



Chatham County Planning Board Minutes September 3, 2024

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

Present

Jon Spoon, Chair
Tony Mayer
Elizabeth Haddix
Shelley Colbert
Amanda Roberson

Mary Roodkowsky, Vice-Chair
Eric Andrews
Clyde Frazier
Nelson Smith

Absent

Planning Department

Jason Sullivan, Director, Angela Plummer, Zoning Administrator, Kimberly Tyson, Subdivision Administrator, and Daniel Garrett, Clerk to the Planning Board.

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Spoon called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

II. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:

Chair Spoon stated there was a quorum, 9 members were present.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Approval of the Agenda – Chair spoon said there are two zoning items on the agenda, but they are part of the same project. Chair Spoon asked to switch the order of the zoning items because a lot of people signed up for the conditional district rezoning item and would like to discuss that item first. There was some Board discussion about the two zoning items and it was agreed the Planning Board will be discussing both zoning items before taking any action on either one of them and the order of the two items would be switched. Motion made by Vice-Chair Roodkowsky to approve the amended agenda, seconded by Ms. Robertson. The agenda was approved, 9-0, unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Consideration of the August 6, 2024 meeting minutes. Motion by Ms. Haddix to approve the August 6th minutes and seconded by Mr. Mayer, the minutes were approved 6-0, Ms. Colbert, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Robertson did not vote because they were absent during the August 6th meeting. Ms. Colbert said even though she was absent from the meeting she did watch it via Zoom and is aware of the discussions that took place.

V. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION:

There was not anyone who signed up to speak.

VI. SUBDIVISION ITEMS:

1. Request by Mark Ashness, P.E. on behalf of SRE NC Landco, LLC for subdivision **Preliminary Plat** review and approval of **Parks at Meadowview Phases 2-4**, consisting of 453 lots on 261.23 acres, located off Parks Meadow Drive (SR-1680), parcels 61935, 10893, 89726.

Mr. Sullivan said During the prior Planning Board meeting there were several public comments questioning the role of the Planning Board in reviewing The Parks at Meadowview preliminary plat. There were also comments requesting additional review of the preliminary plat based on the length of time between sketch plan and submittal of the preliminary plat. Those were good questions and I am going to take a few minutes to explain the county regulations that apply to this project and the limitations imposed on local governments by the Legislature. The Parks at Meadowview was submitted through the major subdivision process and there was no corresponding zoning process required.

The subdivision process is ministerial meaning that if someone submits a layout in conformity with the regulations, they have a legal expectation of approval. If the local government does not like the project the appropriate remedy is to change the regulations for future applications. The reason the subdivision process is ministerial or administrative comes from the Legislature. In North Carolina, local governments are formed by the state meaning that locally elected officials do not have broad discretion when the Legislature has created specific statutes governing a particular activity. For subdivision applications, the Legislature has mandated specific parameters for local governments to use when drafting subdivision regulations. For example, the Planning Board can request an updated Traffic Impact Analysis but cannot require it under the current regulations. The reason being the regulations do not mandate a TIA for every project. However, the NC Department of Transportation can require a TIA when they deem it is necessary and, in this instance, did not require an update prior to issuing their permit for this project.

At the preliminary plat stage, the applicant has received all the regulatory permits for the project and the Planning Board and Commissioners are reviewing the application to ensure it generally conforms to the approved sketch plan. Some may say that the boards should still apply mandatory conditions to the approval and they can, but it will likely be frowned upon by the court system and Legislature. Additionally, the Legislature has mandated that if the courts rule against a local government, the local government must reimburse all the appellants legal costs. In recent years, the Legislature has also scrutinized many local governments based on land use decisions that have been made at the local level. Hopefully, this helps everyone better understand the constraints the Planning Board is operating under as they review this item.

Ms. Tyson said the Planning Board reviewed this application during their August 6, 2024 meeting. Staff informed the board that the county does not have authority over private matters between the developer and the Chapel Ridge HOA. Mr. Mark Ashness, P.E. with CE Group and John Ward with TruHomes were present. Mr. Ashness stated during his presentation this project started in the early 2000's, development has stopped and re-started multiple times, and it has been a significant juggling act. He also commented that Chapel Ridge has private roads, Parks at Meadowview did not have an amenity and their roads were gated in the existing phase. The compromise was to redesign phases 2-4 of the development and compact it, leaving more open space inside the Parks at Meadowview, and agree to build an amenity to serve the existing residents as well as the new residents. Mr. Ashness stated they also provided direct access to the portion that is gated, so the existing homeowners within the original phase have access to the amenity. Phases 2-4 will have two access points that will tie to the existing public road. All permits are in hand, as a pre-'08 subdivision Mr. Ashness stated, they are meeting and exceeding current buffer regulations and current stormwater regulations.

Mr. Ward stated two years ago Sangerman had an agreement, but the agreement had a deadline, and the deadline has since lapsed. It is not clear why the lawyers placed a time duration on the agreement. The project owner is working with the current HOA board of Chapel Ridge to enter into a new agreement.

Several Chapel Ridge residents and adjacent property owners expressed their concerns about spray fields, completing a traffic analysis due to heavy traffic, road agreement between Parks at Meadowview and Chapel Ridge, and paying as much in taxes and utilities as a mortgage and/or rent.

Board discussion included:

- Clarification on the two access points. Response: The two access points both connect to a state-maintained road and Mr. Ashness added that a TIA was completed in 2022.
- Why are the spray fields located close to residents? Response: Per Mr. Ashness, there is a 50' perimeter buffer around Chapel Ridge, and there is also a 50' perimeter buffer around Park at Meadowview. They also located the spray nozzles 90' back from the edge of the spray field, so they have provided 190' buffer from any resident and spray reclaimed water. Currently, they are spraying on the other side of the road in Chapel Ridge that sprays right up to the lots, so when designing the plan, it was not seen to be an issue.
- Is TruHomes working to extend the agreement? Response: Mr. Ward stated, yes, they hope to come to an agreement within a few days.
- Traffic study was completed in 2022, but data was most likely from 2021 during the pandemic when traffic was lighter.
- Chair Spoon reminded the board they are reviewing the preliminary plat and its consistency with the sketch plan. The Board recommended proposing the vote and encourage the developer to work with Chapel Ridge HOA.

