



Chatham County Planning Board Minutes September 5, 2023

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

Present

George Lucier, Chair	Jon Spoon, Vice Chair
Tony Mayer	Shelley Colbert
Mary Roodkowsky	Amanda Roberson
Norma Hernandez	Eric Andrews
	Elizabeth Haddix

Absent

Clyde Frazier
Kent Jones

Planning Department

Jason Sullivan, Director, Chance Mullis, Assistant Director, Hunter Glenn, Planner II, and Dan Garrett, Clerk to the Planning Board.

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Lucier called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:

Chair Lucier stated there was a quorum, 7 members present, Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Haddix arrived shortly after the approval of the first zoning item.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Approval of the Agenda – Chair Lucier asked the board members if they were okay with the consent item on the agenda and the other agenda items. Ms. Colbert asked if the zoning item Pranay Parekh could be heard before the Circle K zoning item. It was agreed to follow that suggestion. Motion made by Ms. Robertson, seconded by Ms. Colbert. The agenda was approved, 7-0, unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Consideration of the August 1, 2023 and August 23, 2023 meeting minutes. Minor edits were noted. Motion by Ms. Roodkowsky to approve the August 1, 2023 minutes and seconded by Ms. Robertson. Motion made by Vice-Chair Spoon to approve the August 23, 2023 minutes, seconded by Mr. Mayer. Both meeting minutes were approved 7-0, unanimously.

V. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION:

There were no public speakers signed up to speak at this time.

VI. CONSENT ITEMS:

1. A quasi-judicial request by Duke Energy for a Special Use Permit for a new 120 ft wireless support tower at their current substation location on Parcel 62351, located at 1785 Corinth Rd, Cape Fear Township.

A quasi-judicial public hearing was held August 21, 2023. Planning staff presented the application a representatives from Duke Energy presented the request. No one else provided testimony during the hearing.

The total site is approximately 483 acres and is split zoned Heavy Industrial and R-1 Residential. The substation site is located within the R-1 residential area however, it has been used by the Duke Energy for over three decades.

When determining whether a Special Use Permit request should be approved as per Section 5 Conditional Zoning Districts, the following findings must be supported.

1. **The alleged error in the Ordinance, if any, would be remedied by the proposed amendment with a detailed explanation of such error in the Ordinance and detailed reasons how the proposed amendment will correct the same.** Wireless telecommunication towers are allowed as a Special Use Permit in a residentially zoned districts. No errors are being claimed in the Ordinance.
2. **The requested special use permit is either essential or desirable for the public's convenience or welfare.** In order to provide faster, remote monitoring between substations, this tower will improve service outage notifications in cases of power failure and to securely transmit information between stations. Due to security concerns, cell providers will not be permitted to co-locate on any of the utility company towers.
3. **The requested permit will not impair the integrity or character of the surrounding or adjoining districts, and will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of the community.** Due to the height being 120 ft, the FAA does not require the top of the tower to have a flashing beacon. The tower will be a cambium pole, galvanized steel to match the other equipment existing at the substation. The tower will be located within the existing fenced, secure area and will not require any additional build upon area. There will be no audible noise, chemicals, or radioactive agents present.
4. The manner in which the proposed amendment will carry out the intent and purpose of any adopted plans or part thereof.
 - Chapter 2, Issues and Opportunities; Land Use Suitability- this use will not hinder any future land development as it will be located on existing property utilized by Duke Energy
 - Chapter 4, Plan Elements; ED Policy 4, Strategy 4.4- encourage the continued use of existing commercial and industrial uses to expand services in correct zoning districts.
5. **Adequate utilities, access roads, storm drainage, recreation, open space, and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided consistent with the County's plans, policies, and regulations. This is an unmanned site, so no utilities are required. There is an existing gated access drive that will continue to be used. No new land disturbance is required.**

The Planning Board has up to three meetings in which to make a recommendation for approval or denial to the Board of Commissioners.

The conditions below are provided for consideration by the board:

Site Specific Conditions

1. A development permit shall be obtained and remain valid at all times within two years of the date of this approval or the site plan becomes null and void.

Standard Site Conditions

2. The application, standards and adopted regulations of the applicable ordinances and policies, and the approved recommendations as provided for and/or conditioned, are considered to be the standards as set forth and shall comply as stated. Changes to or variations from any requirements of this permit must be approved through the Planning Department or other approving board before any such changes can take place.

3. All required local, state, or federal permits (i.e., NCDOT commercial driveway permits, NCDWQ, Chatham County Land and Water Resources, Watershed Protection, and Environmental Health Division, etc.) shall be obtained, if required, and copies submitted to the Planning Department as part of the platting process.

Standard Administrative Conditions:

4. Fees - Applicant and/or landowner shall pay to the County all required fees and charges attributable to the development of its project in a timely manner, including, but not limited to, utility, subdivision, zoning, and building inspections.
5. Continued Validity – The continued validity and effectiveness of this approval was expressly conditioned upon the continued compliance with the plans and conditions listed above.
6. Non-Severability – If any of the above conditions is held to be invalid, this approval in its entirety shall be void.
7. Non-Waiver – Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to waive any discretion on the part of the County as to further development of the applicant's property and this permit shall not give the applicant any vested right to develop its property in any other manner than as set forth herein.

This item was approved on the consent agenda with a vote of 7-0, unanimously.

VII. **ZONING ITEMS:**

1. A legislative public hearing requested by Pranay Parekh to rezone Parcel 17357 from CU-RA90 (previously Contentnea Creek) to R-5 Residential, being 130.443 acres, located at 739 Hatley Rd., New Hope Township.

Mr. Sullivan stated the legislative public hearing was held August 21, 2023. Representatives for the applicant and three neighboring property owners spoke on the matter. There were no objections to the rezoning application.

A conditional use rezoning to RA-90 (90,000 square foot minimum lot size) and conditional use permit for a subdivision were approved in 2006 for a development named Cooper Subdivision. The developer did not move forward with the project and the conditional use permit expired. The current owner wishes to revert the zoning designation to the original R-5 designation (5-acre average/3-acre minimum) in order to create a large lot conventional subdivision.

When considering a general use rezoning, all uses listed in Section 10.13 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance listed under the proposed zoning classification are permitted. However, due to possible limitations such as wastewater capacity, access to public utilities, built upon area limits, etc., not all uses are feasible. The decision to approve a general use rezoning shall be determined by the following criteria.

1. **Any alleged error in the Ordinance, if any, would be remedied by the proposed amendment.** No errors in the Ordinance are being claimed.
2. **The changed or changing conditions, if any, make the proposed rezoning reasonably necessary.** The adjoining property on three sides of this property are zoned R-5 and this parcel was zoned R-5 prior to 2006. The new owner wishes to create up to 25 new residential lots with individual private septic systems. The extension of the county water line will also be proposed.
3. **The manner in which the proposed rezoning will carry out the intent and purpose of the adopted Land Use Plan or part thereof.** The property is located within the Rural node and adjacent to the Conservation node of the Land Use Plan. Rezoning to the original R-5 zoning designation will decrease the density of development further keeping with the rural character in the surrounding area.
4. **Other factors/reasons for rezoning request.** One primary entry will be proposed off of Hatley Road and an existing stub road in Sunset Grove will also be used. County water will be extended through Boxwood Drive, a

stub-out that is in Sunset Grove, private septic systems will be used, and one monument entry sign will be proposed.

