a recommendation on the request as this is a policy decision to be made by the Board of County Commissioners.

Board Discussion followed and some items discussed were as follows:

- Chair Lucier stated these last 69 lots will bring the total lot count up to 463 when they are recorded. Mr. Patrick Bradshaw stated the Chair is correct and these are the last 69 lots and currently 367 lots have been recorded with another 27 lots to be recorded by the end of this year. This leaves the last 69 lots which were preliminary approved in January of this year before the COVID-19 crisis.
- Chair Lucier asked how many of the 394 lots have been developed. Mr. Andrew Smith stated roughly 270 homes are constructed and occupied. Chair Lucier stated the 334 lots from the other phases are

almost filled and 33 lots have just been recorded, plus the additional 27 lots to be recorded by the end of the year. Mr. Smith showed the Planning Board a map of the development and explained what has been recorded and what was soon to be recorded, plus the last phase of the development, Phase 3 which they have not broken ground on yet. They are asking to extend the sunset date and not break ground now because they do not have a buyer readily available to take those lots. They don't want to break ground on this phase today, but wait until the economic market improves.

- Vice-Chair Siverson asked what would be the differences from what is approved now with this development and if it expired and resubmitted following the current subdivision regulations. Ms. Tyson stated the remaining 69 lots would start over and fall into the new four step process, Concept Plan, First Plat, Construction Plan, and Final Plat and the last 69 lots would be required to follow current subdivision regulations. Vice-Chair Siverson is wondering if there would be a substantial difference in what that development would look like. The developer has been generous with buffers, but not sure what the differences would be with stormwater treatment from the old rules to the current rules. Ms. Tyson stated their stormwater treatment falls under State regulations now, but under the current rules the County looks at it. The Watershed Protection department could answer this question better about stormwater treatment and what those changes would look like. Ms. Tyson also stated they have all the permits currently, however it could significantly change some things for them because of pre-2008 verses current regulations.

Mr. Sullivan stated for this remaining phase they would be required to do an on-site riparian buffer review which might show new features that would need to be buffered. The remaining phase would also have to meet the current stormwater regulations which might change the number of stormwater ponds and the design as well. Mr. Sullivan informed the Board of an issue staff has right now with the Westfall subdivision where there is water quality devices that were installed prior to the County having a stormwater program and then they switched that project to the new subdivision process requiring them to meet the new stormwater requirements for only the remaining phases. There are some questions that have been asked as ownership is being transferred from the developer to the HOA, such as which regulatory agency is responsible for oversight of which ponds. The stormwater devices constructed earlier don't meet the requirements and are not under the County's program, which is just something to keep in mind.

- Mr. Smith stated these last 69 lots are the furthest lots away from the creek and these are also the same lots that were reconfigured to have more open space and less land disturbance. He stated they have all of the permits and could start construction today, but with COVID-19 there is not a buyer for the lots. They do not want to start clearing, building the roads and lots, and then have them sit for years waiting on a buyer. They feel that would be an erosion control issue and would constantly be on the site fixing things. Mr. Smith stated all they are asking is to not let these last 69 lots preliminary plat expire, so they can start construction at a later time.

Mr. Bradshaw stated if these last 69 lots can't be developed it will be a hardship to the other lot owners in the community. This community has a substantial private infrastructure such as, roads, club house, gym, swimming pool, and golf course that all need to be maintained. Although there is not a buyer for these lots now, in the long run the community really needs these lots to be completed and sold.

- Ms. Weakley stated she appreciates the challenges they are facing with COVID-19 and it is impacting a lot of people. She would like to recount the timeline for Legacy because it is important context for the decision Planning Board members have to make. This subdivision was approved before 2008, before stormwater control and watershed protection ordinance rules were in place. Legacy was approved in 2006 and recombined in 2011 into one parcel of 402 acres and phases 2 and 3 reverted to their

preliminary plats that were approved in 2006. Ms. Weakley asked if the preliminary plat that the Board is considering was approved back in 2006. Mr. Bradshaw stated the site plan was approved in 2006, but the preliminary plat for these specific lots were approved this year. Ms. Weakley stated most of if not all of Legacy has been developed under pre-2008 regulations and an extension would further the problems that we see with stormwater treatment.

Ms. Weakley asked for confirmation that these plats received preliminary and final plat approval in 2014. Mr. Bradshaw stated they did not receive final plat approval, but there were preliminary approvals that were allowed to expire and reapply for later. Ms. Weakley stated according to the Planning Board notes Phase 2 and 3 with 114 lots received preliminary and final plat approval in 2006. Mr. Smith stated Ms. Weakley is correct and then the project was abandoned. That was before they owned the property and the previous owner did final plat a portion of the lots and then abandoned that final plat. Ms. Weakley is accurate, but way before they bought the property.

Ms. Weakley stated according to the Planning Board notes, in 2011 the developer submitted a request to the BOC to relinquish the final plat approval for Phase 2 and 3, which was undeveloped, to recombine the 114 lots with the remaining undeveloped portion of the property into one parcel of land containing 402 acres and to allow Phases 2 and 3 to revert to their approved preliminary plat status as of November 20, 2006. Tonight we are considering Phase 3. Phase 2 and 3 received preliminary and final plat approval back in 2006 well before any regulations in Chatham County for stormwater. Ms. Weakley stated every time Legacy comes before the Planning Board they have voluntarily committed to treating ½" of runoff and the State current standards are at least 1" runoff and this development is literally on the shores of Jordan Lake. Given that this preliminary and final plat in this section of the development was approved back in 2006 and chose to recombine lots in 2011 and now we are in current times, she feels at the very least consider current stormwater standards. Get a new stream determination and a new permit from the Army Corps and the County because it is probably expired if it has been over 5 years.