Ms. Tyson said the Planning Department recommends granting approval of the road names Hampstead Street, Cherry Branch Drive, Gardenview Drive, Owls Branch Drive, Goldenleaf Drive, Freemont Avenue, Misty Pine Street, Burkdale Drive, Hidden Pond Place, and Hawks View Point and granting approval of subdivision Preliminary as submitted with the following conditions:

1. The final plat shall provide setbacks.
2. The county attorney shall review and approve the contract and performance guarantee prior to final plat recordation.
3. Prior to final plat recordation the engineer shall certify to the county that there is all weather access for emergency vehicles and the certification must be approved by the Fire Marshal.

Ms. Tyson also informed the Planning Board that she received an email that stated the Chapel Ridge HOA and the Parks at Meadowview developer TruHomes are close to a signed agreement.

- Mr. Mark Ashness with the CE Group touched on what Mr. Sullivan had earlier said, the applicant agreed to meet all of the current environmental regulations even though this project falls under the pre-2008 regulations. This project has been modified to create more open space for the overall project. In terms of stormwater and erosion control requirements we are meeting all of the current mandates. We are also not only meeting but exceeding the buffer regulations and chose to use the most restrictive buffers. We have all of the necessary permits in hand to proceed with the project for these phases. Mr. Ashness said since the last Planning Board meeting our client has met with Ms. Karen Styres who is with the Chapel Ridge HOA and other HOA members. Ms. Styres is in attendance tonight and she will be able to inform the Board of the discussions. Mr. Ashness also said they had provided the Planning staff with exhibits outlying all of the spray areas for not only Parks at Meadowview, but also Chapel Ridge which were based off of 2006 and 2008 soils reports.

Public Input

- Mr. David Kaherl of 557 The Parks Drive said he lives in the Parks at Meadowview and this community is dependent on this work to be completed and in full support of the work they are doing. A lot of the remaining infrastructure in phase 1 is dependent on these phases to be completed. Our roads are not fully paved, there is also some pond work that needs to be done, and we have been told once this next phase is under construction we will see the improvements in our infrastructure. We are also looking forward to the amenities with the swimming pool and the other community centers. Mr. Kaherl said he is sure there is opposition, but we need to do what is in the best interest of Chatham County and allow different price points of housing to be available to potential residents. Mr. Kaherl thanked the Planning Board.
- Mr. James Crawford of 56 S. Holiday Drive said he lives in the Parks at Meadowview for 9 years and has seen a lot that has happened and what has not happened. As this Board knows, this land was purchased, but then sold and took a while for an investor to purchase the property to finish the development. This developer has partnered with TruHomes and wants to finish this subdivision which is decades old. This is an opportunity for this project to move forward and completed, I spoke two years ago and it is difficult to understand why we are still here addressing the same issues. It is time to finish and it will be great for the community. Even though these will not be considered affordable housing it is much less than Chapel Ridge and I am in full support of this project and getting it completed. Mr. Crawford thanked the Planning Board.
- Mr. Nazmul Bhuyan of 896 The Parks Drive said he lives in the Parks at Meadowview and is in support of this project. I just moved here last year with my wife and my daughter and we have to drive to Chapel Hill to teach my daughter how to swim. We are looking forward to this community to be completed so we have the amenities like the swimming pool. We can have a good life here. This is also a good project for Pittsboro with housing options and more infrastructure. Our future generations will have a better life here. Mr. Bhuyan thanked the Planning Board.
- Ms. Karen Styre a representative of the Chapel Ridge HOA thanked the Planning Board members for an additional month to work an agreement out with the Parks at Meadowview developer. Ms. Styre said the Chapel Ridge HOA has been in conversations with TruHomes and we have an agreement on the table in which we are working out the details and very optimistic as to where it stands now. Ms. Styre thanked the Planning Board for working with the Chapel Ridge HOA.
- Ms. Jameka Richardson of 512 The Parks Drive said my husband and I just moved the Parks at Meadowview in April of this year and it is very important that we do have the proposed amenities completed because it will provide my kids memories. The amenities will also allow other children in the whole community to come together. Currently, if we want to take our children to go swimming we need to go to another subdivision and it is not always open. Ms. Richardson said when they purchased their home she asked the real estate agent if they were allowed to use the pool in Chapel Ridge and the real estate agent said that pool does not belong to Parks at Meadowview, but they have been talking about constructing a pool for years. Ms. Richardson said it all boils down to our kids, we moved from Georgia in a neighborhood without many children and they only amenity there was a fishing pond, and my children do not fish. This addition of the amenities would be great for our community and the children. Ms. Richardson thanked the Planning Board.
- Mr. Michael (last name is unclear) said he lives in the Parks at Meadowview and is unsure why we are having these discussions because two years ago there was an agreement and everything was all worked out. It has not been explained what happened, what is the cause of the friction, what is the new agreement,

and does it impact the Parks at Meadowview in any way? Chair Spoon said the agreement that was in place between the Chapel Ridge HOA and the Parks at Meadowview developer expired this March of this year. They are currently working on a new agreement so both parties feel comfortable as the construction begins.

