



Chatham County Planning Board Minutes August 2, 2022

The Chatham County Planning Board met in regular session on the above date and the meeting were as follows:

Present

Caroline Siverson
Brittany Harrison
Alex West
Clyde Frazier
James Fogleman

Jon Spoon, Vice Chair
Allison Weakley
Bill Arthur
Eric Andrews

Absent

George Lucier, Chair
Jamie Hager

Planning Department

Jason Sullivan, Director, Kimberly Tyson, Subdivision Administrator, Hunter Glenn, Planner II, Chance Mullis Planner II, Brandon Dawson, Planner I, and Dan Garrett, Clerk to the Planning Board.

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Vice-Chair Spoon called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

II. VIRTUAL MEETING GUIDELINES:

Mr. Sullivan read the virtual meeting guidelines.

III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:

Vice-Chair Spoon stated there is a quorum, 9 members present, Mr. Fogleman joined the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Approval of the Agenda – Vice-Chair Spoon asked the board members if there were any issues with the agenda. With no issues the agenda was approved, 8-0.

V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Consideration of the July 5, 2022 meeting minutes. There were minor changes to the meeting minutes. Vice-Chair Spoon conducted a roll call vote, and the July 5, 2022 minutes were approved 8-0.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION:

There were no residents signed up to speak.

VII. ZONING & SUBDIVISION ITEMS:

1. Request by True Homes for **Sketch Plan Revision** review and approval of **Parks at Meadowview** consisting of 788 lots on 948.3 acres, located of Old Graham Rd (S.R. 1520) and NC 87.

Mr. Sullivan stated the Planning Board held a public hearing on this request during their regular meeting on July 5, 2022 and 150+ attendees joined the remote meeting. 16 speakers provided comments and a brief overview follows.

Comments in support of the application

- The current residents in The Parks at Meadowview will have access to a pool, walking trails, and more open space.
- There currently aren't enough residents in The Parks at Meadowview to support major amenities.
- The gates on both ends of The Parks Drive were activated because of drivers speeding.
- Activating the gates has eliminated traffic from drivers using The Parks Drive as access between Old Graham Road and Chapel Ridge golf course.
- Current Parks at Meadowview residents have the same concern as Chapel Ridge residents regarding private road maintenance and support the proposed layout which won't connect to The Parks Dr.
- The majority of traffic generated from the proposed layout will use Highway 87 instead of Old Graham Rd.

Comments in opposition to the application

- The Chapel Ridge HOA President commented that it will cost \$3.5 to \$4 million to rebuild the roads in their community based on the current condition and additional traffic from The Parks at Meadowview Phases 2-4 will accelerate the road deterioration.
- 465 Chapel Ridge residents have signed a petition opposing the request.
- The traffic impact analysis isn't correct because Old Graham Rd. is the easiest route to Chapel Hill
- The two wastewater spray irrigation areas north of Parks Meadow Dr. are a concern for Chapel Ridge residents living close to those areas.
- There are foul odors from the effluent storage ponds that are part of the wastewater treatment plant located in Chapel Ridge, which also serves The Parks at Meadowview.
- The applicants want to sidestep the regulations currently in effect and should follow the currently approved plan or submit under regulations in effect now.
- The Parks Drive was designed to handle 800 homes under the currently approved layout whereas Chapel Ridge roads were not designed to absorb the additional traffic.
- The Chapel Ridge HOA can install gates to restrict access within the development, but it will cost \$1/2 million and there are on-going maintenance costs.
- Traffic has increased considerably on Old Graham Road, yet the road hasn't been widened and there needs to be more law enforcement present during rush hour to slow drivers down.

Planning Board discussion included the following and responses from the applicant are also provided:

Are there other users of Aqua NC utilities in this area other than The Parks and Chapel Ridge? Approximately 200 lots outside of those two developments are connected or will connect to Aqua's utilities. Several additional projects that were entitled have been withdrawn and between 1,800 and 2,000 dwellings will ultimately be connected to the utilities.