Mr. Bradshaw stated he understands Ms. Weakley has had these exact concerns for a very long time, probably for the life of this project which is a long time. This project was very hard hit by the 2007, 2008 recession and it struggled for quite a while. In 2014 Freehold Communities came in and have done a great job turning this community around and it is developed down to these last 69 lots and now we have been hit by this new crisis. This has become a successful community and it is almost finished, these lots were just preliminary approved this year and we all know what is happening in our society and our economy. Mr. Bradshaw stated he didn't even know how to do new stormwater standards for this one small section of a planned unit development based on approvals granted years ago. Ms. Weakley stated, you hire an engineer. This section had preliminary and final plat approvals in 2006, this goes back 14 years. Mr. Smith stated if that preliminary plat had been built, it would have impacted a lot more land and a lot less open space and it was a good thing that it wasn't build. We have shrunk the impact, provided more open space, and given more additional buffers. We have tried to do right by this project, but we underwrote it with a set of standards that we had for this project and we struggled through this project. All we are asking is for is the last 69 lots to give us a little more time to get to the finish line.

- Ms. Weakley asked the developers to treat 1" runoff instead of ½" runoff. Come up to current stormwater standards, this is a project on the shores of Jordan Lake and this project depends on its drinking water. You are already giving a 100' voluntary buffer on perennial streams and a 50' voluntary buffer on intermittent streams to meet current standards. The rules are being rewritten for Jordan Lake, the County and municipalities will have to bear the brunt of retrofitting projects to treat nutrient runoff. This project had preliminary and final plat approval in 2006, recombined in 2011, we are now in 2020,

the least you can do is treat 1” for stormwater runoff. Mr. Smith stated they have looked at that, but the size of the pond would get enormous. This entire phase is in rock and would end up clearing a lot more property and blasting a lot more rock. Ms. Weakley suggested reducing their impervious surface.

Mr. Smith stated they already have reduced their impervious surface going from 100’ lots to 75’ lots and shortened the road by hundreds of feet. We can’t economically make the ponds the right size for 1” runoff, we can’t do it. Our options are, we get more time to develop this, or we go out and develop it and then there is this developed phase that could be sitting for years which we do not want to do. Mr. Smith stated they have all the permits to start construction. Ms. Weakley asked when was the State permits last issued, they will expire in 5 years. Mr. Smith stated all their permits were issued this year and he respects what Ms. Weakley is saying, but please understand a lot of these things are out of our control. We want to finish this community and provide the lots and have 463 units funding the HOA, but we went from having sales, to zero sales for 4 months, it doesn’t make financial sense for us to develop these lots and have them sit.

- Ms. Weakley stated the developer is asking for a 2 year extension and previously the final plat was due by December of this year and the Governor’s Executive Order gave an extra 5 months, can’t this get done by May 2021? You are asking for 2 years beyond that date. Mr. Smith stated he doesn’t know what this crisis is going to do and he doesn’t want to come and ask for more time in a year, which is why they asked for 2 years. We want to get it developed and sold to homeowners as fast as we possibly can, but he doesn’t want to come to the Commissioners every year asking for more time because there is not a buyer. They asked for 2 years because they are hopeful for a vaccine for the virus and people will become comfortable buying houses again and finish Legacy, but he doesn’t know when the vaccine will be available or when people will start buying houses again. Ms. Weakley stated the concern of the Planning Board is public health and safety.

Mr. Bradshaw stated if it becomes uneconomic to develop these remaining lots either because it doesn’t make sense to do it right now or because it can’t be done under different regulations, it will make a real hardship for the other lot owners in this community. Ms. Weakley stated it is all private roads and that was your decision when you decided to develop the subdivision with private roads. Mr. Bradshaw stated they are just asking for some additional time for these last lots because of a major crisis that has occurred.

Ms. Weakley stated they had a chance in 2006 and 2011 and she is simply asking to treat stormwater to current standards given that the developer is asking for a 2 year extension on something that has already been extended a few times. Mr. Bradshaw stated he and this developer didn’t do anything in 2006 and didn’t do anything in 2011. Ms. Weakley stated that is not her problem. Mr. Bradshaw stated it is not anybody’s problem, it just is what it is, and the community was approved at a time that came just before the last financial crisis and really suffered because of that. This developer came in during 2014 and has done a tremendous job and has invested a tremendous amount to making this community a success. If the Board chooses because of the opportunity to force them to do something that makes no economic sense right now, or make it so for one reason or another these lots never get developed, just realize this has consequences for citizens of this county. Ms. Weakley stated this has consequences for people who rely on Jordan Lake and the County who is going to have to pay for retrofit when developments that were approved back in 2006 and 2011 that are not meeting current stormwater standards continue to impact the Lake in which it sits on. She does not take this lightly and hopes her fellow Planning Board members don’t take it lightly as well.

- Ms. Hager stated it seems like stormwater treatment is the issue, is there any other alternatives or other options besides ponds for stormwater treatment that can be explored without denying this extension

request. Ms. Weakley stated to reduce the impervious surface. Ms. Hager asked Mr. Smith if they have explored any low impact development strategies. Mr. Smith stated they have explored some of those options and have included 4 filter devices along the roadway and is already part of the permit that is in place now.

- Ms. Moose stated she sympathizes with the developer because this is a really tough time, but also feels that a lot has changed in terms of water in the County between 2006 and May 2023 and would struggle to recommend extending this request. There is the extension from the Governor and hopefully that will be sufficient. Chair Lucier confirmed that the Governor's extension goes until May 2021.
- Mr. Smith stated they have not had any erosion control violations or any runoff issues, they have been developing this project in a smart way with extensive buffers and we have tried doing everything the right way for the County. This is the last thing they wanted to do to ask for more time. The last time we were in front of you we were ready to develop and there were builders lined up and everything was going well. The plan was preliminary plat in January and break ground in March and then COVID-19 hit and all the builders said stop, quit spending money, we are not doing anything right now. Mr. Smith said he doesn't know how long this is going to be so they are not asking for anything more than time. If two years feels like too much, then consider one year and come back if we are still in the same COVID-19 pandemic state, if that seems more reasonable.
- Chair Lucier asked what the wish of the Planning Board?