- Mr. Craig Brown of 1036 The Parks Drive said amongst most of the Parks at Meadowview I am probably one of the youngest homeowners. I come from eastern North Carolina from a town called Tarboro and I took a liking to Pittsboro because I wanted to look up and see the stars. If you had asked me years ago if I would be here today I would have said no. The house I grew up in was the size of my current living room. To be able to be a part of a community such as this is a great thing for me and my family. Mr. Brown said he understands that with a community this size there is going to be a lot of push and pull and a lot of stress, but the biggest thing for me remember is my three daughters can walk out the front door and have a street full of other little girls. To have my children grow up in a community such as this is something I pride myself on. I have one job, one role, and one career and that is to provide for my daughters. As adults and human beings, I believe we can come to an agreement and I am in full support of this project just like my neighbors who have spoken tonight. Mr. Brown thanked the Planning Board.
- Mr. Partrick Smith at 92 S. Parkside Drive said I have lived in the Parks at Meadowview for two years and had moved from Colorado and where I lived it was pretty homogeneous, everyone looked just like me. Coming to the Parks at Meadowview that has been so amazing for our four children there are people of all walks of life. I married a woman who is Ecuadorian so my kids look much different than I do and where we lived before they stood out like a sore thumb. Coming here and seeing people of all different nationalities in my neighborhood was a wonderful thing to see. I fully support that we expand this community with all the different price points for houses is going to bring so many more people who will help us expand our knowledge, or understanding, and our caring for people who may not be the same as us. Mr. Smith said I am in full support of finishing this project and thanked the Planning Board.

Board Discussion

- Ms. Colbert asked if the agreement between the two parties could be reached before the next Board of Commissioners (BOC) meeting and can that be a promise to this Board. Mr. Ashness said he cannot make that promise because he has not been part of the negotiations but feels that an agreement has almost been reached and that is the plan.
- Chair Spoon said this is the second meeting to discuss this subdivision and we will need to make a recommendation one way or the other. This is a much different discussion than last meeting and there seems a lot of progress has been made between the HOA and the developer.
- Vice-Chair Roodkowsky said one of the big concerns expressed at the last meeting was about traffic. Has there been any progress made in working with NCDOT to possibly have another traffic study conducted? Mr. Ashness said the traffic study that was conducted anticipated not only the delay in the project, but also the growth of the project and anticipated a background growth of transportation traffic on Hwy 87. When the study was done two years ago all of that was fully calculated, it is not a snapshot of two years ago. These studies look out through the whole growth of the project until its full buildout.
- Ms. Robertson said she was absent during the last meeting but did read through the meeting minutes and the public comments from that meeting and Mr. Bell indicated that the traffic study projected 3% annual growth, yet Chapel Ridge increased by 29% over the past two years and there are 788 lots now opposed to 715 lots. Ms. Robertson asked to elaborate on that and there were some scary concerns about how

dangerous Hwy 87 is just trying to turn onto it. Mr. Ashness said beyond the traffic study itself NCDOT set the parameters for that study and the sight distance on Hwy 87 is not the greatest, and there are sight distance issues all over the county, just like on Hwy 751, but they cannot all be corrected. NCDOT has strict requirements to install an intersection, but there are areas where NCDOT allowed a mirror to be placed in a position so oncoming traffic can be seen and we would be willing to discuss that with NCDOT, but we do not control that property on the other side of the highway. Mr. Ashness said in the end this is a NCDOT public road and NCDOT is in charge of that road, monitor and maintain those connections.

- Ms. Robertson asked what about the discrepancy between the 3% annual growth from the study versus the 29% Chapel Ridge is experiencing? Mr. Ashness said the 3% growth is not only Chapel Ridge, but also referring to the entire region and 3% growth on Hwy 87, Chapel Ridge is a subset of that growth. Ms. Robertson asked what is the 29% growth being related to? Mr. Ashness said Chapel Ridge is a large contributor of the traffic, but there is a larger base of users on Hwy 87 and much bigger than Chapel Ridge. Ms. Robertson said she understands and that information was helpful.
- Ms. Styres said she is speaking on behalf of Chapel Ridge HOA and one of the items we have discussed in the new agreement is working together on the traffic situation with NCDOT. This is an important thing for all of us because we recognize the safety needs for our children and residents. Ms. Colbert asked if Ms. Styres is asking the Planning Board to recommend approval of this subdivision. Ms. Styres said yes, we are close to an agreement and we want a recommendation for approval.
- Mr. Frazier said he would have been happy to vote for approval if the agreement had been reached, but it has not been reached. If we choose to table this item that sends a message to the commissioners. Chair Spoon said this is the second meeting for this item and we need to take action on this item tonight. It is also not the county governments duty to interfere with private entities negotiating contracts. It sounds like both sides are asking us to recommend approval. Mr. Andrews said he is okay with having a motion tonight as long as the commissioners are aware that an agreement should be reached before their October BOC meeting.
- Ms. Colbert said she disagrees about the HOA and the agreement because she read the meeting minutes from the original submission back 2022 and that agreement was part of addressing the traffic situation. Ms. Colbert said if they do not come to an agreement then the applicant has not met the original plan as far as addressing the traffic. Ms. Colbert said that is why she asked Ms. Styres how they felt about a recommendation for approval and with her assurance, we should move forward with a vote tonight.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Roodkowsky to recommend approval of this item where the Planning Board encourage/suggest an updated TIA for the traffic around Parks at Meadowview and encourage/suggest having an agreement finalized between Chapel Ridge HOA and developer (TruHomes) prior to BOC meeting on October 21, 2024. The motion was seconded by Chair Spoon.

- Mr. Andrews asked if we were going to vote on a motion without the recommendations. Ms. Colbert said there is a motion and a second and we need to take a vote, we cannot change the motion. Ms. Haddix thanked Mr. Sullivan the Planning Director for the piece he had said at the beginning of this meeting which is very important for everyone to understand the limitations on this Boards authority. There are times where it is necessary to slow things down to obtain more information and have a good public debate and then there are times when we have all the information we are going to get and it looks like some progress is being made and we have limitations as to what we can do. Slowing things down or confusing things for the

BOC is not good civic duty. Ms. Haddix said she respects all my colleagues and we are all concerned about the traffic and when she casts her vote she is conscious of all of these limitations we have and the clarifications we are giving or not giving to the BOC when we make a recommendation. It is not a vote against the traffic concerns on Hwy 87 or hoping that an agreement has been reached.