Have there been any issues with the wastewater system like those that have occurred in Briar Chapel? The project engineer responded he wasn't aware of similar type issues.

Is it realistic to think 40% of the traffic will travel through Chapel Ridge to access Old Graham Road? The traffic engineer responded that their study is based on existing traffic patterns, existing land uses, adjacent development and future build out, and used a standardized method. They also coordinated with NCDOT on the traffic analysis and think their analysis is supported.

Why are there fewer vehicle trips generated by townhomes vs. single family dwellings? It is based on the IT trip generation manual based on studies of similar type developments throughout the US. Townhome demographics are different than single family and tend to have older residents who don't travel as much as families with children.

Has the developer considered gate access the gates at The Parks at Meadowview to make The Parks Dr. a through road for all residents? The developer met with the current residents of The Parks at Meadowview multiple times and keeping the main road gated was a priority for them.

How much impervious surface is anticipated? The project engineer estimates 18%.

The Planning Board also discussed whether the developers offer to voluntarily meet current riparian buffer and stormwater standards could be enforced by staff. Planning staff commented that there had a been discussion with the county attorney the afternoon of the meeting and his opinion was that they can be enforced and suggested adding conditions if the recommendation is for approval. The Planning Board voted 11-0 to postpone discussion to allow staff time to prepare conditions to consideration by the board.

Staff prepared the first two conditions below regarding riparian buffers and stormwater and the county attorney reviewed them and added the third condition.

- The applicant shall comply with the more stringent of the pre-2008 riparian buffer standards or those currently in effect in the Chatham County Watershed Protection Ordinance and shall be shown on the Construction Plan and Final Plat layouts when they are submitted to the county for approval. The Watershed Protection Department shall have full authority to administer and enforce either riparian buffer standard as authorized in the Watershed Protection Ordinance.
- The applicant shall comply with Chatham County Stormwater Ordinance currently in effect and shall be shown on the Construction Plan and Final Plat layouts when they are submitted to the county for approval. The Watershed Protection Department shall have full authority to administer and enforce the Stormwater Control Ordinance.
- The two preceding conditions were requested by and agreed to by the applicant.

It is planning staff opinion the proposed layout meets the requirements of the pre-2008 Subdivision Regulations. Planning staff does not provide an opinion on the request to extend the development schedule because there are no criteria for evaluation.

- Ms. Weakley stated she had requested an update on the spray fields and the locations of the lift stations, but the map that was shared was from when this was called Buck Mountain back in 2008. Ms. Weakley stated she was expecting a map with the current layout with Phases 2-4, to include Phases 1 and 5, relative to what is going to be used because Mr. Ashness has said some of the areas may not be used now.
- Mr. Birch stated Mr. Sullivan touched on everything in which the Board was looking for us to discuss between the meetings. We have formalized the language on the zoning conditions related to the buffer and stormwater regulation rules. Mr. Birch stated he will turn over the discussion to Mr. Ashness to address the spray field concerns and then come back and discuss the traffic concerns from Chapel Ridge community.