Motion to not approve this item made by Ms. Weakley, second by Vice-Chair Siverson.

- Mr. Arthur stated he feels like he needs more information on this and doesn't understand what Ms. Weakley was saying about the County being liable for retrofitting developments and doesn't know what that means. Mr. Arthur stated the Governor's extension is a short period of time given the COVID-19 virus and two years may be too long. He is concerned about runoff and it is a serious problem that needs to be addressed going forward.
- Mr. Gomez Flores stated the issue is with prior developments and keeping them with old regulations when new regulations come up. Chair Lucier stated if the deadline has passed then they have to resubmit under the new guidelines not the old guidelines. Up to this point they have been functioning under the old guidelines in terms of stormwater and stream buffers, although the developers voluntarily use post-2008 stream buffer regulations in the development of this project.
- Ms. Hager stated she is also conflicted because this is a final piece of this development, but it is really hard to support this extension. She feels there should be some kind of solution that allows this to move forward with a compromise around stormwater.
- Vice-Chair Siverson stated this project has been long enough and frustrated to keep giving the green light to pre-2008 rules.
- Chair Lucier stated he has had a lot of history as some of the other Board members have had with this development as well. Back in 2004 when it first came up Chair Lucier stated he was the Chair of the Planning Board at that time and the Planning Board voted not to approve this subdivision because of a lot of the concerns Ms. Weakley brought up with the project being so close to Jordan Lake. The zoning was R5 on the edge of the Lake and it was rezoned to R1. Before the rezoning it was 1 lot per 5 acres on 650 acres, you could only have 130 houses under those rules. Ultimately the Planning Board decided not to recommend the development, but this development was not supported by the BOC at

that time and they voted to approve the development. The development went belly-up in 2008 and resurfaced again. Chair Lucier stated he appreciates the improvements the developers have made in the project itself and it is a better project than when it was initially approved in 2004-2005. Chair Lucier understands the issues the developer has and understands the rules so close to Jordan Lake are too relaxed.

Chair Lucier completed a roll call vote and the motion to not approve this item passed 8-0, unanimously.

- Chair Lucier stated the developer can still develop, but they have until May 31, 2021 and the BOC agree with the Planning Board recommendation or unless there is a further extension by the State.

VIII. ZONING:

1. A Legislative public hearing for a general use rezoning request by Glandon Forest Equity, LLC to rezone Parcel No's. 5050, 4787, 4742, and portions of parcels 4653 and 76194, from R-1 Residential to NB Neighborhood Business, located off Old US 421 S, Bear Creek Township.

Ms. Phelps stated a legislative public hearing was held on June 15, 2020. Planning staff presented the rezoning request and the applicants Brent Pardum and George Venters were available for questions. No one signed up to speak. Planning staff have received comments for support of the rezoning. The property is currently zoned R-1, Residential, the properties to the west are zoned IND-L Light Industrial, NB Neighborhood Business, and R-1 Residential. All other adjacent properties are zoned R-1, Residential but currently have businesses on them that chose not to rezone to a commercial designation at the time the BOC zoned the remainder of the county in 2016. They are permitted legal non-conforming businesses. The properties adjacent to the west is the "Bonlee Mall" area, which are mostly vacant, and an auto repair business. The property diagonal from the proposed rezoning is an auto business and to the south, there is a gas station and convenience store.

When considering a general use zoning classification, the boards must consider all of the uses that are allowed within the district. In considering a general use rezoning request Section 19 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance includes four standards that must be addressed and supported in order for a rezoning application to be approved. The standards are:

Standard No 1: The alleged error in this Ordinance, if any, which would be remedied by the proposed amendment. No error in the ordinance is being alleged. **It is planning staff opinion this standard is met.**

Standard No 2: The changed or changing conditions, if any, in the area or in the County generally, which make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to the promotion of the public health, safety, and general welfare. Historically, this property's use was a gas station and convenience store. All tanks have been removed and it has since gone into disrepair and is utilized for the land owner's personal storage. The applicant states this does not benefit the community and is also an eyesore. These properties are an excellent location and opportunity to help revitalize Bonlee and the Village Center core. **It is planning staff opinion this standard is met.**

Standard No 3: The manner in which the proposed amendment will carry out the intent and purpose of the adopted land use plan, or part thereof. In the Chatham County Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2017, Bonlee has been classified as a Village/Village Center which promotes development to "accommodate small-scale, local-serving retail, office, institutional, and service uses, restaurants, and some residential. Mix of uses include retail, restaurant, services, and office uses clustered near a village center (typically consisting of smaller

commercial footprints)” in mostly one- and two-story buildings. Economic Development Policy 2, Land Use Policy Strategy 2.3 and 6.1 support the development of village centers to encourage growth. The proposed Neighborhood Business zoning will allow the redevelopment of a currently vacant corner parcel, which was historically used for commercial purpose into new and more vibrant commercial uses that will serve the local residents of the Village Center. **It is planning staff opinion this standard is met.**

Standard No 4: All other circumstances, factors, and reasons which the applicant offers in support of the proposed amendment. Currently, residents of Bonlee must travel almost 10 miles to access a variety of retail services. The Neighborhood Business rezoning will create flexibility, as suggested in the Chatham County Comprehensive Plan, allowing businesses to locate at this site to satisfy the convenience needs for the community. The proposed development would also offer employment opportunities, increased property and sales tax revenue for Chatham County. The rezoning would pave the way to redevelop a prime corner which currently has two under- utilized buildings in disrepair that is not currently the highest and best use for the property. A new business coming to Bonlee could possibly re-energize the Village Center and bring further economic activity to the area. There are several older buildings across the street that are vacant but could be available for new businesses. **It is planning staff opinion this standard is met.**

It is planning staff opinion that the Zoning Ordinance standards for granting a rezoning request have been met for this property.