- Mr. Mayer said he is not enthusiastic of this development, and he will vote for approval tonight but would rather vote with only the recommendation for the agreement to be reached; the traffic study request is beyond this Board. Chair Spoon said we have a motion and second, if it is not approved then we might have a motion without those recommendations.
- Ms. Colbert asked for a restatement of the motion with the conditions. There was some discussion about the motion and what was said to be recommended or encouraged, but not conditions for approval, are the traffic study and the HOA/developer agreement. It was agreed that the motion that was made earlier and what would be voted on now was to approve this item where the Planning Board encourage/suggest an updated TIA for the traffic around Parks at Meadowview and encourage/suggest having an agreement finalized between Chapel Ridge HOA and developer (TruHomes) prior to BOC meeting on October 21, 2024.

There was a vote taken and the item was recommended for approval with the two suggestions noted with a vote of 6-1, opposed by Mr. Andrews and abstained by Mr. Frazier and Mr. Smith.

2. Request by K. Luke Turner, P.E. on behalf of David Weekley Homes for subdivision **First Plat** review of **Hamlet's Forest Subdivision**, consisting of 47 lots on 118.76 acres, located off Hamlets Chapel Road (SR-1525), parcels 1806, 2035, & 95989.

Mr. Andrews recused himself from this item.

Ms. Tyson said the request is for First Plat review and recommendation of Hamlet's Forest, consisting of 47 lots on 118.76 acres, located off Hamlets Chapel Road, S.R. 1525. 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. The road is to be built as a 20-foot-wide travel way with a 60-foot-wide public right-of-way.

The applicant received comments during the Concept Plan TRC Meeting. The Chatham County Historical Association recommended the developer to look into a possible cemetery on the proposed project or in the vicinity of the project. The developer contacted North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources, a letter provided by this state agency stated, we have conducted a review of the project and are aware of no historic resources which would be affected by the project." CCHA requested the history of the property be honored by road names and requested if there were any historic features be identified.

Notification of the proposed development was provided to the Chatham County School System. Chris Blice, Chatham County Schools Assistant Superintendent for Operations was contacted by email dated June 12, 2024. Mr. Blice stated, for school buses to enter the neighborhood an amenity location with parking area off the main road would be needed. Otherwise, the bus stop will be at the entrance of the subdivision.

A Trip Generation Letter was provided a letter dated January 23, 2024, from Exult Engineering stated "the proposed site is expected to generate 494 external daily trips, 37 AM peak hour external trips (9 entering, 28 existing), and 48 PM peak

hour external trips (30 entering, 18 existing). The anticipated trip generation of the proposed site is well below NCDOT's threshold (3,000 vehicles per day) for requiring a Traffic Impact Analysis. The proposed site is expected to have minimal impact on the surrounding roadway network."

The developer submitted the General Environmental Documentation, and a letter dated June 18, 2024, from North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources Natural Heritage Program to Chatham County Land & Water Resources Division for review. The letter states "A query of the NCNHP database, indicates that there are no records of rare species, important natural communities, natural areas, and/or conservation/managed areas within the proposed project boundary. Please note that although there may be no documentation of natural heritage elements within the project boundary, it does not imply or confirm their absence; the area may not have been surveyed." Taylor Burton, Senior Watershed Specialist, reviewed the information submitted. Ms. Burton replied in a letter dated July 9, 2024, that the requirement has been met. Additional comments included any Allowable uses and Allowable with Mitigation uses in the protected riparian buffer will require a Buffer Authorization from Chatham County, all permits with wetland and stream impacts from NC Division of Water Resources and the US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be obtained prior to receiving approval from Chatham County for a Grading Permit and Land Disturbing Permit.

A community meeting was held on March 7, 2024, at Chatham County Agricultural and Conference Center, 1192 US Hwy 64 West, Pittsboro. Approximately twenty-four people attended the meeting. Items/issues discussed included the following:

- Perimeter buffer along the west side of the proposed subdivision Response: Developer provided a 20' voluntary landscape buffer along the western portion of the subdivision.
- Water allocation, erosion control, flooding, wetland impacts. Response: Construction documents will account for existing drainage to route water away from new pads.

The TRC met on August 14, 2024 to review the First Plat submittal. Mr. Luke Turner, P.E. with McKim & Creed and Charlie Yokley with David Weekley Homes were present. Mr. Turner stated the parcel is mostly wooded with some water features and the design is with a main street with three cul-de-sacs. NCDOT roads, one stream crossing to be permitted, public water and private septic.

Discussion included:

- The Water Dept. stated the utility plan was reviewed, split taps are not allowed, and individual service lines will be needed. Maintain a 5-foot offset and no valves in the road. Fire hydrants need to be every 500-feet, would like the hydrants before the bulbs in the cul-de-sacs, and the Water Dept. may ask for a hydrant on Hamlet's Chapel Road. Depending on the placement of the home on lot 16, an incasement pipe may be needed for the extension.
- The Watershed Protection Dept. stated the wetlands and streams need to be labeled in accordance with the riparian buffer report. Be mindful of the SCM's and stream buffers because maintenance cannot be conducted within the buffer.

A soils report and map were submitted to James Tiger, Chatham County Environmental Health Supervisor II, for review. Mr. Tiger stated, "The proposed subdivision appears adequate based on the information provided. The ability to permit these lots will largely depend on final house location and footprint, desired bedroom number, driveway location, grading activities, soil suitability, topography, and available space. Additionally, SCM setbacks may reduce reported septic area on some lots." County water will serve the subdivision. The road names Hamlets Forest Way, Whistle Stop Court, Chantry Court, and Chancel Court has been approved by Chatham County Emergency Operations Office as acceptable for submittal to the Board of Commissioners for approval.