5. **All other information required on this application or as offered by the applicant in support of the request.** The proposed subdivision plan consists of 25 lots with individual septic systems on each lot. Homes are expected to have up to four bedrooms and will utilize the county water system. The property is located within the WSIV-Protected area watershed which allows for 40,000 square foot lots.

Mr. Sullivan said the Planning Board has up to three meetings in which to make a recommendation to approve or deny the request to the Board of Commissioners.

If approval is recommended, the following Consistency statement has been provided for consideration:

“The rezoning of this property maintains the integrity of the Rural land use designation as shown on the Future Land Use and Conservation Map in Plan Chatham.”

- Mr. Sam Nye, an engineer on the project, gave a brief overview of the rezoning request and touched on the major subdivision that is planned for this property. The average size lots would be 5 acres on public water with private septic systems.

Board Discussion:

- Chair Lucier asked if there was anyone in the public wishing to speak on this item, there was none.
- There was no board discussion about this item.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Spoon to approve the consistency statement, “The rezoning of this property maintains the integrity of the Rural land use designation as shown on the Future Land Use and Conservation Map in Plan Chatham.” Second by Ms. Colbert. The consistency statement was approved with a vote of 7-0, unanimously.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Spoon to approve this zoning item, second by Ms. Roodkowsky. The zoning item was approved with a vote of 7-0, unanimously.

2. A legislative public hearing requested by Manns Chapel II, LLC and Circle K Stores, Inc., to rezone Parcels 2642, 2641, 2562, 2564, 2563, 2542, 2560 from B-1 Business and CU-B1 to CD-NB to redevelop the convenience store site and allow for additional retail and personal services commercial building, located at 11399 US 15-501 N, Baldwin Township.

Mr. Sullivan stated a legislative public hearing was held August 21, 2023. Attorney Nick Robinson and others presented the request. When determining whether a rezoning request should be approved under Section 5 Conditional Zoning Districts, the following findings must be supported.

1. **The alleged error in the Ordinance, if any, would be remedied by the proposed amendment with a detailed explanation of such error in the Ordinance and detailed reasons how the proposed amendment will correct the same.** The applicant is not claiming any errors in the Ordinance pertaining to this request.
2. **The changed or changing conditions, if any, of 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.** The original convenience store site was deeded in 1951 and has been used for commercial activity since the 1960s. At that time and until around the early 2000s, US 15-501 N was a two-lane road. As part of the widening project, additional right-of-way was acquired by the NC Department of Transportation which restricted the layout of the gas station (see google earth image below from 2005).

The conditional use rezoning on the adjacent parcel #2641 was approved in October 2005 for the Baycorp Corporation and was intended for a bank. This was never developed, and the conditional use permit is now void and there are no permitted uses for the site.

The combination of all the parcels will allow the convenience store to be rebuilt and a layout that provides for safer vehicular movements. The redevelopment of the gas station will provide improved access from Manns Chapel Rd. and 15-501 and allow for one outparcel for other retail use.

3. The manner in which the proposed amendment will carry out the intent and purpose of any adopted plans or part thereof.

- a. Chapter 2 – Creating in-county jobs and maintaining retail sales within the county. This area is shown as one of the proposed locations for commercial suitability (pg. 21-22).
- b. Chapter 3 – Goals and Objectives- area is within the Neighborhood Center node of the land use plan.
- c. Chapter 4 – the re-development of the project will bring approximately 12-15 jobs (Economic development, p 53). This is an area within the planned growth designations per Land Use pg. 62 and Strategy 2.1

4. The requested amendment is either essential or desirable for the public convenience or welfare. As previously noted, the redevelopment of this retail site will provide for safer access drives at the intersection of US 15-501 N and Manns Chapel Road. The Appearance Commission reviewed the landscaping plan and new landscaping will be installed as indicated in the application. The gas station has been in this location for many decades and provides a needed service within the northeastern portion of the county. Additionally, the redevelopment of the station will provide additional services without the need for a new station at a new location.

5. All other circumstances, factors, and reasons which the applicant offers in support of the proposed amendment. The NC Department of Environmental Quality, along with the Board of Commissioners reviewed a revision to the Watershed Protection Map and approved revising the boundary between the WSII-BW and WS-IV PA districts. Field surveys were prepared indicating the drainage on the property was different than as shown on the watershed projection map. The amendment was adopted by the Board of Commissioners on August 21, 2023 and this will allow more use of the property.

- Additional information in support of the amendment request is county water will be used and Aqua NC will continue to serve the store site for wastewater. The new out-parcel will be served by an on-site septic system. Stormwater will meet all current regulations and will be sized to accommodate all anticipated uses. All other regulations regarding lighting and signage will meet all current regulations.

Mr. Sullivan said the Planning Board has up to three meetings in which to make a recommendation of approval or denial to the Board of Commissioners. Should you recommend approval, a consistency statement is provided below.

“The rezoning for redevelopment of these parcels will allow the continuation and expansion of an existing business and meets Land Use plan, ED Policy 4, pg. 56.”

The following conditions are also provided if the recommendation is for approval.

Site Specific Conditions:

1. The recommendations from the Chatham County Appearance Commission (CCAC) shall be followed as stated in the minutes and as shown on the revised site plan. The planning staff and CCAC may conduct routine inspections of the property to ensure compliance with the landscaping requirements.
2. A reduction in the overall impervious surface coverage by changing the amount of parking spaces from 1 space per 200 sf of gross floor area to 1 space per 300 sf of gross floor area is allowed. This information shall be placed on the submitted commercial site plan for approval.
3. A building permit shall be obtained and remain valid at all times within two years of the date of this approval or the site plan becomes null and void.

Standard Site Conditions:

4. The application, standards and adopted regulations of the applicable ordinances and policies, and the approved recommendations as provided for and/or conditioned, are considered to be the standards as set forth and shall comply as stated. Changes to or variations from any requirements of this permit must be approved through the Planning Department or other approving board before any such changes can take place.
5. All required local, state, or federal permits (i.e., NCDOT commercial driveway permits, NCDWQ, Chatham County Land and Water Resources, and Environmental Health Division, etc.) shall be obtained, if required, and copies submitted to the Planning Department as part of the platting process.

Standard Administrative Conditions:

6. Fees - Applicant and/or landowner shall pay to the County all required fees and charges attributable to the development of its project in a timely manner, including, but not limited to, utility, subdivision, zoning, and building inspections.
7. Continued Validity – The continued validity and effectiveness of this approval was expressly conditioned upon the continued compliance with the plans and conditions listed above.
8. Non-Severability – If any of the above conditions is held to be invalid, this approval in its entirety shall be void.
9. Non-Waiver – Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to waive any discretion on the part of the County as to further development of the applicant's property and this permit shall not give the applicant any vested right to develop its property in any other manner than as set forth herein.