Ms. Phelps stated in closing that the planning staff recommends approval of the general use rezoning request. The Planning Board has up to three meetings in which to make a recommendation for approval or denial to the Board of Commissioners.

A proposed consistency statement has been provided below in support of the rezoning request:

It is the opinion of the Planning Board the rezoning request is consistent with the Chatham County Comprehensive Land Use Plan based on meeting ED Policy 2 strategy 2.1 and Land Use Policy 2 strategy 2.3 of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and therefore is recommended for approval.

Board Discussion followed and some items discussed were as follows:

- Chair Lucier stated from the public hearing his understanding is that this project is on County water, but will be served by a septic system. Ms. Phelps stated yes. Chair Lucier stated he thinks this is a good project, hopes it is successful, and believes is a good thing for the people of Bonlee.
- Vice-Chair Siverson stated she agrees and feels this is exactly what the Land Use Plan has laid out for those types of communities in our County and does not see any problem at all with this proposal.
- Ms. Weakley stated she supports this project and feels it is a good use of neighborhood business for this area. She asked Planning Staff to confirm that current stormwater standards would be met. Ms. Phelps stated the stormwater standards would have to be met for the new development. Ms. Weakley stated the General Assembly has tied the hands of local government for redevelopment and when a property is redeveloped they don't necessarily treat any stormwater. Ms. Phelps stated initially they had only been looking at one or two parcels, but with the septic and stormwater requirements they have acquired more property to be able to fit everything they want and comply with the regulations.
- Mr. Sullivan stated he knows what Ms. Weakley is stating and believes there have been some provisions in the stormwater ordinance that cover redevelopment of sites, but it doesn't give a blanket

exemption for what he recalls for the entire project. Mr. Sullivan gave an example of another project called Cole Park Plaza which has now been renamed to North Chatham Village that was redeveloped. That site was just about 100% impervious surface and even with the redevelopment of that site they had to install some level of stormwater control. Ms. Weakley stated that was before the General Assembly tied our hands. Mr. Sullivan stated he does not believe the ordinance has been updated to reflect that change and is not familiar with that change so he can't speak to that. Mr. Sullivan stated this is not a Conditional District rezoning where we could apply a condition to meet x, y, and z, but they have to meet whatever the County requirements are. If the State law has overwritten that it would override our rules, but he has not heard that from the Watershed Protection staff and we can verify that with them.

Motion to approve the Consistency Statement made by Mr. Arthur, second by Ms. Moose.

"It is the opinion of the Planning Board the rezoning request is consistent with the Chatham County Comprehensive Land Use Plan based on meeting ED Policy 2 strategy 2.1 and Land Use Policy 2 strategy 2.3 of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan."

Chair Lucier completed a roll call vote and the motion to approve this Consistency Statement passed 8-0, unanimously.

Motion to approve the item made by Mr. Arthur, second by Ms. Moose. Chair Lucier completed a roll call vote and the motion to approve this item passed 8-0, unanimously.

2. A request by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners to consider amendments to the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance; specifically, Section 7.2 Definitions, and Section 10.1-10.12 Schedule of District Regulations.

Mr. Glenn stated at the February 4th Planning Board meeting the board had several questions regarding the building/structure height limit of 60 feet. Instead of approving the language provided by planning staff, the planning board asked that staff research the topic. Several board members were concerned about the maximum height limit of a structures was sixty (60) feet. Planning staff informed the planning board that they would research the policies of surrounding jurisdictions. The sections that will be amended are 7.2 Definitions and 10.1- 10.8 and 10.12f Schedule of District Regulations.

Below is a list of the Structure definitions from surrounding jurisdictions:

Durham City/County: Structure- A walled and roofed building that is principally above ground; a manufactured home; vertical projections meeting the definition of antenna-supporting or wireless support structures; or when used in reference to Sec. 8.4, Floodplain and Flood Damage Protection Standards, a gas or liquid storage tank that is principally above ground.

Moore County: Structure- Anything constructed or erected, including but not limited to buildings, manufactured homes, or a gas, liquid, or liquefied gas storage tank that is principally above ground, which requires location on the land or attachment to something having permanent location on the land.

Wake County: Structure- means any object anchored to the ground, constructed or installed by humankind, including signs, buildings, parking lots, garages, carports, flagpoles, stoops and utility buildings (Note: All buildings are structures, but not all structures are buildings).

Lee, Randolph, and Harnett counties do not include individual definitions for structure in their development ordinances, but instead include structure references within the definition for building. Based on planning staff research the average building height limit in residential areas in surrounding jurisdictions is 35 feet. In non-residential zoning districts when there is a height limit, it is usually 60 feet. Additionally, it should be noted that in Chatham County there are a significant amount of permitted structures, mainly private residences, which exceed a 35 feet maximum height.