AJ Kamal with Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA (S&EC) completed a site visit on October 12, 2023, and identified fifteen (15) surface waters within the review area that were potentially subject to riparian buffers. AJ Kamal, with S&EC completed the on-site riparian buffer visit with Drew Blake, Asst. Director Watershed Protection Dept., and Phillip Cox, Senior Watershed Specialist on March 31, 2024, to verify the consultant's findings. A confirmation letter dated April 9, 2024, stated three (3) ephemeral streams, three (3) intermittent streams, one (1) perennial stream, six (6) potential wetlands, and one (1) beaver impoundment. A 30-ft buffer from top of bank landward on both sides of the feature for all ephemeral streams, a 50-ft buffer will be required beginning at the flagged boundary and proceeding landward on all wetlands, a 50-ft buffer from top of bank landward on both sides of the feature for all intermittent streams, and a 100-ft buffer from top of bank landward on both sides of the feature for all perennial streams. On-site determination expires five years from the date of the riparian buffer report. The Jurisdictional Determination has been submitted to the Army Corp of Engineers.

There are three (3) proposed stormwater devices and as part of the stormwater permitting process additional information will be provided to the Watershed Protection Department during the permitting process. A Stormwater Permit and Sedimentation & Erosion Control Permit will be obtained from the Chatham County Watershed Protection Department prior to Construction Plan submittal. No land disturbing activity can commence on the property prior to obtaining Construction Plan approval. Site visits were scheduled for August 28, 2024, for Planning Department staff and various board members to attend.

Ms. Tyson said the Planning Department recommends granting approval of the road names Hamlets Forest Way, Whistle Stop Court, Chantry Court, and Chancel Court granting approval of the First Plat for **Hamlet's Forest** with the following conditions:

1. Approval of the First Plat shall be valid for a period of twenty-four (24) 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.
- Mr. Charlie Yokley with David Weekley Homes said that we are one of the largest private home builders in the country and have been in the Triad since 1996 and as a company our goal is to make our customers happy. We are currently in Chatham County located within Chatham Park. Mr. Yokley gave a brief overview of the project and said this project has 47 lots on approximately 118 acres. This project will have public water and served with individual septic systems. There will not be any mass grading, we will only clear for the Right-of-Ways and the home site. There will be existing landscape on each lot. We are only proposing one stream crossing. Planning staff asked for a 60-foot Right-of-Way between lots 27 and 28 for future connectivity. We are also providing a 30-foot utility easement between lots 15 and 16. We held a community meeting March 7th, their concerns were for the trees, and they wanted us to look at the topography to make sure none of the community members will have water draining onto their property. Mr. Yokley said they did research the topography and found the best location for all the drainage and worked with the Watershed department for an approved stormwater treatment plan. Mr. Yokley said Mr. Chris Seamster with McKim & Creed is here as well if the Board has any questions.

There was not anyone signed up for public comments.

Board Discussion

- Ms. Robertson said she went on the site visit but was not able to go further down because the property was so dense and asked if any of the other members were able to see where the collection ponds will be located and how that is intergrading with the streams and buffers because they seem very close. Mr. Seamster said this display showing the ponds on the plat do not show the fine details like the grading plan will show. On this plat the ponds do seem close to the stream buffers, but we will not be grading within the buffer or the no build buffer and we will protect them.
- Chair Spoon asked if this project would have any off-site septic systems and will there be any stream crossing for septic utilities. Mr. Seamster said all the individual septic systems are on-site and there will not be any stream crossings for septic utilities.
- Ms. Colbert asked about the proposed Right-of-Way between lots 27 and 28, will that not have a stream crossing? Mr. Seamster said yes, we have put a reservation on that future 60-foot Right-of-Way that was requested from county staff during the Concept Plan review because the property behind this parcel is landlocked. At this point we do not know if that road will be build or not, so we have the future reservation for that and placed a gap between the lots if it is required in the future. As of right now we will not make an impact on the stream and we do not know if it will happen or not. Ms. Colbert asked what would be the plan to deal with that and who would be making that determination for an impact assessment? Mr. Seamster said that is to be determined whether the developer chooses to develop that parcel, if so, it would be up to them to coordinate the impact to cross the stream.

- Chair Spoon said this is zoned R1 with over 2-acres per lot, all the septic is handled on-site with minimal stream crossing. Mr. Mayer said it is a simple plan and the walk out there was beautiful. Ms. Colbert said she felt like there were a few too many lots on this plan and would have been more pleasing to see a few less lots and the stormwater ponds pulled away a little more from the stream buffers.

Motion made by Mr. Mayer to recommend approval of this item, second by Ms. Haddix. There was a vote and the item was approved 7-0, Mr. Smith abstained and Mr. Andrews recused himself.

VII. ZONING:

- Chair Spoon said this is a little different than normal because we have two applications for essentially the same project. We did switch the order in how we will discuss them, but everyone will have an opportunity to speak during the public input. Chair Spoon said he knows there has been a lot of broader discussions about this item in the community, we will be evaluating this project based on the use, the site map, traffic, and environmental impacts. We cannot discuss the broader topics whether or not religion or churches are needed in this area, that will not be part of our discussion. The Planning Board will be focusing purely on the zoning designation and whether or not this is designated for that part of Chatham County. Chair Spoon said we will have Ms. Plummer give the staff presentation then the applicant is allotted fifteen minutes for their presentation, then we will open public comments. After that, the Board will discuss both applications before taking action because they are linked.
 - Ms. Colbert wanted to echo Chair Spoon and said when we are looking at this zoning we are referring to the 2017 adopted Plan Chatham and for any rezoning application we will be applying those standards, and we are going to be doing that in a way that is consistent with every rezoning case. We will not be talking about the specific use except as it relates to the zoning designation.
1. A legislative request by Qunity, PA to rezone Parcels 18750, 18896, 18897 from CD-CC Conditional District Compact Community to CD-O&I Conditional District Office & Institutional for a church/place of worship, being a total of 50.117 acres, located at 9780 US 15-501 N, Williams Township.

Ms. Plummer stated a legislative public hearing was held August 19, 2024. Planning staff presented the request, and the applicants also made a presentation and were available for questions. No one from the public spoke. The applicant stated they will be utilizing an underground drip system for the wastewater so there will nothing visible from the ground surface, they are designing the facility to complement existing commercial in the area, they have added additional buffering and are working with NCDOT on creating the safest traffic flow possible. These parcels were rezoned in February 2022 for a Conditional District Compact Community use for a 55+ development with 151 single family dwellings, a congregate care facility, daycare/offices, community garden, and barn for event space.