- Mr. Ashness stated to answer Ms. Weakley's question, the permitted spray areas have not changed from the initial drawings, and we have proposed two pump stations in the compacted area in Phases 2-4 which was shown on our sketch plan submittal. There is an existing pump station on the spine road today, about halfway up the project from the entrance on Old Graham Road. The proposed open space on the eastern and southern side of the project does have permitted spray fields there, but unlikely to be used, but during the construction phase we will know more information and discussion with Aqua. We have had good conversations with them over the past few days, confirming all of these spray areas are permitted and that there is adequate capacity to support this project and the other projects planned to be supported by this wastewater plant. Ms. Weakley asked if the location of the spray fields could change as they move closer to the construction plans. Mr. Ashness said for example, we have an average use of 100 gallons of flow per house per day and with this project and the other planned projects at full buildout will not have anywhere near the 500,000 gallons per day capacity, more likely half of that capacity will be used, so it is very unlikely we will need to use all the permitted spray fields.
- Ms. Weakley stated the spray areas #7 and #8 on the east side are located in undeveloped open space, will these stay permitted spray fields? This area has steep slopes and that is a concern. Mr. Ashness stated the spray field on the far east side of the project has a low application rating which means if you do not need to develop all of the spray footprint to meet the gallon flow requirement this is an undesirable spray area and would unlikely ever be developed or used verses another area with a high application rate where you could spray 1.5 to 2 times the amount of treated wastewater for that same surface area. The intent of that area to the east is to leave it the way you see it now. Ms. Weakley stated that is why she was hoping to see a new exhibit with the new layout, however it can still possibly be used as a spray area, and it seems ridiculous to put infrastructure in place to reach than small area within the open space. Mr. Ashness stated he agrees 100%, but this would be derived more clearly during the construction plans and right now we are just at the sketch plan revision phase. Aqua and ourselves understand and recognizes that the true flow rate will not necessitate the full completion of the fields and this field is not an area we would pursue and very unlikely it would be used.
- Ms. Weakley asked if spray areas #4 and #16 west of Autumn Chase already have spray irrigation infrastructure located within it? Mr. Ashness stated the areas in green on the map has installed infrastructure and that indicates there is not any infrastructure in spray areas #4 and #16. Ms. Weakley stated there had been some public comments concerning odors around that Autumn Chase area. That area is also a Natural Heritage plant community, Dry Oak Hickory subtype that was delineated and is about 31 acres. Mr. Ashness stated this is not a conservation subdivision, but we did have discussions with Aqua about removing the first rung of spray which is about 80' to 100', plus the two 50' buffers dividing the neighborhoods, which is a 200' buffer with no spray and we are very sensitive to these concerns. We would not have to clear and remove the trees; it would be a selective process and protect all we could if this spray area were needed.
- Mr. Birch stated they have had meetings with Chapel Ridge Community Association, and we have work diligently trying to produce a written private agreement between the two parties. Although we do not have a signed agreement we are continuing to work on negotiations. At this time, the applicant has agreed to participate in another traffic study that considers the future buildout of the Parks at Meadowview and Chapel Ridge. The applicant agrees to contribute six-figure amount of funds towards mutually agreeable improvements of the results of the new traffic study. The applicant also agrees to provide the Chapel Ridge Community Association with another six-figure amount of funds to help mitigate traffic concerns or use where they need it. The applicant also agreed to post signage directing construction traffic away from Chapel Ridge Drive, limiting the construction entrance and include clauses in our subcontractor agreements to prohibit the use of Chape Ridge Drive. The applicant has also agreed to provide funds that would implement methods and mitigate the odor from the treated wastewater spray fields. Mr. Birch stated even though they do not have a signed agreement with the Chapel Ridge Community Association everything that was just mentioned the applicant is committed to

fulfilling. We have worked diligently over the past month, and we understand that there are some more negotiations to occur, but we believe what we have offered and mitigated the concerns for the use of the private road. If the Board is comfortable, would respectfully request a recommendation for approval of this project.

Public Input:

- Ms. Charlene Stephens stated based on what the applicant is willing to concede to Chapel Ridge regarding the road usage, as per the HOA president nothing has been agreed to as of yet. Based on the revised plat, why can't an access road be built from the new phase going down and around the proposed walking trail and come out on Botanical Way or Parks Drive as close to the gate entrance to out to Old Graham Road. That would alleviate a lot of the traffic that the current residents are concerned about. The new residents in the new phases could have their own access codes for the gate and that would alleviate a lot of traffic on Chapel Ridge Drive. I understand that the Planning Board would like to see this project go through but are you willing to burden a neighboring community even though the developer is offering financial backing behind the proposal. The burden is on our community to either gate our road or put in speed bumps, the burden should be placed on the Parks at Meadowview, and I would ask the Planning Board to consider that before this development is approved. I would be very concerned if you as a board were to vote on this project knowing and agreement had not been reached or signed. Ms. Stephens also mentioned the spray area that is identified as a National Heritage site, what assurances do we have that this area will be preserved as much as possible? Ms. Weakley stated it is not a National Heritage site but is a natural community that is tracked by the Natural Heritage Program and was delineated by them at some point.
- Mr. Adam Sessions stated he is a new resident and believes the main issue as why the project didn't move forward was because of the gates. We are willing to work with Chapel Ridge as much as possible to allow this project to move forward.
- Mr. Dick Schuler stated that the Chapel Ridge attorney had provided the Planning Board documentation concerning some access easements. These easements date back to 2004 and provide general internal access and to be accessible to the residents of the Parks. There was an amendment in 2006 which allowed them to build the gates and it stated that anyone who lives in tract 1 will have access to that road. It is simple that the submitted plan is not consistent and is in violation of the amendment to the easements. Phase 5 also has an easement as well, but this plan is trying to circumvent these easements and I cannot understand why the Planning Board can approve a plan which violates two legally documented easements. Nobody in Chapel Ridge is against the gates or against the need for amenities, but we are in favor that legally recorded documents should be adhered to.
- Mr. Philip Royal stated last meeting he had discussed the aerators to mitigate foul odors when sprayed, but that was not mentioned tonight and would like to bring that back up because those are doing a good job based on the current load. We are afraid that additional usage could make these aerators not function as they should. A couple of years ago before these were installed our neighborhood smelt like a septic tank, we had to fight with Aqua to get them installed and I would expect we would have to go to the State and battle again for more aerators if the additional load from the new phases requires it. We would also have to pay additional septic charges for the improvements, and we should not have to pay with the addition of the Parks load. I am requesting that an engineering study be conducted and preferably one that Aqua does not provide because they are bias, and this should be done up front and the developer pays for it and not Chapel Ridge residents.
- Ms. Barbara Arcand stated the proposal continues to say that there are 948 acres under consideration, but there are not, 155 of those acres are the Harris tract. The Harris tract has been owned by someone other than the Parks at Meadowview and it was given a Right-of-Way though deeded access to public

roads including Old Graham Road and Parks Meadow Drive. At that time, the Planning Board and the County Commissioners wanted to make sure there was connectivity between public roads. The project that is under consideration is 700 and some odd acres not 948 acres and we should be clear on that. If the current plan is accepted, it is going to cut off access to the developer of that property which is currently Chatham Partners and Polk. This property has the potential to provide traffic through there, so I do not understand why the Planning Board would give the green light to a proposal that is still existing under the pre-2008 lack of zoning standards when Governor Cooper has lifted the Covid-19 restrictions and this project will need to be considered under current zoning plans where the county would have some say over the administration of the wastewater provisions and enforce standards. Right now, it is all on a prayer a promise and a wink, I don't believe the development of this size with the potential of 800 homes built on 1/3rd of the portion of the property would be acceptable. Ms. Arcand encouraged the Planning Board to delay this project so it can be further studied and place it under the proper planning guidelines that we all deserve as citizens of Chatham County.