Mr. Glenn also stated at the June 2nd Planning Board meeting several members expressed concerns over the lack of new height limit regulations for flagpoles and monuments. Staff explained to the planning board the difficulty in crafting regulation in which certain types of structures, in this case flagpoles and monuments, are regulated more strictly than others. With the planning board wanting greater clarification regarding flagpole and monument height, staff agreed to prepare additional language and consult with the county attorney

The proposed definition of Structure is “Anything constructed, erected, or placed, including but not limited to buildings, carports, or storage buildings, and which requires location on the land or attachment to something having permanent location on the land. (Note: All buildings are structures, but not all structures are buildings.)” The word flagpole was removed. Sections 10.1B-10.8B and 10.12F now includes language to the section dealing with Location of Accessory Building and Structures. “Accessory buildings and structures must conform to the minimum required setbacks for the district. Provided, however, well houses, satellite dishes, open structures and telephone booths may be located in the required yards provided they are at least 10 feet from any street or property line. Fences are permitted within the front, side and rear yards with no minimum setback requirement. While not required to conform to minimum setbacks for the district, Flagpoles and Monuments shall not exceed a height of twenty five (25) feet.”

Based on the research of neighboring jurisdictions, the height limits for flagpoles and monuments is proposed for all districts except for light and heavy industrial and compact community districts. Limiting the height of flagpoles and monuments in these districts is proportionate with other jurisdictions and commensurate with the expressed intent of the planning board members’ concern over flagpoles being 60 feet tall. It should also be noted that section 8.8 of the Zoning Ordinance regulates Height Limit Exceptions, including public buildings, church spires, belfries, domes, etc. Flagpoles that are incorporated into the architectural design of a building, such as an American flag on the roof of a bank, would not be subject to the 25 foot height limitation.

The updated language presented in the redline attachment will address the concern over potential flagpole and monument heights, while not creating limitations on other structures such as houses. At the last planning board meeting, staff explained that there were many buildings and homes in the county that would become non-conforming if the maximum height limit was no longer 60 feet. Mr. Glenn stated the County Attorney said that flagpoles and monuments on government property would be exempt from a height limitation.

Mr. Glenn stated in closing a recommendation on consistency statements for rejection and/or approval is provided below.

The request for amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance is consistent with the comprehensive plan of Chatham County, Plan Chatham, by supporting land use policy 5: “New Development should demonstrate design principles that preserve rural and small town character,” specifically, Strategy 5.1 “Encourage context sensitive development design.”

Board Discussion followed and some items discussed were as follows:

- Mr. Frazier asked if the staff is aware of any structures which are higher than 25’. Mr. Glenn stated yes, there are a lot of structures higher than 25’ such as homes and buildings and that is why they are just limiting it to monuments and flagpoles. Mr. Frazier stated we are talking about structures which are not buildings. Ms. Plummer stated there are things like water towers, communication towers, and several

things that are higher than 25'. Mr. Sullivan stated things like cell towers and water towers has an exemption and allows for certain things to be built to a certain height and that is the reason we had this discussion about monuments.

- Vice-Chair Siverson asked about church steeples and stated they are part of a building so they would have the 60' height limit. Mr. Glenn stated church steeples are even exempt from the 60' height limit per section 8.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Mr. Frazier stated he is still trying to get clear about whether there are structures that are higher than 25' that we are regulating. There are garages, storage buildings, well houses, satellite dishes, and stuff like that and none of that in his experience is going to be over 25'. Water towers and communication towers are permitted under another section. Mr. Sullivan stated what has happened over time is when we were initially talking about regulating flagpoles and monuments the discussion was to try and have flagpoles and monuments meet the 60' height requirement in all the districts. So when staff crafted this language before, structures included things like flagpoles and we thought that the Board was okay with flagpoles and monuments limited to 60' instead of any height allowed. When this was being discussed as a Planning Board several meeting back, that is when there was discussion that 60' was not adequate and needed to be more restrictive and that is when staff looked at this in further detail.

The way it is currently crafted, structures would still be allowed up to 60', but flagpoles and monuments now have been pulled out of the definition of structure. We have added this language in red which is a new restriction we never had that says, flagpoles and monuments shall not exceed a height of 25'. We created this new subcategory for just flagpoles and monuments in residential districts that says they can be not taller than 25'. If someone wants to build a carport or their house up to 60' we would still allow that. Also, the way this is written, it will not apply to any non-residential districts, so if there is any concerns about flagpole and monument heights in light industrial or commercial districts those would need to be added in 10.1B, 10.8B, and 10.1F if that is a concern. Right now we understand the concern is only in residential districts.

Mr. Frazier stated this is clear to what is happening and does not agree with keeping monuments and flagpoles restricted more than other structures. Generally, when things which are symbolic or expressive has some 1st Amendment protection, because they are expressing a point of view, they are treated more lenient. It was on those grounds that the Black Lives Matter demonstrations were allowed to go forward even though they might conflict with some of the Coronavirus rules. He stated he does not like us picking out things which express a point of view and restricting them more. Mr. Frazier stated why we can't put the same limit on flagpoles, monuments, and other structures and it is not clear why we need a smaller limit for them.

- Chair Lucier stated to Mr. Frazier, you disagree with some of the other Board members about their concern with flagpoles and monuments where 60' was too high. Mr. Frazier stated there are a lot of flagpoles he is not happy with, but he doesn't think it is appropriate for the Planning Board to try to limit things because we don't like what people are expressing with their flags. Ms. Weakley stated she disagrees and it is not about the content of the flag. Mr. Frazier stated we can put a 25' limit on all structures including flagpoles and monuments. Chair Lucier stated that is not going to work because there are a lot of houses that are much taller than 25'. Mr. Frazier stated this is not regulating houses, it

is structures and house are buildings and buildings can be to 60'. We are talking about other accessory structures which are not buildings and believes those can be 25'.