Board Discussion:

- Ms. Roodkowsky said there will be improved access from Manns Chapel Road, and it was indicated that it is for egress and ingress, this does not seem like an improvement, it seems like it could cause more danger. That whole area from Manns Chapel Road to Great Ridge Parkway is now the subject of a lot of neighborhood discussion with traffic concerns. How was that entrance decided and why do they think it is an improvement? Mr. Sullivan stated currently there is a traffic impact analysis (TIA) being conducted. However, the NCDOT has already approved this design and they look at anything involving Hwy 15/501 very closely for safety concerns. Ms. Colbert asked if the TIA had been completed. Mr. Sullivan stated the TIA is currently in progress but has not been completed.
- Mr. Nick Robinson, the representative for the Circle K project, gave a brief overview of this property and the benefits of the rezoning request. He stated the current zoning is split B-1, conditional use B-1, and R-1. The R-1 parcels have abandoned homes located on the properties and would be removed. The plan is to rezone all the parcels to the current zoning designation Neighborhood Business District. The existing gas station on the parcel is located on .84 acres and is very close to Hwy 15/501 due to the road improvement years ago. The new location of the gas station will be further back and located on 6.6 acres where all the access driveways will be spaced out and much safer than the current configuration. Mr. Robinson stated we have met with Planning staff and the staff is in favor of this rezoning. There was a community meeting held for public input, and there was no opposition to the rezoning. We have also met with the Appearance Commission, and they have approved our application as well. We would be willing to reduce the impervious surface area and have our parking spaces 1 per 300 sqft if so desired. All the findings have been met and we feel this project will be an improvement then the current configuration and much safer.
- Ms. Robertson asked about the applicant contacting the other property owners and why only the parcels near the bottom were sold. Mr. Robinson stated there were several property owners and some were willing to sell, and others were not.

- Ms. Colbert asked what would happen to the underground fuel tanks. Mr. Rick Baker, a civil engineer on the project stated they will be removing the old tanks and piping and installing new tanks and piping which is regulated and approved by the North Carolina Division of Groundwater Quality Standards. Ms. Colbert asked what the sizes of the tanks are. Mr. Baker said he does not know the size of the current tanks underground.
- Chair Lucier asked if the stormwater pond will be located down by the existing abandon homes. Mr. Robinson stated that is correct, a portion of the pond will be located there, and a portion of the pond will not. Chair Lucier also asked where the septic field will be located for the proposed auto parts store. Mr. Robinson stated the septic field will be located near the rear of the property.
- Vice-Chair Spoon confirmed they will not be using Cedar Village for access to the project. Mr. Robinson stated they will not be using Cedar Village. Vice-Chair Spoon also asked if there will be a way to turn left into the project off of Hwy 15/501 going north or will you need to drive past and conduct a U-turn? Mr. Robinson stated you will not be able to turn left onto the property and a U-turn will be required. Vice-Chair Spoon confirmed that the project will include an auto parts store. Mr. Robinson stated that is the current expectation. Chair Lucier stated he agrees this plan will have a much better traffic pattern than what is currently in use.
- Ms. Hernandez asked how much larger the new convenience store will be than the current store. Mr. Andy Priolo with Circle K stated the current size is 2200 sqft and the new store will be 5200 sqft. Ms. Colbert asked how much more commercial space will be on the project. Mr. Priolo stated 6900 sqft.
- Mr. Mayer asked if the watershed map amendment helped with the new design. Mr. Robinson said yes, it was very important with the design. There was a new delineation and that helped to increase the impervious surface allowing for this much better plan.
- Vice-Chair Spoon asked if there will be a carwash on site. Mr. Robinson stated there would not be a carwash. Ms. Roodkowsky asked will there be a level three electric charger on site? Mr. Priolo stated they are currently looking into that option, and it is too early to tell if a charger will be installed or not. Mr. Mayer asked why two entrances are located on Manns Chapel Road? Mr. Robinson stated it gives the customer an option if they want to enter the property and go to the auto parts store or just straight to the fuel pumps. Vice-Chair Spoon asked how many pumps will be on the new site. Mr. Robinson stated currently there are 8 pumps, and the new configuration will have 16 pumps.
- Ms. Colbert stated she would like to make a motion to table this item before next month's meeting to see if the TIA could be completed and studied. Also, even though the applicant is required to notify the adjoining property owners there are a lot of people in the northern area that will be impacted by the way that this configuration will change, and not aware of the impact to the community concerning the traffic. There would be an option for additional public comments from neighbors that were not intitled to the public notice and could help us determine if this item should move forward or not. Chair Lucier asked staff what the public notice process was for this application. Mr. Sullivan stated for all of our rezoning applications we mail a notice to the adjoining property owners, we run a legal ad in the paper for two weeks before the public hearing, we post the property with public hearing notice signs. This property had three signs, one on Manns Chapel Road, and two along Hwy 15/501. The applicants also had to provide notice for the community meeting and the applicant stated nobody attended the meeting and we did not have anyone attend the public hearing. There was also notice sent out for the watershed portion of this property, we did receive one response from a company owner from across the street making sure nothing was going to interfere with his business.
- Chair Lucier stated there is a motion to table this item by the October 3rd Planning Board meeting. There was not a second and the motion was denied.

- Ms. Colbert stated when we as a board look at the five findings we need to ask, why do we need another gas station. The existing gas station is on a very small piece of land, we are talking about expansion, and really anything could go into that space once it is rezoned. They are expanding the commercial use that is creeping a little into the R-1 designation and ultimately, we are in the middle of a climate crisis, we already have three gas stations including this existing station within a half mile of each other. We do not know whether or not the store will be an auto parts store, but we already have two other service stores within a mile of this location. It is not the kind of development that is appropriate for that corner, especially if it is going to draw a lot more traffic onto Manns Chapel Road. I understand that the signs were posted, but there are a lot of people in Briar Chapel that will be pulling right onto Manns Chapel Road, and they most likely have no idea this is happening. I would not support this rezoning until I could see the TIA study.
- Ms. Roodkowsky said she had asked for some clarification about the entrances, and we received good answers to our concerns. After looking at this and hearing the explanations, this is a safer plan. I do not see the value in waiting until next month, the public has had the opportunity to speak, and nobody has spoken on this topic. This looks like a safer option, and it is not an additional gas station it is an existing gas station, and I do hope they are able to install a level three charging station for electric cars. The need for the convenience store and the gas station is already there, people are using it daily. This is a reasonable application and rezoning for which I am in support of. Ms. Colbert stated it is an expansion of the convenience store with additional commercial space and will generate additional traffic. That is why I am interested in seeing the TIA study because I feel it will bring additional traffic to this area.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Spoon to approve the consistency statement, "The rezoning for redevelopment of these parcels will allow the continuation and expansion of an existing business and meets Land Use plan, ED Policy 4, pg. 56." Second by Mr. Andrews. There was a vote to approve the consistency statement and it was approved 8-1, opposed by Ms. Colbert.

- Chair Lucier stated he agrees with the motion, it is a safer plan that what the current situation is now, and the larger portion of the parcel was already zoning conditional district B-1, it was supposed to be a bank at one time and now maybe an auto parts store. The only impact to the R-1 was 4 small parcels with the dilapidated homes. This is an improvement on what is there now and will vote to approve it.

Motion made by Mr. Andrews to approve this item, seconded by Vice-Chair Spoon. There was a vote, and this item was approved 8-1, opposed by Ms. Colbert.