- Ms. Cherise McDermott stated she is a newer resident of the Parks at Meadowview and understands some of the concerns that Chapel Ridge has with traffic, and we have some of the same concerns. We love that we have the gate in our community, and it was a selling point for us, and it would be hard for us to have the gates taken down. I would hope that we could find some kind of resolution with Chapel Ridge that would not require us to remove the gates. I also feel that the developer has tried really hard to work on a negotiation with Chapel Ridge and there will need to be some give and take, and the developer is giving quite a bit. I hope we can find a solution that is happy for everyone because we want to have good relations with our Chapel Ridge neighbors.
- Mr. Christopher O'Brien stated he has property in both Chapel Ridge and Parks at Meadowview and can see both sides of the story. The access for the new phases is to a public road and the Chapel Ridge private road starts at the traffic circle and the Parks Drive, it is in the interests of both us and Chapel Ridge that those roads are not abused by contractors. We did a study 5 years ago and we had 8600 vehicles using our road that did not reside in our neighborhood and they were mostly heading to Chapel Ridge golf course and some of the residents of Chapel Ridge were using it as well. We want to be great neighbors and do community things together, but it is important to understand that the safety of our children and community all depend upon our ability to control access through our neighborhoods. I also feel the True Homes has bent over backwards in offering compromises to Chapel Ridge and good faith is not being returned, this is where we need to begin to make an agreement.
- Ms. Cheryl Markiewicz asked what the goal of this new revised plan is, the larger home in the development is selling quickly and a huge demand for those home in this area. When I see the townhouses and smaller living areas, in this area, it is not convenient to anything. It is not walking distance to a store, a school, a library, there is nothing. What we have to realize when we are making these homes for "first time home buyers" the trend is that investors are buying these homes and out bidding first time home buyers and I think we need as a county to think what is going to end up in there. I drove over to the cottages at Chatham Park, half of those cottages are investor owned, they are not people that live or participate in the community. I don't know what the goal is for the county, but the Parks original design would be better, with the owners of the home living in the homes, which is what we want, we do not want investors to be the absentee owners. Smaller type homes should be closer to the towns, it is 13 miles to get to Food Lion, do the math, it is not near a school or anything. I don't know who we are trying to attract.
- Mr. James Crawford stated he has lived in the Parks for seven years and has been really happy to see a developer come in and finish a project that has been outstanding for a long time. Having this be completed will be the best thing for everybody, we do not want to be fighting with our neighbors. One nice thing I see about this new layout is the smaller footprint and more open space. There are a lot of benefits to this plan, nobody is going to be completely happy, there are pros and cons to everything, but I think the developer have acted in good faith and we want to see things progress and completed. My first home was a townhome, and I was not within walking distance of anything, it was a split community

of townhomes and single-family homes and it worked out great. It was not like having a trailer park in your backyard, there are plenty of affluent people that move into those kinds of homes, they could be downsizing, empty nesters, not looking to maintain a yard, they don't want to be in a downtown area, there is a different way to look at it with a lot of positives. At the end of the day, we would like to see this project completed and hope you vote to move forward with this project.

Board discussion:

- Ms. Weakley asked if this was the last meeting to discuss this item, or do we still have one more month? Mr. Sullivan stated because this item falls under the pre-2008 regulations the Board has 65 days, and the next meeting is on September 6th so we can hold a third meeting for this item. Ms. Weakley stated it seems like there is still some outstanding issues that need to be addressed and it might be a good idea to give them some more time to work those out. Vice-Chair Spoon stated even if we were to recommend denial, this subdivision would just revert back to the pre-2008 regulation approved plan.
- Vice-Chair Spoon asked the developer under this new plan it is adding 49 lots and all the regulations are being met under current standards, so why the rush to get this approved under pre-2008 regulations. Mr. Birch stated there is a project in place and the current residents of the Parks has been waiting a long time to get this project built out and bearing the burden of the costs maintaining the infrastructure that is on the project now and has not received any of the benefits they expected to come with the subdivision. By proceeding under the current entitlement with revisions we are able to get more families in the neighborhood and HOA members to turn the neighborhood over to them and reduce the cost burden on the current residents. There is also a housing shortage in Chatham County and operating under the existing entitlement with revisions allows for the delivery of a verity of housing units to the market and to the people quicker. We are meeting and exceeding the post-2008 regulations, so it is not in anyone's best interest to wait another year for us to go back through the whole process demanding more time from staff, boards, and residents when we would be presenting the same plan.
- Mr. Andrews stated he is having issues with a section of the community that wants to gate themselves, but still have the benefits of the remainder of the community. I cannot vote on this item until the traffic concerns have been resolved with Chapel Ridge. It is in everyone's best interest to get this resolved and would like to table this item if we do have time. Mr. Sullivan stated we do have time and can hear this item at the September 6th Planning Board meeting. Because this is a pre-2008 subdivision the Planning Board will see each submittal for this project, preliminary plat, construction plans, and final plat.
- Mr. Arthur stated he feels uncomfortable voting on this item as well until the negotiations and discussions are finalized. One speaker mentioned something about easements which has not come up before in our discussions, is that something into which we should look or is it even relevant. Mr. Sullivan stated that is not relevant to this discussion.
- Vice-Chair Spoon stated there is an option for us to have one more meeting to discuss this item and feels the same as Mr. Arthur and Mr. Andrews about unresolved issues and is not comfortable voting on this item until there are some agreements in place that is fair to the whole community. Vice-Chair Spoon thanked and encouraged the residents who have been attending and speaking at the Planning Board meetings, but now is the time for you to speak with your HOA and get involved with that process, make sure your voice is heard so an agreement can be made for the entire community that everyone is comfortable with. If we could come back to our next meeting with an agreement this Board would be comfortable with that as well.