The main concern voiced by the Commissioners during the public hearing was that the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) referenced up to 3,000 total trips one day a week on Sundays, concerned that the design wasn't in keeping with the surrounding area (rural character and existing businesses), preservation, number of parking spaces needed, the size of the main building, and what the benefit to the county would be since they are not required to pay property taxes under the non-profit exemption law.

Based on the traffic analysis provided with the Herndon Farms rezoning in 2022, the expected trips per day at build out would be 1,616. Over the seven-day period, that would equate to 11,312 total trips per week. The development was

proposed to have 150,000 sf of non-residential buildings. Since the public hearing, the Planning Department has received numerous emails both in support of and opposed to the rezoning for a church. A majority of the emails are from residents that are not adjacent to or adjoining the site but from Fearington Village, Governor's Club, Briar Chapel, and other areas.

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, that 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.** No errors are being claimed.
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 public health, safety, and general welfare.** Population growth in the county has risen considerably over the last five years. It is expected to continue to increase with new developments already in the que and more on the horizon. There are four other churches one mile or more from this site. They are all denominations and a couple have served the community for over 150 years. This facility has a team of people to ensure traffic movement into and on the site to make safety a top priority. At build out, the busiest day will be Sundays. There will be smaller anticipated weekly meetings and events during the week.

A property owner adjacent to the northern property line in Hidden Oaks has requested they maintain at least the 100 ft buffer that was provided with the Herndon Farms rezoning. The property owner adjacent to the eastern property line, where an existing solar farm is located, has also requested a 100 ft buffer.

A community meeting was held April 29, 2024 and the applicant received general questions about site development. The Planning Department has received one specific concern about outdoor noise such as music. Staff advised that is something that, if the Commissioners want, can be conditioned if approved. Also, the county has a Noise Ordinance which would apply. There will be general outdoor recreational activities or gatherings on the grass field as part of their activities.

3. **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, the plan notes that churches remain central gathering places in towns and rural townships in the County. This property is adjacent to residential and commercial uses. Per the definition of Compact Residential seen below, churches are specifically mentioned as part of the community fabric. Pg. 18 under Rural Character also specifically mentions churches as supporting rural character and preservation of natural features. The site will preserve approximately 18 acres of forested land, they have set the building back approximately 500 ft from US 15-501 and will have the stormwater ponds and underground drip septic system exposed to provide the look and feel of open pastureland and natural habitat. The site plan also shows a greater than 50 ft buffer off the intermittent stream located in the northeast corner of the site in an effort to protect unique assets and native species of the area.
 - Chapter 3, Goal 5, Conserve Natural Resources by maintaining and restoring quality and quantity of groundwater and surface water resources. The proposed stormwater control measures will maintain pre-development hydrological patterns, create additional surface waters that provide wildlife habitat, and help stormwater infiltrate to recharge groundwater supplies. The existing wildlife corridor will also be maintained.
 - Chapter 4, page 61, Land Use notes that Compact Community nodes should include a mix of land uses, with residential, commercial, and civic components. The church would add a civic component to the healthy mix of land uses in the area.
4. The requested amendment is either essential or desirable for the public convenience or welfare. The church will provide a specific service to the community and surrounding areas, especially in areas that are becoming very populated with residential development. Because the applicants want to be respectful of the viewshed from the roadway and to soften the appearance of commercial in a rural setting, they have located the building approximately 500 ft from the 15-501 road frontage. The zoning district which has been applied for only requires a 40 ft front setback. They will be preserving existing mature woods around the northern and easter property line

and installing approved landscaping in areas as noted on the submitted landscape plan. That plan was reviewed by the Appearance Commission on April 24, 2024, and recommended for approval.

There are two signs proposed at the two entrances of the property that will be under 10 ft in height and have a sign copy of area that will not exceed the Ordinance limit of 50 sf.

5. All other circumstances, factors, and reasons which the applicant offers in support of the proposed amendment. The property will be served by county water and a private underground drip septic system. NCDOT will be required to review, approve, and issue commercial driveway permits for both entrances.

The site is within the WSIV-Protected Area watershed of Jordan Lake and is limited to no more than 36% impervious surface (BUA). The site plan show 21.5% proposed.

Ms. Plummer said the Planning Board has up to three meetings in which to make a recommendation to approve or deny to the Board of Commissioners. If recommended for approval, a consistency statement has been provided for consideration:

- The rezoning request is consistent with the comprehensive plan by being located within a compact community node where churches are specifically mentioned as part of the fabric of development.

Also, if recommended for approval, the following conditions shall be considered and approved as part of any approval going forward:

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 site plan. The planning staff and CCAC may conduct routine inspections of the property to ensure compliance with the landscaping requirements.
2. A building permit shall be applied for and approved for construction within two years from the date of this approval or the use becomes null and void. Should an extension be needed, a timely revision to this approval must be filed with the Planning Department and go through the revision process.
3. Events that provide outdoor music, whether live, DJ or otherwise, shall comply with the Chatham County noise ordinance and be turned off no later than 10pm following said outdoor event.
4. A 100 ft buffer shall be provided from the northern property line that abuts the Hidden Oaks residential housing.

Standard Site Conditions

5. 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.
6. 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:

7. 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.
8. Continued Validity – The continued validity and effectiveness of this approval was expressly conditioned upon the continued compliance with the plans and conditions listed above.
9. Non-Severability – If any of the above conditions is held to be invalid, this approval in its entirety shall be void.
10. 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.