- Ms. Colbert stated she will submit a minority report to the Board of Commissioners.
- Ms. Haddix asked if we wanted a charging station available at the gas station, can we make that a requirement? Mr. Sullivan stated it is a conditional district rezoning and the board wanted to make that a condition, you could suggest that, but it would be up to the applicant to agree to the condition. If the applicant does not agree, then the board could not add the charging station through the conditional district rezoning process. Moving forward, the charging station topic is being discussed for the UDO.

VIII. PLAN MONCURE DRAFT SMALL AREA PLAN:

1. Plan Moncure Small Area Plan Public Review Draft.

Following the announcement that the automaker VinFast selected Chatham County's Triangle Innovation Point (TIP) mega site as their location for its first North American assembly plant for electric vehicles, the County Comprehensive Plan "Plan Chatham" stated that "Once a tenant for the TIP site was identified, the County would prepare a 'small area plan' for the Moncure area." The consultant team including White & Smith Planning and Law Group, Nealon Planning, and Green Heron Planning immediately were established, and they sprang into action with data collection and examining the existing conditions of the study area to better understand how to prepare the plan. We structured this project in two phases. The first phase being a subject matter assessment, visioning process, and development of an action plan for Plan Moncure. The final report from Phase 1 is available in the "Plan Moncure Documents" tab on the project website. Phase 2 began in January of this year and started with a series of analyses related to market trends, land use, transportation, utilities, and historical and environmental features in the Southeastern part of Chatham County. This initial stage of Phase 2 allowed the Project Team to better understand the existing conditions of the community today.

The County investigated ways to better understand relationships between existing and potential future development as well as between the built environment and the natural resources of the Moncure study area. The primary objective was to give the community an opportunity to influence the change that would result from the investments already underway. In April 2023, the county took steps to initiate the small area planning process. This plan has included a series of activities that engaged the residents, business owners, property owners, and other stakeholders. We had three resident drop-in sessions at Moncure Fire Station 8, three community open houses in Moncure, a community listening session at Moncure School, a pop-up table at a local Moncure event "Spring Around the Loop", a scenario planning online session, and over 2,000 website visitors since it went live. The small area planning process has encouraged dialogue about growth in the Southeastern part of Chatham County spurred by the VinFast announcement and other investments in the region. The plan builds on Plan Chatham and conveys more specifically the community's expectations and aspirations for the future of the Moncure area. The conversations held regarding these expectations and aspirations allowed the County to connect deeper with the Moncure residents through community engagement efforts. This process has helped the community consider how to leverage positive outcomes through development opportunity and preservation of rural character. The results of this plan will help guide policy decisions in the Southeastern part of Chatham County over the next 20 years.

Through the development of Plan Moncure, we have reached the milestone of having the Public Review Draft Report and revised Future Land Use & Conservation Map for the Moncure Study Area. Public Comment on the draft began on August 9th, 2023, during the third Community Open House at the Sprott Center in Moncure. This public comment period will conclude at the end of August. Additionally, a third survey is available on the website that will also capture resident feedback to incorporate in plan revisions following the public comment period.

At the August 23rd Special Planning Board Meeting, the consultant team alongside Planning staff provided a presentation that reviewed the key points of Plan Moncure, the preferred scenario map, steps of implementation, and provided responses to questions from members. The Board also heard public input from some of the community members about the project. The next steps that were outlined at that meeting were for the board to provide their additional questions, thoughts, or concerns on a shared OneDrive document provided via email by Chance Mullis in the Planning Department. Having read the entire draft plan and reviewing the Future Land Use & Conservation Map, Planning Board members will provide their feedback and items for clarification on that document. The feedback on that document needs to be completed ahead of the next scheduled meeting on September 5th. At the September 5th meeting, the Planning Board will have an additional agenda item for Plan Moncure to discuss the feedback shared on the document and then move forward with making a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

The Planning Department recommends the Planning Board discuss the Plan Moncure Small Area Plan Draft collaborative document feedback and provide a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

PUBLIC INPUT:

- Mr. Jeff Flanagan said there seems to be a lot of concern about the availability of affordable housing in the future Moncure area. I have spent all my life living in affordable or moderately priced housing, and I

also spent the larger part of my adult life building houses. In contemplating my housing experience, there arose a larger concern of how people can create for themselves an affordable and fulfilling Life. For me it rings true to say that “One’s level of wealth is determined by the quality of one’s impressions.” I do think the proposed Moncure plan strives to create or preserve an abundance of quality impressions in the physical environment while accommodating future growth and working within the prevailing paradigm of market driven real estate development. By its nature, this paradigm discourages the creation of affordable housing so that outside subsidies are often needed to create affordable housing units. Other approaches to lower housing costs without compromising the quality of life might include alternative social/legal arrangements such as co-housing, co-op housing, and shared housing. These alternative arrangements have a strong track record and could harmoniously and invisibly blend into the proposed Compact Residential, Village Center, and Community Center place types. A different paradigm for real estate development is the values driven “Intentional Community,” whereby members of the community try to live in close proximity to each other, often on the same piece of land, in order to provide mutual support in living according their shared philosophy. Numerous intentional communities sprang up in the 1970’s as part of the counter-culture movement and I was immersed in two such communities throughout the 70’s & 80’s. In these communities I was blessed with an abundance and wide variety of quality experience while living on a minimal income. The members of intentional communities are often social and/or spiritual explorers seeking to define new ways of creating real wealth through relationship to right livelihood, to each other, and to that which they hold sacred. Central to the foundational ideas of some intentional communities is a deep reverence for the Earth and these communities often seek to live in rural areas as stewards of the land. The economic opportunities coming to the Moncure area, combined with the abundance of agricultural and rural land types, could provide the ideal conditions for this type of intentional community to take root and prosper. Also, successful intentional communities often make meaningful contributions to the larger local community of which they are a part, and there are even examples where the contributions have been on a national or worldwide scale. It is my hope that the Unified Development Ordinance codes for agricultural and rural land types will leave an opening for the establishment of intentional communities whose values and aims align with those of Chatham County. I welcome opportunities to discuss this topic further with anyone interested. Thank you for the opportunity to give this presentation.