Motion made by Mr. Arthur to table this item to the September 6,2022 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Andrews. Vice-Chair Spoon conducted a roll call vote, and the item was tabled by a vote of 9-0, unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING:

2. Request by Brad Haertling, P.E. of American Engineering on behalf of Contentnea Creek Development Co. for Subdivision First Plat review and approval of Summit Terrace, consisting of 26 lots on 56.15 acres, located off Mt. Gilead Church Rd (S.R.1700), Parcel 19355.

Mr. Glenn stated the request is for First Plat review and recommendation of Summit Terrace Subdivision consisting of 26 lots on 56.15 acres, located off of Mt. Gilead Church Rd (S.R. 1700). A vicinity map showing the property location (attachment #2) is included in the agenda packet. The parcel ID is 19355. Per the Subdivision Regulations, section 5.2C(4), a public hearing shall be held at the first planning board meeting to receive comments on the proposed subdivision. Item (b) states that following the public hearing, the planning board shall review the proposal, staff recommendation, and public comments and indicate their recommendation for approval, disapproval, or approval subject to modifications. As stated above the Planning board has two (2) meetings to act on the proposal.

Summit Terrace Dr, Amhurst Dr, Southbury Dr and Archway Dr. are shown on the plat as 50' right of ways with 20' wide travel way. During the Technical Review Committee held on July 13, 2022, Jennifer Britt with NC Department of Transportation informed the applicant that a 60-foot-wide right-of-way is required since the roads will be state maintained.

Following the TRC meeting, Sy Robbins sent an email to planning staff summarizing the concerns of the Chatham County Historical Association. The comments were particularly focused on the cemetery on the property. Having the cemetery boundaries well marked during construction activities would be important to avoid accidental damage--especially since this cemetery, like many of the old ones in Chatham, doesn't look much like a cemetery to the untrained eye. Any removal of trees and growth in the cemetery should be done with particular care not to disturb the graves and fieldstone markers. The packet also includes a narrative from the Chatham County Historical Association.

At the time staff was preparing these notes, the applicant had not received any correspondence from Chris Blice. It looks like there could have been some timbering on this property in the past. There is also significant pastureland and some of the wooded area may have historically been pasture. The General Environmental Documentation was included with the application and reviewed by Watershed Protection Department staff.

The applicant held a community meeting at 50 Windfall Creek Dr. Chapel Hill, NC on May 4th, 2022 from 6pm to approximately 7:30pm. No issues were noted by adjacent property owners as they only had general questions regarding what was being proposed. They asked about lot size and price point of homes. They asked if access were going to be maintained to the existing cemeteries, and if proposed septic field would have any effect on the existing neighboring wells and if screening would be required along Mt. Gilead Church Rd. No changes are anticipated to the layout because the residents were satisfied that access to existing cemeteries was being maintained and the price of the homes would be comparable to other new home construction in the area.