- Ms. Weakley stated this limits accessory buildings and structures, not buildings and structures. Mr. Sullivan said, to try and get this into the ordinance staff has put flagpoles and monuments into this catchall location of accessory buildings and structures. If we need to staff can add heights of flagpoles and monuments in the title for clarity. Mr. Weakley stated recommended text changes are mostly dealing with accessory building and structures, and we are lumping flagpoles and monuments into accessory buildings and structures. Mr. Sullivan stated yes, we are lumping it into the place that was most convenient, but it is not an accessory building and it is not a structure by definition. It is just place to put flagpoles and monuments to try to get it into the ordinance with as much ease as possible.

Ms. Weakley stated our Zoning Ordinance is already ridiculously long and it is very difficult to determine what is allowed and what is not. Flagpoles and monuments have been removed from the definition of structure, but it seems like we are putting it into the accessory buildings and structures definition and into that category. Mr. Sullivan stated we could change the description to, location of accessory buildings and structures/ heights of flagpoles and monuments, and just change it in every district where we want to regulate flagpoles and monuments heights separate from other buildings and structures. Ms. Weakley stated why we don't just create another definition for structure that includes flagpoles and monuments. Mr. Sullivan stated that is the way it was written before, but 60' wasn't appropriate for some Planning Board members and wanted it more restrictive for those two uses. Ms. Weakley stated make a different definition other than structure and call it something else like in Wake County it is called vertical structures. Create a new definition of flagpoles and monuments so that it is very clear that they are separate from other structures. Mr. Sullivan stated staff can look at that and bring it back to the Planning Board next month.

- Ms. Hager stated she would like to get some clarification from Mr. Frazier's thoughts. Are you saying we could just limit the height of accessory buildings and structures to 25' and therefore flagpoles and monuments would be included in that height limit. Mr. Frazier stated yes. Ms. Hager asked staff if there is a reason we wouldn't be able to limit the height of accessory buildings and structures to 25' is there some that would not be compliant. Mr. Glenn stated there are a lot of things that would be limited. If we were to put flagpoles and monuments back into accessory structures the height limit would need to be like 35', 40', or 60' which is a good standard from what we found from other jurisdictions. Ms. Plummer stated a lot of structures are in municipalities where things are tighter and closer together and in Chatham County we can have silos taller than 25' and that is a structure.
- Vice-Chair Siverson stated we have discussed this item long enough and feels pulling out flagpoles and monuments and restricting them to 25' is not infringing on anybody's free speech, we are not saying they can't have them, we are just saying they can't be so tall they will tower over a neighboring property. Vice-Chair Siverson stated she would like to move forward and approve this language.
- Mr. Arthur agrees and then asked is a statue a monument. Mr. Sullivan stated yes, they are the same. Chair Lucier agrees as well, we have gone back and forth with this item from 60' to 35' to 25', back up and down, we are saying flagpoles and monuments are different and we don't want them towering over the communities. Mr. Glenn asked if the language is going to be different or are we leaving it how it is written. Mr. Sullivan stated staff can work on the language between now and the BOC meeting for

clarification. Something that says location and height of accessory buildings, structures, flagpoles, and monuments. Then once you get into the regulations it is clear there are setbacks for accessory buildings and structures and with flagpoles and monuments we are just dealing with height.

- Ms. Weakley asked why flagpoles and monuments don't have to conform to minimum setbacks. As a property owner, somebody could put up a flagpole on the property line. Mr. Sullivan stated if we want flagpoles and monuments to meet setbacks we could do it. Ms. Plummer stated that might be something for a different text amendment because there is a lot that would need to be changed for that. Ms. Weakley stated accessory buildings and structures must conform to the minimum required setbacks, so why are we making an exception. The language is written and required to conform to setbacks. Mr. Sullivan stated we could add in that they need to meet a 10' setback, but what we will run into is that people don't get permits for flagpoles or for monuments and when they put one up and it is in violation, we are going to force them to move it. If they put up a 25' flagpole and they spent a lot of money on a pole and concrete we are going to enforce it just like they had built a building in the wrong location. There will be consequences in the public's view on the enforcement side, but staff will deal with that. If a setback for flagpoles and monuments is requested we can add that in. Ms. Weakley stated they should not be different than any other accessory building or structure.
- Chair Lucier stated maybe we should just vote on what is in front of us and if that doesn't pass then we need to come back and do something different. Ms. Weakley stated she doesn't understand why there is an exception for flagpoles and monuments while not required to conform to minimum setbacks for the districts and shall not exceed a height of 25'. Why is there an exception? Mr. Sullivan stated because that is how we wrote it as staff. It is just like signs, there is not a setback for signs. The Planning Board requested that we bring back language which is what staff has done and is open for discussion. If you want to add setbacks in as the Planning Board that is your motion to make as a Planning board and forward it to the BOC. Ms. Moose asked Ms. Weakley if it should just read flagpoles and monuments shall not exceed a height 25'. Ms. Weakley said yes and doesn't understand why they are excused from setbacks.

Motion made by Mr. Arthur to approve this item saying flagpoles and monuments shall conform to minimum setbacks for the district and shall not exceed a height of 25'. Second by Mr. Frazier.

- Ms. Hager stated she heard Mr. Sullivan say this would be a public issue because people have to pull permits for everything else and how are they going to be educated about a flagpole if they never had to pull a permit for it and staff is going to have to deal with the aftermath. Mr. Sullivan stated staff would have to issue a press release making people fully aware of this change. The way it is worded they will have to meet the minimum setbacks for the districts, 40' from the front property line, 25' from the sides and rear. We will tell people they will have to get a zoning compliance permit and a floodplain permit which is \$20 each and provide staff with a site plan. Staff will then issue those two permits and if they don't get them staff will cite them for ordinance violations and if they built those staff will make them remove them. Vice-Chair Siverson stated that is pretty onerous. Chair Lucier stated yes and didn't realize there would be that much to it.