- Mr. Nick Robinson with Bradshaw Robinson Slawter & Rainer stated he is representing a Moncure landowner and the CE Group. Mark Ashness and I have been attending the community meetings on behalf of a Moncure area landowner and putting comments in and stickers on the maps, seeking one change to the proposed Future Land Use Map for Moncure. Hopefully, you have a copy of the suggested addition that was to have been emailed to you in advance of this meeting. Both Pea Ridge Road and New Elam Church Road interchanges are being improved and are adjacent to each other. On the north side of US 1; each interchange area is being designated as a Crossroads Community. There is an area between the two Crossroads Community nodes adjoining US 1 (on the north side) that is currently designated as Rural. Given that this area directly adjoins US 1; it would make sense to designate it as a Crossroads Community or Employment Center (between the two Crossroads Community nodes). This designation would likely assure that a collector road would be built between the two interchanges paralleling US 1 (on the north side). The Collector Road would allow traffic to move between the two interchanges without requiring access back and forth to US 1. This approach would also be consistent with the continuous band of Employment Center already designated on the south side of US 1. We request that the Planning Board consider this addition to the Small Area Plan Future Land Use Map as part of its recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.
- Mr. Peyton Holland said good evening, thank you for your time and your service to Chatham County. There are two key questions and one concern that many in our area, particularly those of us along Pea Ridge Rd North of the US 1 interchange, would like to see addressed before a plan is approved or

further development is allowed. The following questions were presented throughout the process and with no clear answers. Speaking for those of us on Pea Ridge Rd who live north of the US 1 interchange, we have not seen adjustments to the proposed maps based on our recent feedback, so we would like to humbly ask this again. From the Pea Ridge Rd/US 1 interchange to Cape Fear Dr., this plan proposes compact residential development and a community center, which comes with significant, high-density commercial & residential development, resulting in increased traffic pressure and erosion of rural character. This is contrary to the feedback that we have consistently given on preserving rural character and encouraging agricultural and low-density residential use in that area. Please consider reducing the allowable density in that area. Encourage and support small family businesses, but keep high-density, high-traffic development located within the more than ample space marked as employment centers south of the Pea Ridge/US 1 interchange. Please change the plan.

What is the roadway improvement or expansion plans that will come along with the growth presented in this final map?

As we have already seen in our community, eminent domain can be utilized to support the needs of developers while working contrary to the needs of our residents. What assurances do we have that plans will be developed to divert traffic off of our existing rural roads and that more homes will not need to be lost and families displaced due to road widening? There are no conceptual DOT road maps presented as part of the plans to accommodate the projected growth. Our community is being asked to support a plan for which we do not know the true impacts, especially for those of us that live along the roads. Our community does not want to be taken advantage of again as we were with the megasite. Please give us a plan.

What property tax relief measures can or will be put in place to maintain affordability for current residents? Before we sign off on a plan, we want to understand the potential financial impact it is going to have on us (many of us have no intent to sell our land, it is our home and heritage, not an investment). There are instruments utilized in other states (although not perfect) that help maintain or limit the growth of property tax burden for current residents. What considerations do we have that could be similar to the present use program for individual residential owners? The state and county were willing to offer significant tax incentives to developers and international companies to build here, while local residents are going to be saddled with significant increases due to rising property values and a large tax burden to support our community. Please give us a plan.

Chatham County only has one chance at preserving what makes it special, Pea Ridge Rd and Southeastern Chatham are rapidly losing it, our rural character. In the proposed plan, we lose over half our agricultural and woodland area under this plan, from 23% of the space in the study area to 10%, much of that is along Pea Ridge and New Elam Church Roads. Please do not let that go or let the sacrifice that 29 families, 5 businesses and 1 church have already made to accommodate this county's desire for a megasite be for naught. Preserve the rural buffer that exists along Pea Ridge Rd and New Elam Church Road from the US 1 interchange to Jordan Lake and move the density south of the interchange. It better protects our waterways, agricultural lands of significance, and our rural character. Thank you for your time.

Board Discussion:

- Mr. Ben Hitchings with Blue Heron Planning, a consultant for the Moncure Small Area Plan came before the board with answers and comments to their questions and concerns regarding the Plan Moncure document. Below are questions and comments the Planning Board members gave staff and Mr. Hitchings which were discussed. Mr. Hitchings stated some of the questions he will have answers or comments, or rationale as to why they are proposing something.

Chair Lucier –

1. Overall, the draft small area plan for Moncure is well organized document which provides options, a preferred plan and action steps. It reflects an open process that involved citizen input and numerous revisions based on the comments received. It provides a well-thought-out vision and guide for expected growth in the Southeast part of Chatham County, and it should inform the drafting of the Unified Development Ordinance.
2. The Moncure plan is long and somewhat complicated out of necessity. It would benefit from a more detailed table of contents and a readable executive summary.
 - Chair Lucier stated this addresses the readability of the document. Right now, there is very limited information on the table of contents, and it would be beneficial to have more information placed there so the reader is able to go right to the area they are looking for. The executive summary is a good idea if someone just wants a general overview of what is in the document and what it means. Ms. Roodkowsky stated an expanded executive summary is essential and what is in the staff notes is a very good start to it. A short paper explaining what this document is about would be a major improvement to helping people get through this document. Ms. Robertson suggested a brief summary before each section would be beneficial as well. Ms. Colbert stated it would also be beneficial to have links to more information so if someone were interested in reading deeper into a specific topic, they could click on the link, and it would take them there.
 - Chair Lucier summarized by saying we are asking for a consideration of an expanded executive summary, a detailed table of contents, and possibly adding hyperlinks to the document so it will take you where you want to go.
3. The estimates from the different scenarios, including the preferred scenario, are presented as bright lines and exact numbers for housing units, commercial areas, tax revenues and future needs etc. For example, the preferred scenario estimates 3602 future dwelling units between 2023 and 2040 and 170000 sq ft of retail space. These numbers are derived from models and all models have uncertainty associated with the estimates. Sometimes, the uncertainty associated with models is large and sometimes it is small. The uncertainty range is determined by a number of factors including the amount of empirical data and the range of assumptions used to generate the estimates. The plan should include a brief general description of the expected uncertainty in the estimates for growth provided in the plan.
 - Mr. Hitchings stated a market analyst prepared a market assessment as part of the project so that as we create a shared community vision for the plan, we can also make sure it is grounded in the realities of the market. One of the problems with this area is it is a relatively small population so small numeric changes can lead to significant percentage changes and provides more uncertainty associated with the population projections. Chair Lucier stated it would be helpful early in the document to state that these numbers are best estimates, but there is always uncertainty associated with these estimates.
4. The plan states that areas designated in the National Historic Register should be protected but it is not clear how this will be accomplished. The action plan should include a statement that sites and areas on the National Historic Register should be protected from rezonings etc. that impair the integrity of the area and such protections be formally included in the Unified Development Ordinance.

- Mr. Hitchings said the plan proposes a heritage plan that could identify different strategies to protect whatever the county is interested in protecting historically. Chair Lucier stated it needs to be in the UDO because it is not just Moncure, it is all of Chatham County.
5. The number of estimated additional students for the Chatham system is not included in the preferred plan.
 - Chair Lucier said this information is in Plan Moncure, but it also needs to be added to the preferred scenario document.
 6. I assume that the Moncure Small Area Plan, once approved by the BOC, will be added to the current Land Use Plan and the map be modified to include the revisions contained in the Moncure plan.
 - Mr. Hitchings stated that the Future Land Use map in Plan Moncure will be used to update the Plan Chatham Land Use map for that portion of the county.