- Ms. Colbert said it was mentioned that there were four other places of worship within a mile or so of this proposed rezoning, what are the size of those parcels? Ms. Plummer said she is not aware of the size of the parcels but could find out. Ms. Colbert said she believes they are approximately 5 acres. Ms. Colbert also asked about what Ms. Plummer mentioned referring to the U-6192 project, it is Ms. Colbert's understanding that those implementations are not supposed to happen before 2036, is that correct? Ms. Plummer said that is when the buildout is supposed to be finished. Ms. Colbert asked when is it supposed to start. Ms. Plummer said in 2028, but this is where our legislature and our commissioners need to be pushing NCDOT, saying we need to get everything set up. We have staff that are members of the RPO and NPO and if we have urgent matters that is where they are addressed and get done. Ms. Colbert said just to clarify, when we are talking about this buildout, it will start at some point in the future and it is going to take some time to get it all implemented. So, whatever the current conditions are that is what we are going to be dealing with for at least some foreseeable point. Ms. Plummer said yes, that is correct.
- Ms. Robertson said during the public hearing Commissioner Dasher brought up and asked is can loss of significant revenue could be used as the bases for recommending denial for a zoning application. Mr. Sullivan said that is getting into a legal question. Yes, generally, when you are evaluating a rezoning case, you are looking at the comprehensive plan and other adopted plans. You have broad discretion in making recommendations, and ultimately, commissioners whether or not they decide to approve or deny the rezoning request, legally it is not clear. It would be a County Attorney question.
- Ms. Colbert said in the staff presentation it was said that there were a lot of responses both for and against this rezoning request. She counted the comments on the webpage and said there were 24 total comments at the time. There were 4 comments in support and 20 comments were in opposition, it was not even, unless more comments were received later this afternoon. Ms. Plummer said she received emails both in support and against, a number was not given and the public comments were spread out around the county.
- Ms. Jael Wagoner with Qunity gave a brief presentation and said one of the things that was heard from the public hearing last month was concerns about the type of programming that would be available or not be available. Over the course of the summer, we did some additional programming that was finer tuned during the month of August, but it was not quite ready when we went to the joint public hearing. Currently, they are anticipating 2 services on Sunday that will grow over time to have a maximum of 1,200 seats in the building. They are going to be anticipating 2 to 3 evening youth services during the week with approximately 50 people attending those. Once a month there might be a college event utilizing the multi-purpose field to provide added services to the local community. Ms. Wagoner said another item she wanted to point out was they are already working with NCDOT to try to optimize a plan that they have in place that was referenced during the staff presentation. We have already had some initial discussions with them about how to place the driveways to make sure that we are addressing their future buildout. So, we have already engaged in conversations this early in the project with NCDOT, the first meeting we had with them was in July.
- Ms. Wagoner said, additionally to address traffic until the buildout is in place, at the very first church meeting there is going to be a traffic safety plan in place. Summit Church has safety personnel at their other locations with traffic safety plans in place, they will also be working with municipal first responders to be able to ensure safety is taken into consideration. It is the goal during the time of services to not have issues with traffic. Ms. Wagoner said there is 18 acres of preserved land with this project, we are not clear cutting and that does not include the land for the power line easement which will not be disturbed. Ms. Wagoner said she understands traffic is a major concern and they brought the traffic engineer with them tonight if the Board has any questions.

Public Input

- Ms. Bonnie McCarthy of 73 Tyner Loop Circle said I live in Briar Chapel and I am here to express my strong opposition to the construction of an 88,000 sqft megachurch in our community along with a 525-vehicle parking lot. This project is simply out of place in our rural county and bring several significant concerns I

would like to highlight. First, the size and scale of this development conflicts with the rural nature of Chatham County. Briar Chapel and the surrounding areas are primarily residential with small businesses and green spaces that align with the county's rural atmosphere. An 88,000 sqft building would be more fitting in urban environment not a rural county where we value open spaces. Secondly, it is important to consider the financial impact on the county and its residents. Churches as a non-profit organization do not pay property taxes. This means that while our property taxes continues to rise we will be losing out on revenue for this piece of land. As homeowners, we are already shouldering the increasing taxes and now to be faced with the prospect of losing potential revenue, while enduring the disruptions this structure will bring. Additionally, the traffic patterns are profound, the traffic analysis projects 3000 trips on a typical Sunday and 600 to 700 trips on a weekday basis, totaling 3600 to 3700 vehicular trips per week. This level of traffic will strain our local roads, increase congestion, and affect our daily use and quality of life. With briar Chapel so close to the proposed site will bear the brunt of this increased traffic. Finally, there is a significant transparency issue. Briar Chapel did not receive formal notice of this proposed development until August 13th, meanwhile adjacent landowners to the site were informed much earlier and had the opportunity to meet with the developer face to face. The fact that briar Chapel was excluded from these early discussions despite the clear impact this project will have on our community is concerning. Briar Chapel owns the land that is adjacent to the R1 parcel and according to Ms. Plummer this is a package deal so I would assume the R1 parcel would be part of that. We should have been notified because Brair Chapel owns property adjacent to that. In conclusion, this project is out of character with our county, it will not add tax revenue, cause significant traffic disruption, and it lacks the transparency our community deserves. I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

- Mr. Mark Weedon of 249 Tobacco Farm Way said he is a resident of Briar Chapel and I have some questions to ask about the change that was made to the agenda. You made a change to the agenda are you treating these two applications as the same thing? Chair Spoon said we will have two sperate votes on them, but we will have both discussions before we take action on those votes. Mr. Weedon said there is a project on one side of Hwy 15/501 and there is another project on the other side of Hwy 15-501, is that correct. Chair Spoon said yes, currently we are discussing the east side, which is where the church would be located. Mr. Weedon said this seems to be a different description of what we are talking about tonight and it makes it difficult to understand your agenda. As I understand it one of the projects has two parcels on one side of the highway add 1 parcel on the other side of the highway, and the second project has three parcels on that side of the highway. Chair Spoon asked Mr. Weedon to move forward with his comments because there are a lot of other residents who have signed up to speak as well.
- Mr. Weedon said he thought about asking the news media to come out, but I decided against it because I trusted Chatham County. I trusted what you have done all the way through, and your kind of messing it up. I guess I should have asked them to come. First of all, the integrity of the community is affected by taking 100 acres on each side of Hwy 15/501 and turning it over to one particular operation with an 88,000 sqft building who wants to have 500 parking spots and 3000 visits which is probably not enough parking. I walk my dog today right along the R1 side where it could be changed from R1 to pavement because there was not enough parking allocated. Now about transparency, you folks have got that off from day one. On April 22nd there was a community meeting of some sort and that was followed up on April 29th with another community meeting. Those meetings look like a complete sham from here. I tried to get additional information about it. The pictures in your presentation that took place at the Board of Commissioner meeting on August 19th showed one line of chairs and a few people there, it did not include the people on the other side of the room. The first notification that the VCCA received was on August 2nd and it did not get through to the homeowners until August 13th. On August 19th. the Board of Commissioner meeting was held and we could not ask any questions.