Ms. Weakley stated she would like to know more about the permitting process. Other things are not allowed in the setback so why this would require a separate permit. Mr. Sullivan stated because we

are setting standards that have to comply with zoning regulations and staff has to verify. The only way staff can verify is to have an application submitted with a site plan that shows the setback and shows the height and staff has to issue that permit with a \$20 fee associated with it. Ms. Weakley stated that happens all the time and doesn't understand the issue. Mr. Sullivan stated people don't get permits for flagpoles and staff has never issued a zoning permit for a flagpole. Staff will have to issue a permit for the monument in Moncure. Ms. Weakley stated we are talking about a very small percentage and sound like a non-issue. Mr. Sullivan stated flagpoles up to 25' are pretty routine.

- Chair Lucier reminded the Board there is a motion and a second and we should vote. Vice-Chair Siverson confirmed that this motion is to require the minimum setbacks for the districts. Chair Lucier stated yes and only in residential and not light or heavy industry districts. Chair Lucier stated he is sympathetic to what Mr. Sullivan had said so he will be voting against this motion even though he would vote for the language as written in the staff notes. The setback requirement is too onerous. Ms. Weakley asked, why is it too onerous? Chair Lucier stated because of the permitting issues and the enforcement issues is just too much. Vice-Chair Siverson agrees. Chair Lucier stated we are going to vote on this motion and if it doesn't pass we can have another motion.

Chair Lucier completed a roll call vote and the motion to approve this item saying flagpoles and monuments shall conform to minimum setbacks for the district and shall not exceed a height of 25'. Motion did not pass 2-7, opposed by Chair Lucier, Vice-Chair Siverson, Mr. Frazier, Mr. Gomez Flores, Ms. Moose, Ms. Hager, and Mr. Wilson.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Siverson to approve this item with the language proposed by the Planning staff, second by Ms. Hager.

- Ms. Moose asked if section 10.1B is limiting it to residential areas. Chair Lucier stated that is correct. Mr. Glenn stated it is not in light and heavy industries or compact communities. Mr. Sullivan stated there is not any height restrictions in light and heavy industrial. Ms. Moose stated a 60' silo would be allowed in these areas, but not a 60' monument which can only be 25'. Mr. Glenn stated silos are exempt per section 8.8 and are not limited to 60'.

Chair Lucier completed a roll call vote and the motion to approve this item was approved 6-3, opposed by Ms. Weakley, Mr. Frazier, and Mr. Wilson.

Motion to approve the Consistency Statement made by Mr. Arthur, second by Vice-Chair Siverson.

The request for amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance is consistent with the comprehensive plan of Chatham County, Plan Chatham, by supporting land use policy 5: "New Development should demonstrate design principles that preserve rural and small town character," specifically, Strategy 5.1 "Encourage context sensitive development design."

- Ms. Weakley stated she would like to go on the record that she believes in the consistency statement, but she does not believe the motion gets to that statement. Vice-Chair Siverson stated then it is not consistent and you can vote against it. Chair Lucier stated it is your choice to vote for it or against it.

Chair Lucier completed a roll call vote and the motion to approve this Consistency Statement passed 6-3, opposed by Mr. Frazier, Ms. Weakley, and Mr. Wilson.

IX. NEW BUSINESS:

- Vice-Chair Siverson stated she would like to start a conversation on the Planning Board for a text amendment in the subdivision ordinance to address the issue with wells in agricultural areas. The Land Use Plan specifies that goal several times and is one of the principles in the agriculture section for conservation of ground water in agriculture areas. In November of 2017 the Agricultural Advisory Board had submitted a resolution to the BOC asking that all new major subdivisions in agricultural areas be required to be on public water. There was the issue with the Conservancy at Jordan Lake last month and even though that subdivision had passed in a previous meeting unanimously, it was a very close vote based on that issue, switching from public water to wells and there were several Board members that had a problem with that. Vice-Chair Siverson stated this is something we were hoping to address in the UDO, but it seems that the UDO has been delayed quite a bit and it is going to be a long time coming. Meanwhile, we're going to have development proposals coming before the Planning Board in agriculture districts and would like to have a way to address that issue.

Chair Lucier asked Mr. Sullivan the best way to proceed with this concern. Mr. Sullivan stated at the last BOC meeting there was a motion that was approved by the Board to investigate wells in general and well placement as it relates to subdivision regulations. There will be a conversation starting on that and the direction was to have the Planning Board and Environmental Review Advisory Committee (ERAC) to work on that.

Mr. Sullivan stated Staff is currently coordinating with the Managers Office with that piece because it is a little more complex for the Planning Board and ERAC to try and regulate wells through the subdivision regulations. That falls under the purview of the Health department which could potentially involve the Board of Health. Mr. Sullivan stated he feels the Agriculture Advisory Board may need to be involved in this discussion as well, particularly because the discussion last month focused on well contamination broadly in the County. There is a concern that if there is a perception that well water in the County is largely contaminated, there could be repercussions for the agriculture community that uses well water for produce, cattle, or for chickens which is one of our largest industries in the county.

Mr. Sullivan stated there are two areas of interest that need to be focused on, one is well contamination and citing of wells and how that impacts residential and possibly other industries in the County. The secondary issue is addressing wells in agriculture areas as it relates to subdivision regulations.