Vice-Chair Spoon –

1. Are we planning around potential preemptions from the state?
 - Mr. Hitchings said every year there is a new legislation at the state level that impacts local land use authority. The School of Government does a good job of tracking the bills and updating planners across the state regarding the changes. We will track these as well and adjust as needed to legislation.
2. Establishing different tax rates for current vs. incoming residents is illegal. Correct?
 - Mr. Hitchings stated we are not able to differentiate between an existing resident or an incoming resident. Property tax is based on valuation of the property.
3. Can we legally enforce a requirement that a certain percentage of goods and supplies coming and going from industrial operations be transported by rail?
 - Mr. Hitchings stated we do not have the ability to control the type of transportation mode, but one of the assets in this area is that there is an existing rail line, and it will be utilized.
4. Why was the Rocky River not included in the waterways with a conservation focus?
 - Mr. Hitchings stated this was an oversight, Rocky River is an important natural resource, and we will make a note to include this in the discussion of land conservation in the plan.
5. Was it made clear in the community meetings that stasis is not an option?
 - Mr. Hitchings said there are a variety of forces in Moncure that are creating change and there are ways to manage the change. We took all the different perspectives shared by community stakeholders and worked to balance the different considerations, ranging from keeping the area rural to allowing dense development. We tried to concentrate the various activities in appropriate places. Chair Lucier stated we would like to speak more about the two community centers and the rural area in-between them. Ms. Colbert asked is Shaddox Creek was located

in-between the two community centers. It was determined that the creek is located between them.

6. Where will the apartments go in the plan? Any plans for hotels?
 - Mr. Hitchings stated the opportunity is available for apartments or hotels in the community center or even the employment center.
7. We need to develop a joint land use plan with the town of Apex to prevent them from poaching high tax yielding industrial operations without some compensation to Chatham.
 - Mr. Hitchings said this is a good suggestion for the county to consider and could be a project similar to the joint land use plan with Cary in the northeastern part of Chatham County.
8. We need to develop a Chatham Land Trust and a conservation credit system to enable us to meet our conservation goals for the area.
 - Mr. Hitchings said this could be a recommendation within the Plan that can be suggested. Vice-Chair Spoon stated the conservation credit system would be where developers could exchange density on a parcel of land and purchase conservation credits and the Chatham Land Trust could purchase property that would be removed from potential development and be in conservation forever. Mr. Hitchings stated it sounds like purchase of development rights or transfer of development rights which are two tools that use zoning to accomplish conservation. Mr. Sullivan stated the Land Trust is part of Article 46, sale tax funds and 1/3 of that tax is allocated for farmland preservation. Vice-Chair Spoon said it would be good to separate agriculture from woodland and ultimately place 50% of Chatham County in greenspace. Mr. Hitchings stated the county has the Conservation Implementation Plan project which has been funded and this could be a place to have more discussion about the conservation credit system.
9. Can we require the developer of one of the denser nodes to set aside space for a Sheriff's Department substation?
 - Mr. Hitchings stated whenever we get new development at some point there will be a need to add community facilities, The need and timing for a facility such as a Sheriff substation will depend on the growth in service demand from new residents and businesses. The Sheriff will monitor the growth and will discuss with the County if that time arrives. It would be too early at this stage to dedicate a particular place for a substation right now. Vice-Chair Spoon said the Plan suggested how many more deputies would be required and when Briar Chapel was developed, we had a good faith effort for reserved space for that purpose. Ms. Colbert stated this is a good idea, but maybe rather than point that out in the Small Area Plan we could make a recommendation to investigate whether or not a substation should be required in Moncure. Mr. Hitchings pointed out on page 56, implementation item 4.5, calls for exploring possible new Chatham County sheriff substation". That will create a means of having a conversation about a possible substation in Moncure.
10. Do we need to establish a rehab code to facilitate the refurbishment of historic properties while keeping their character?
 - Mr. Hitchings said North Carolina has a rehab code that allows the redevelopment and reuse of existing structures. Section 1.33 of the code addresses historic structures.

11. Chatham Transit must be a big part of this planning. Vinfast should donate some electric buses. Transit routes need to be established from dense communities throughout the county to industrial sites in Moncure to lessen the daily vehicle traffic.

- Mr. Hitchings said this budget year Chatham has approved a transit study, so that will help us determine where public transit will be needed in the county.

12. What is the timeline for the Comprehensive Conservation Plan?

- Mr. Mullis stated it is a two-year project and is in the early stages.

13. In the case studies from other communities, why was there no discussion of daily traffic in and out of the production facilities and its effects on the community?

- Mr. Hitchings said the market analyst did look at some communities in the southeast that have experienced the development of a major auto manufacturer. He had said a review of the daily traffic generated by these projects was beyond the scope of this review. This work was focused instead on employment and associated land uses generated by the new manufacturing facility.

14. Was there an analysis that compared the incentive packages that were given by the communities in the market study vs. the ones that were given by Chatham?

- The market analyst did not investigate the incentive packages in these other locations verses what was provided here in Chatham.

15. We do not want and cannot allow a proliferation of RV parks where people live during the week and then go back to their homes for the weekends.

- Mr. Hitchings said we understand that there were some employees at the Shearon Harris plant that temporarily took advantage of RV parks when they were making repairs on the plant. It sounds like that could happen with construction of the VinFast facility because it is a flexible form of housing that can be made available while the construction work is being performed. Vice-Chair Spoon stated he was wondering if it was within the market analysis if people who came to work at a location bought an RV and stayed in it for work and then left to go back to their home for the weekend. That is something we would not particularly want to happen.

16. Why was Greer, SC not one of the communities included in our market study?

- Mr. Hitchings said the market analyst believed the county had already explored Greer S.C. as part of the background work for the VinFast project, so he focused on other locations.

Ms. Colbert –

1. Plan documents have too many low-value graphics and non-essential images.

- Mr. Hitchings said different people prefer different formats for documents and what we created is similar to the industry standard, but he recognizes that may not be the preferred format for everybody.

2. Vision Map on p.30 does not show percentages allocated to various place types.

- Mr. Hitchings stated he will discuss this with his colleagues to see if we can reflect the distribution of the various place types.
3. I generally agree with substance of existing descriptions, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations within SAP, and would recommend BOC approval, with some specific modifications to some of language.
 4. Stronger policy encouragement of environmental best practices and use of municipal water would be a welcome addition.
 5. To give a couple of examples: A. strengthening/ clarifying language on page 11 regarding environmental protection and the role of the regulatory process, including the UDO, and B. page 37, specifying/clarifying employment centers definitions for allowable housing types (also noted in the consultant memo): "These centers are targeted for future job generating uses in settings that meet today's workplace expectations. The mix of uses includes industrial, office, and supporting retail, restaurant, service, recreation, and other uses."
 - Mr. Hitchings said page 11 is part of that existing conditions which is more of a description of what is currently in place so maybe there is an opportunity for clarifying language. Chair Lucier said it is a good idea to look at that because we have a lot of natural resources here and we need to do what we can to protect them. Mr. Hitchings said we also have a plan implementation theme devoted to protecting natural resources.
 - Mr. Hitchings noted that the project team will take the Planning Board comments to the BOC with the Plan recommendation as it is written and the working addendum. We are not going to change the Plan before it is brought before the BOC. The commissioners will have the benefit of the Planning Board suggestions while they review the Plan. Chair Lucier stated that will work out best and it will be easier for the BOC to look at.
 6. Generally comfortable with appendices.
 7. Short-Term Implementation Projects: I would defer any recommendation on the specific projects, or their priority noted in the document until the BOC adopts an SAP for Moncure. Many of the projects, while important and insightful, are either not specific to, or are beyond the scope of, the proposed SAP. Many (perhaps most) are county-wide in applicability and should be addressed within the UDO.
 - Mr. Hitchings stated what I am hearing is that this feels overly general, and you would be interested in seeing more specificity. Ms. Colbert stated yes, but mostly there are just some suggestions that the consultants and the commissioners could consider enhancing the Plan document. Ms. Colbert said the rest of the comments could be skipped in the presentation.
 8. On page 17, remove paragraph that says retail follows rooftops in its entirety and recommend removing it. The whole idea of an SAP policy plan is to proactively guide the development, not "follow the rooftops".
 9. Initiating the idea of "mixed-use" without defining it or cross-referencing its meaning within the document sounds like an endorsement without basis. I would rather see a description of the kinds of constraints and projections noted in the 8/23 marketing assessment re retail.
 10. Limit any residential outbuilding to non-commercial use for lots of 2 acres and less.