The TRC met to review this project at their July 13th meeting. Discussion included the location and spacing of fire hydrants, grading for a cul-de-sac near a buffer, mail kiosk location, street lighting, and right-of-way width. Each lot will be served by individual private septic fields. Central Carolina Soil Consulting, PLLC submitted a soil/site evaluation to the applicant on January 24th, 2017. The report is attachment 5. The site is served by a 12" county water line on Mt. Gilead Church Rd, and a 6" county water line is also on the property. Summit

Terrace Dr, Amhurst Dr, Southbury Dr and Archway Dr. were submitted Emergency Operations and were deemed accepted. The roads are shown on the plat as 50' right of ways with 20' wide travel way.

The site has three intermittent stream segments, two perennial stream segments, and three potential wetlands. The intermittent streams require a 50-foot buffer from the top of bank. The perennial streams require a 100-foot buffer from top of bank. The wetlands require a 50-foot buffer from the flagged boundary landward. There are no special flood hazards identified on the property. There are three stormwater devices on the site. One BMP is to the northeast of lot 24. Another BMP is situated between both perennial stream buffers north of lot 21 and the Amherst Dr. cul-de-sac. The third BMP is located adjacent to lots 16 and 18.

It is planning staff opinion the proposed First Plat meets the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

Plan Chatham was adopted by the Board of Commissioners in November 2017 and is a comprehensive plan that provides strategic direction to address the most pressing needs in the county. The entirety of this project is located within the rural designation on the future land use and conservation map. The description for rural includes single family homes on large lots, low density development, mix use of agriculture, home-based and small-scale businesses, open space, greenway trails, protected lands, and conservation easements. The proposed subdivision meets the adopted riparian buffer and stormwater control standards of the county. It should be noted that Plan Chatham is not intended to be used as a regulatory tool but is a policy document. When reviewing subdivision applications, the boards can use the plan as a tool to identify future regulatory changes.

The Planning department recommends granting approval of the road names Summit Terrace Dr., Amhurst Dr., Southbury Dr., and Archway Dr. and granting approval of subdivision First Plat for the Summit Terrace Subdivision with the following conditions:

1. Approval of the First Plat shall be valid for a period of twelve (12) months following the date of approval by the Board of Commissioners and the Construction Plan approval shall be valid for a period of twenty-four (24) months from the date of approval by the Technical Review Committee or Board of Commissioners.
2. The county attorney shall review and approve the contract and performance guarantee prior to final plat recordation.

Public Input: No residents wished to speak.

Board Discussion:

- Mr. Andrews asked about the stub-out near the cul-de-sac. Mr. Haertling stated this will be a public road giving access and connectivity to the adjacent property owner.
- Ms. Siverson stated she went to the site visit and there were nice oak trees on a home site, and I had asked if those trees were going to be protected, if this is a private home site how can we guarantee the trees will be protected? Mr. Haertling stated we will add it to our protective covenants to ensure they are not disturbed. Ms. Siverson also asked if they had plans to identify and protect the cemetery on the site. Mr. Haertling stated yes, they will be placing a fence around the cemetery with a marker. Ms. Siverson stated she enjoyed the site visit and believes this is a good project.
- Mr. Arthur stated on the soil survey the southeast corner has unsuitable soils, how is that going to work with septic systems? Mr. Haertling stated when this project moves forward there will be a more detailed survey to find the best soils in that location and these are sizable lots.