- Vice-Chair Siverson stated water quantity and water quality. Chair Lucier stated water quality issue is tough because if you look at some of the water supplies in the County like Pittsboro water supply, it is probably not nearly as good as what you can get from your well with some of the contaminations that are well above screening levels, it is a hard issue to deal with in that respect. Chair Lucier stated it is easier to deal with the concern for groundwater quantity and that is what concerns the Agriculture Advisory Board. Chair Lucier asked Ms. Moose if that was correct. Ms. Moose stated that is her understanding also.
- Ms. Weakley stated Chatham County Health department has been partnering with North Carolina Geologic Survey for some time looking at arsenic levels in groundwater and in wells which is especially prevalent in Silk Hope and other places where geology is similar. Groundwater quality for newer wells is more well-known and is something the County needs to be considering. Chair Lucier agrees and it is going to be in all different areas, because some areas are fine where other areas there will be higher arsenic levels in the wells. Chair Lucier stated his point is that the municipal water supply from a well water quality standpoint is not necessarily the answer. Ms. Weakley asked, what is the answer? Chair Lucier stated he doesn't know the answer, but we can't just assume that the municipal water supply is fully safe. You are going to find exceedances of safe levels in groundwater and you are going to find exceedances in the municipal water supply as well.

- Ms. Moose said, focusing on groundwater quantity and if quality seems to be part of that as well, she supports this discussion and thanked Vice-Chair Siverson for bring it before the Board. Vice-Chair Siverson stated she feels that groundwater quality is beyond our control and is more of a Health department issue. The Planning Board has the Land Use Plan with the agriculture area with subdivision submittals that come to the Board. There is a recurring concern about this and she would really like a way to be proactive about this topic and come up with some kind of regulation that we as a Board can adhere to before too long. Maybe development has slowed down like the Legacy developer has stated and we don't have to worry about development for a while, but who knows, a few months ago it felt like we were going to have some real pressures in agricultural areas.
- Mr. Sullivan stated as a next step we can schedule a call with Chair Lucier, Vice-Chair Siverson, Mr. Sullivan, and Ms. Lowry, the director of Environmental Health, to have a general well discussion and map out a strategy the Planning Board could take to look at the groundwater quantity issue as it relates to the number of wells in a subdivisions. Chair Lucier stated that was the issue with the Conservancy at Jordan Lake and the Agriculture Advisory Board have mentioned it on multiple occasions. Obviously we want to protect our rural and agricultural areas and willing to have a conversation with Ms. Lowry. Chair Lucier asked Vice-Chair Siverson if she was able to participate in the call as well. Vice-Chair Siverson said yes.
- Ms. Weakley suggested that they also speak to Ms. Lowry about groundwater quality. Vice-Chair Siverson stated that is being worked on and feels that is a separate item and beyond her expertise. Ms. Weakley stated groundwater quality and quantity is tied together. The more groundwater that is extracted from an area that has a low water yield and pulling through rocks, that contributes to arsenic values in the water. Chair Lucier stated he doesn't disagree, but we have to start somewhere and the issue initially will be quantity. The water quality issue is certainly one of great importance as well, especially with the coal ash issues in the Moncure area. Chair Lucier asked Ms. Moose if she would like to be included in the phone call with Ms. Lowry as well because of her relationship with the Agriculture Advisory Board. Ms. Moose stated she didn't think she needed to be at the meeting, but willing to help if needed.
- Mr. Sullivan stated it will be a general discussion and talk strategies, then bring that back to the next Planning Board meeting to discuss. Vice-Chair Siverson asked about the logistics of this topic and how it can become binding with the BOC approval. Mr. Sullivan stated we could go to the BOC with a couple options and ask them if they have a general interest in this topic to make them a text amendment.
- Ms. Hager stated she had done a lot of research on a community in Arizona where they have a lot of competition for groundwater. There is some language that might be helpful in their regulations and ordinances that they had to create as they developed land. Vice-Chair Siverson stated that would be great information.

X. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

1. Update from the Planning Board liaisons.

- Chair Lucier stated the Pittsboro Planning Board did not have a meeting in July. In the June meeting they discussed going forward with the Mosaic subdivision in Chatham Park. Ms. Weakley stated she drove by the entrance and saw a lot of sediment going into storm drains and she notified Ms. Thorne with the County and Ms. Sutton with Haw River Assembly. This has been a perennial problem and every time she goes by Mosaic sediment is going into the drain. If this high profile area is having problems with sediment going into storm drains, just think about the areas that are no high profile. We are seeing the beginning of a lot of water quality degradation coming to Chatham County. Chair Lucier stated he lives across the river and can see where the creeks come in that drain from Chatham Park and you can see the sediment.
- Vice-Chair Siverson stated Siler City Planning Board had a meeting in May and they approved a recommendation for an 84 unit affordable housing development where the old hospital was located. The June agenda looked at setbacks with the UDO.
- Ms. Moose stated the Agriculture Advisory Board did not meet last month, but will meet next week and they are looking for new Board members from the northeast and southeast quadrant of the County. They will be accepting applications until July 13th.
- Ms. Weakley stated the Chatham Conservation Partnership meeting in July was cancelled and the October agenda topics is spiders. If we can't meet in person they plan to have a virtual meeting.

XI. 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.
2. *Unified Development Ordinance update.*
3. *Public Hearing for August BOC meeting.*

- Mr. Arthur asked about the William's Corner item and is concerned about virtual public input and wanted to know if there is a way people can physically be there. Mr. Sullivan stated the public hearings are now being held at the New Agriculture Center and will be using the smaller breakout rooms to have 10 people in each room to help with having people physically there. Public input will be coming in a variety of ways, one if they want to speak at the meeting, they will have an opportunity to do that. The historic court house and possibly other building will be available and the public can provide comments there as well. The remote meeting platform will allow public input and also written comments. This is complicated because there are so many different groups of people to monitor, such as the Planning staff, Commissioners, other department staff, applicants, and the public. Mr. Arthur stated it sounds good and glad they are accommodating as best they can. Vice-Chair Siverson stated she attended the June BOC meeting at the historic court house and the quality of the audio and video at times were not very good and frustrating to catch every word.

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

Signed: _____ / _____
George Lucier, Chair Date

Attest: _____ / _____
Daniel Garrett, Clerk to the Board Date