11. Regarding compact residential “within reasonable walking or biking distance” of shopping/dining: that will never happen unless the residential units abut a major state road. In our climate, if the distance is greater than half a mile, it will not be walkable for most people.
12. Provide specific example of the kind of compatible "light industrial" use within the village center.
13. Re the term "community center" and the "mix of uses": we have yet to see a single successful example of this in unincorporated Chatham County, perhaps with the very limited exception of Fearington. Instead, include some description of the scope and apportionment of activity that defines a community center and "mix of uses" and that is also consistent with known declining trends for office and retail.
14. There needs to be much stronger policy statement of developer responsibility for stormwater management and requirements for turnover, including developer fines for failure to remove "temporary" barriers in natural open space areas and conservation/recreation areas.
15. Regarding joint use of school facilities for recreation, encourage developers to design amenities and/or deed land to county consistent with multi-use purposes, including the need for school security and public access.
16. Strongly encourage developers to include adequate recreational amenities, regardless of project size or type, and identify responsibility and provide specific guidelines for maintaining easements and conservation areas.
17. To the extent that the county already has existing municipal services- like county water- developers should be required to tie in. I would suggest some sort of over-arching policy statement to avoid a patchwork of avoidable opt-outs.
18. As far as wastewater treatment is concerned, the policy within the SAP should follow comments (above)concerning adequacy of design and turnover for major subdivisions.
19. The issue of accessory buildings needs to be defined very carefully within the SAP. The UDO should classify short-term rentals of accessory buildings as commercial activity incompatible with residential units. The county should adopt an explicit policy concerning this item to distinguish it from owner-occupied B&Bs that currently exist on larger properties.
20. Mobile home parks are only "affordable" if there is some mechanism for ensuring that people are not priced out or forced to move by increases in lot rentals. What constitutes "appropriate techniques" to accomplish affordability within this housing form?

Mr. Mayer –

1. Overarching perspective: Let us not overlook Chatham county’s strong identity and potential to prosper with sustainable agricultural, arts and eco-tourism. Any development that works against those resources is counterproductive.
 - Mr. Hitchings stated on page 74, theme 12, implementation project 12.3, it talks about supporting increased tourism and recreation opportunities and amenities, particularly sustainable tourism, and authentic experiences.

2. The new place type called “neighborhood residential” sounds nice and looks good on paper. I support it when it is well thought out, well connected, and built with an awareness of ecological constraints. My concern is it may become a new, more palatable form of suburban sprawl that tends to serve privileged, affluent, and typically white communities at the expense of previous residents. I want working-class people and communities of color to have a place in Moncure.
 - Mr. Hitchings said we had a spectrum of different proposed land use types or place types identified in the Future Land Use & Conservation Vision Map on page 31, and that there is a limited amount of acreage proposed for “neighborhood residential” compared to the project area as a whole, so that should help prevent this activity from causing widespread suburban sprawl.
3. Page 19 of the PowerPoint titled future development states apartment and condominiums 650 DU. It is an estimate of future needs of that type of dwelling unit. If we brought that number up to 1,000 DU, how would that affect the plan, what constraints would we run up against?
 - Mr. Hitchings said he will discuss this further with his colleagues.
4. On page 24 of the PowerPoint (concept plan pea ridge road). Many of the schematic diagrams in this plan show conservation along roadways including major interchanges along US highway 1. This seems a bit disingenuous to me. I grant that some county roads have ecologically high value roadsides with healthy native, and occasionally, endangered plant communities.
 - Mr. Hitchings said that the conservation land shown along the roadways is intended to protect the vegetated views from the road and help maintain the rural character of the area. It will likely have some conservation value but mostly we serve as a viewshed buffer. Chair Lucier stated parts of the UDO that have been drafted so far are taking that vision of viewsheds and road buffers and turning it into a requirement, which is an important thing to do.
5. There is lake access off Pea Ridge Road east of Jordan lake dam. The Army corps of engineers has a long thin strip of property from the road to the lake that is used by bicyclists and hikers to access the trail system between New Hope overlook and the dam area. I want to make sure this access point remains and connects to a coherent set of pedestrian greenways within the Moncure plan.
 - Mr. Hitchings said he will need to double check but it most likely is conservation or protection area and will not be changed unless there is an active proposal to change that access. Mr. Mayer stated it is an important access and just wanted to make sure that it stays there.
6. The PowerPoint says we will need 8 mi of new greenways by 2040. I would suggest we add 30 or 40 miles countywide.
 - Mr. Hitchings said it is important to create a greenway network because it brings so much value when we link our greenways into a functioning system. One of the obstacles to building the trails is resources, but we hear what you are saying. There is an incredible opportunity for a greenway system in this area connecting to the planned trails for the Deep River extending down into Harnett County. Ms. Colbert said Mr. Mayer’s point is a good one because 8 miles does not seem like a lot of greenway for that area. Maybe we could address this in the Plan with a range of miles like 8 to 20 miles. There was some board discussion about making this recommendation as part of the Plan to establish a range of miles as a goal to reach for.
7. I was surprised to see the 3M industrial site as part of this plan. I am concerned its inclusion here may be misconstrued as tacit approval from this board. I would prefer that we reevaluate the site looking for

environmental concerns. For example: some of the area is within the Jordan lake watershed and probably ought to be protected from any development. A second concern is that small businesses have expressed a need for more industrial zoning along the 15-501 corridor south of Pittsboro. Ideally, I would like to see the county create incentives for 3M and Luck Stone to carve off parts for Jordan lake conservation and small parcels along the highway corridor made available for small local businesses.