- Ms. Weakley stated she appreciates the narrative about the history of this land and glad the cemetery will be honored. In the area of the cemetery this plat is showing a wetland, but it does not have a buffer around it. Mr. Haertling stated this plat needs to be updated, the delineation has been confirmed that the wetland no longer exists based on the US Army Corps documentation. Ms. Weakley stated this project is within our conservation area of our Plan Chatham and we have an appendix called the Big Woods Conservation Design Guideline, it is good to see that these lots will remain wooded, and your consideration of the stream crossing is appreciated. The stub-out is not needed, the adjacent property owner has access to Big Hole Road and Mt. Gilad Church Road already. Ms. Weakley asked if the developer would be agreeable to remove the stub-out. Mr. Sullivan stated Planning staff pushed for that connectivity, even though the parcel is not landlocked, it is a rather large piece of property, so we were looking at connectivity as far as emergency vehicle access as well as water system connection. Vice-Chair Spoon stated he feels we should go with the staff recommendation for the stub-out. Ms. Weakley stated it seems like an unnecessary stream crossing. Vice-Chair Spoon stated they will not cross the stream yet and they may never need the connection, but I am in favor of going with the staff recommendation and trusting that it is something worth having in the plan for flexibility in the future.
- Ms. Weakley asked why the school has not responded. Mr. Sullivan stated the notification is not for the school to say they have adequate capacity; it is a notification to see if they have any plans to build a future school in that area that they may want to acquire property for land acquisition.

Motion made by Ms. Siverson to approve this item, seconded by Mr. Arthur. Vice-Chair Spoon conducted a roll call vote, and the item was approved by a vote of 8-0, unanimously. (Mr. Fogleman seemed to have lost connection to the meeting and was unable to vote)

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

IX. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

1. Update from the Planning Board liaisons.

- Vice-Chair Spoon stated we had a second UDO subcommittee meeting and Ms. Meg Nealon helped with future dates and provided structure that will be helpful to move forward. We would have liked to pursue an August meeting, but scheduling became complicated and as of August 15th we are not allowed to have remote meeting anymore. If there are questions about how we are going to proceed, please send an email and they can be addressed. We will hold our September 29th and October 27th meeting in the Historic Courthouse.
- Ms. Siverson stated the Siler City Planning Board agenda had approved the development for 147 single family homes and 67 townhomes located on 99 acres. The Agriculture Advisory Board did not meet in July.
- Ms. Weakley stated the Chatham Conservation Partnership had their meeting on July 21st and it was a great meeting, the recording is available to view if you would like to see it. The next meeting will be on October 20th as a Zoom meeting between 9-11:30am, it will be another conservation-oriented meeting. The Triangle Land Conservancy will be telling us about their work with the conservation funds on the Rocky and Deep Rivers. We are going to ask the North Carolina Natural Heritage Program to speak about any updates they can provide.

2. Discuss resuming in-person meetings.

- Vice-Chair Spoon stated the Planning Board will be meeting in person for the September 6th meeting at the New Agriculture because as of August 15th we are not allowed to meet remotely. Ms. Weakley stated the Town Council in the municipality she works in voted to allow remote meeting to continue. Mr. Sullivan stated the State Statute is confusing and we will look at it closely to see what can be done. We are not allowed to make people wear masks, but they will be available for those who would like to wear them. Mr. Andrews asked if our quorum would change if someone could be out for medical reasons. Mr. Sullivan stated no, only if there was a vacancy. Ms. Harrison stated she will not be able to attend the in-person meeting. Vice-Chair Spoon stated none of us would like to be in this position, but everyone needs to do what they feel is right for themselves and their family.

X. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

Mr. Sullivan reported on the following:

1. Minor Subdivision spreadsheet
 2. Unified Development Ordinance Update
- Mr. Mullis gave a brief overview of the status of the UDO and stated the consultants are drafting module 1. We did have a really good UDO subcommittee meeting and provided the input to the consultants. There will be a BOC meeting with the consultants held on August 29th during the day and discuss the scope of the work for phase 1 and into phase 2.
 3. Moncure Site Area Update
 - We are keeping up with VinFast and all the coverage they are receiving on the news and WRAL went to Vietnam to tour their facility.

XI. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Signed: _____ / _____
George Lucier, Chair Date

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