- Mr. Sullivan stated the reason that was shown is because that area is already zoning heavy industrial except for a portion on Moncure-Pittsboro Road. Mr. Mayer said his concern is including it here, suggests that this board approves of that, and I do not think that was zoned at a time when the board was looking at the same environmental issues as what we look at today. This whole topic needs to be discussed separately and should not be included in the Plan. Mr. Hitchings said what we have in the Plan is just an acknowledgment of the existing industrial property.
 - Ms. Robertson asked what would be involved in changing that zoning. Mr. Sullivan stated the BOC can take action to down zone that area.
8. Finally, since we are looking out to 2040, it is wise to consider we may be in the middle of a climate disaster at that point in time. For example, how would this area adapt if forced to house a couple thousand climate refugees?
- Mr. Hitchings said this is a living document and can be amended in the future if the county finds itself confronted with this kind of situation and reminded everyone, we have created a document that provides a planning framework, but the decision to develop, redevelop, or submit new land use applications remains up to each property owner.
 - Chair Lucier said let us discuss the area between Pea Ridge Road, New Elam Church Road, and US Hwy 1. Mr. Hitchings said we have a community center node at Pea Ridge, and we have one at New Elam Church Road with the rural designation in between and a small protected viewshed corridor. Vice-Chair Spoon asked what the distance between the two community centers is because it looks like about 2 miles. Mr. Mayer said from US 1 to Shaddox Creek conservation area is about ½ mile. Vice-Chair Spoon said all of this development is contingent on sewer access and asked if they would need to bore under US 1 for utility access. Mr. Hitchings said there is an existing manhole at the intersection of Corinth Road and Old US 1 and that is the closest access to sewer. If anyone were to develop and use the public sewer system, they would need to connect from that point.
 - Mr. Hitchings said one of the issues is economic benefit verses economic cost and Plan Moncure does create some economic opportunities, but with it would come some responsibility to get the infrastructure to that area. Mr. Hitchings said if this whole area were to be connected with the brown color for “community center, “it could allow significantly more area than needed for this kind of land use in the planning timeframe out to 2040. When we over entitle land for commercial development it can often become more dispersed than we would like, which can make it harder to achieve a walkable development pattern and also change the character of a larger area. We intentionally focused the mix-use in these nodes next to the interchanges to ensure good access to existing road infrastructure and help maintain the rural character of the area to the extent possible. Right now, there is plenty of acreage to reach the projected growth anticipated by 2040, but if the study area continues to grow, this can be revisited in the future. Chair Lucier said it sounds like the consultants have looked at merging these two centers together but keeping them separate is a better idea. Mr. Hitchings said we feel that this approach reflects the range of considerations we heard from the stakeholders and helps focus

the development on an appropriate location.

- Vice-Chair Spoon said how this is laid out now makes sense and if that corridor is prime for development, it will be a post 2040 opportunity, but right now there is ample space for development within those nodes. Is there a regulatory way we can focus the density on the nodes first and then have it written that once they are fully built out it could trigger a change in the zoning for the other area? Mr. Hitchings said it is theoretically possible, but it would be complicated. Instead, he would suggest revisiting the land use designation for the area if the pace of development calls for more space in community center in the future.
- Ms. Colbert stated the consultants have addressed certain kinds of needs and did their best with this example to balance competing interests. I also appreciate the county for hiring consultants that have independent expertise and an unbiased view as to what this should look like. They are not advocating for a single class of homeowners or class of citizens or class of financial interests. We would be foolish not to accept on face value some of the things they have presented to us. That is a general statement. In this particular instance where we are talking about concentration and walkability while protecting some of our watershed and Shaddox Creek as it runs through this area. I am sure the Plan will not completely satisfy all of the homeowners in this area, but it is better than some of the other proposals we have seen. I used to live in southern California and there are limits to what you can do for walkability proposals. Here in North Carolina, we do not have a 12-month walkable climate and people will use their vehicle when it is uncomfortable outside. Even in climates where it is always walkable you may not walk if you are pushing a stroller, or the distance becomes 1 mile or more, then it stops being walkable for most people. When we look at these nodes that are a couple miles wide even if it is flat and beautiful outside it is not walkable. The way this is laid out is a smart way to look at it, concentrate in the main areas that are walkable rather than spread it all out. My recommendation at this point is to accept the nodes as they are in the community centers.
- Mr. Mayer said he understands why a developer would like to spread it all the way across because of more opportunity, but why go from community center to straight to rural district, why not community center to neighborhood, then separate even further to rural. Mr. Hitchings said the project team tried to listen to the public input and apply the considerable desire to maintain rural character in a substantial way in greater Moncure. The idea is to have high density at the “community center” nodes and then to feather out from there to rural land and larger lots.
- Vice-Chair Spoon said this is a difficult issue for me because I know a lot of people who will be impacted by this Plan and care very deeply for them. I am one of those people that wished Chatham County would always stay the same as it was 20 years ago. We asked for jobs in our community, so we do not have to commute to work and now we have those jobs here in Chatham. This is a well-developed Plan by accommodating the manufacturing plant coming into Moncure area and to accommodate a future mix of commercial, residential, and major industry centers the right way in the correct locations. Vice-Chair Spoon thanked the consultants for the well thought out Plan and they listened to the community more than any other community in North Carolina. I am sad for any person that is losing something, and I would be upset if this happened to my area. This is something we have asked for and now we need to handle it the best way we can.
- Chair Lucier said he agrees with Vice-Chair Spoon, and we should recommend the Plan to the commissioners and adopt the Plan with the revisions we had gone through tonight.
- Ms. Colbert suggested the Planning Board make a recommendation to adopt the Plan and provide the commissioners a list of our comments for their consideration and they can adopt the

Plan with or without some of our comments. If there is anything anyone feels that is an objection note that, but from what we have seen there was nothing in the Plan that was completely worth objecting. There was some board discussion as to how to present the recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. Chair Lucier stated it was agreed to provide the Plan Moncure as currently written along with the Planning Board comments and recommendations for small adjustments and changes if desired by the commissioners.

Motion made by Mr. Mayer to approve the Moncure Small Area Plan with the Planning Board comments provided to the Board of Commissioners, second by Ms. Colbert. There was a vote, and the item was approved 9-0, unanimously.

IX. NEW BUSINESS:

X. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

1. Update from the Planning Board liaisons.

- Ms. Robertson stated she had attended the Pittsboro Planning Board meeting. the 500-acre farm item, the condition to reduce the setbacks was not approved and the item was tabled another month. A conditional rezoning called Turkey Creek from residential agriculture and heavy industrial to residential multi-family 139 acres proposing 146 dwelling units and some commercial, this was approved. Belmont Station - 154 acres proposing 636 units with townhomes and apartments included, which was approved. Chatham Park - 128 acres with 242 dwelling units connects Old Eubanks and Chatham Park Way, which was approved. Ms. Robertson stated she is going to run for Chatham County commissioner in the 2024 election and the meetings for the Chatham County commissioners are on the same Monday night as Pittsboro. Ms. Robertson asked if anyone would be interested in attending the Pittsboro Planning Board meetings going forward. The board members will consider being the liaison.
- Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Colbert were not able to attend the Siler City meeting. Ms. Colbert stated she will see if she can attend some of the Pittsboro Planning Board meetings, but not able to commit to all the meeting dates.
- Vice-Chair Spoon stated the UDO subcommittee will be resuming their meetings on September 28th and the fourth Thursday of every month and we would like to get a draft of the four chapters we review to the commissioners by December. New Planning Board members interested in joining the UDO subcommittee contact Mr. Mullis and we are planning on adding some ex-officio members as well. The meetings will be virtual and normally are 1.5 to 2 hours long.

2. Discuss and decide the October Planning Board meeting location.

The Board discussed and agreed the October meeting will be held in person at the Agriculture and Conference Center.

XI. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

Mr. Sullivan reported on the following:

1. Minor Subdivision spreadsheet
2. September 18th Public Hearing items.
3. Unified Development Ordinance Update.
The UDO draft has been moving forward and there will be four chapters for the UDO subcommittee to review.

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Signed: _____ / _____
George Lucier, Chair Date

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