- Ms. Stephanie Powell of 114 Beacon Ridge Boulevard said I am here to request that you do not recommend the rezoning of the three parcels along Hwy 15/501 for the use of their church. I have a number of reasons, but for the limitation on time I am going to give you three. First, the major increase in traffic along the 15/501 corridor is detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Everyone who drives in this area is aware of the traffic problems that already exist and the high accident rate. You need to consider along the whole corridor, not just one particular intersection. An additional 3000 trips on Sunday, plus over 700 well during the week will only worsen the current situation. I want to note I do not believe that these numbers take into account the use of the future growth plan and do not rationally consider the fact that many of these will be for the evening and late afternoon programs that are during rush hour. To say that this is a minor additional burden and will not negatively impact traffic is absurd. It is further absurd to base an agreement on this on the fact that improvements may come in another 12 years at the very earliest, we have to live with the project now. Who knows what the NCDOT will do when they ultimately improve that corridor. Second, the rezoning is not necessary or required for the public welfare as required by the code. Think about this, 50 acres, not 5, not 10, will be taken out of the tax base forever, we cannot get that back. Who bears the burden of the cost of taxes and the drain on the infrastructure, we do, all of the taxpayers in Chatham County. There are no economic benefits to offset this, no services or goods are included, revenue sales, tax, no employment opportunities. Sorry, very little based on the applicants findings, and no place for people to live. This rezoning would put the county in the negative. Third, this project is simply not consistent with the rural areas simply because it is a church, churches are allowed in rural areas and that is okay. This megachurch is profoundly different from churches that exist now and contemplated in rural Chatham County. Compare this mega church with the four churches mentioned in the applicant's findings, and ask yourself, are they really even comparable. Of course, they are not none of them are even close to 88,000 sqft. None of them are situated even close to 50 acres, or situated near a major corridor, or generate this amount of traffic. This mega church is simply not a church in context and requires a defined community. In fact, the locations listed on their website are listed as campuses. Even more, the mission statement on the website is to plant 1,000 churches by 2050. This is simply not consistent with preserving the world nature of Chatham County. It is a means to an end. Ms. Powell thanked the Planning Board.
- Mr. David Kaherl of 557 The Parks Drive said I am a member of Summit Church. I chose Summit Church because I am aligned with their principles and their beliefs. Prior to 2023 I lived in Durham County and attended their Durham location. This is what I can tell you about Summit. Summit invests in the lives of people and they invest in the community that they are in. They reach out to those in need in their local towns. They serve schools, teachers, they hold back to school programs for kids. The people that attend Summit are generous and loving people and live in the community around the church. Many probably from Briar chapel. They shop and they dine in local establishments, you cannot put a price on the investment those people are going to make in this community. It is going to exceed any tax revenue you might be losing. People at Summit, they live and worship within this community. I wanted this project mainly because I want to live 10 minutes away from my church not 30 minutes away. I urge this board to consider Summit to be located here. Ms. Kaherl thanked the Planning Board.
- Mr. James Copland of 4328 Millcreek Circle said I have lived in Fearington Village for 6 years. In brief, my objections to this project has to do with the tax base, traffic, and scale. I am all for comparable size churches, 150 to 200 families that serve the people who live locally to the church or house of worship. I would like to remind you that Chatham County is already number 5 in the highest property tax in the state, and by giving away a huge chunk of tax revenue you are not helping ourselves in that dubious race. I would like to read to you something from Wikipedia, Summit Church is a Baptist evangelical multi-site church formed in Durham, North Carolina with 12 campuses across the triangle. Tenants average nearly 11,564 per week. Now I would like to read from the Summit Church website, in December 2023 we were able to gather as one church at one location for Christmas with Summit at the Durham Performing Arts Center with 16,000 people to hear the

Gospel proclaimed. I do not think anyone can guarantee that Summit Church would never have a joint event with their other 12 churches across the triangle. Think about 16,000 people once a year, I would not want to buy into that. Lastly, coming back to scale, again I am reading from the Summit Church website, Summit Church directional elders recommended a budget for the 2024/2025 fiscal year with a total of \$51.7 million. Now, they are entitled to do that and tithing is great and I am all for tithing, but I would just take this to underscore the tax revenue we would be kissing away. Mr. Copland thanked the Planning Board.

- Ms. Stacy Donelan of 112 Treywood Lane said I live in Briar Chapel and my concerns and objections about Summit Church is traffic which we have heard already and I do not think they can completely predict what happens when the place is fully built out. They will hold services, training, and seminars with be offered. People will not just be coming to one service on Sunday, programs and group meetings and whatnot, they will evolve into weekly gatherings from people coming from all different directions. I think this is evidenced by multiple times for opportunity documents saying these are currently no development plans for the 2 western parcels. The proposed plan also allows for future accessory building, currently only right in and right out. The builds final design has not yet been determined. Currently there are no plans for development and these properties will remain undisturbed. I just do not think we have the knowledge of the impact this church will bring being built. When I Google it Summit Church is described as a Baptist and evangelical church, I am trying to keep my objection separate from my personal thoughts and religion. My observation, however, is that Baptist Churches abound in Chatham County. I Google searched and there are 21 Baptist churches listed. Why is another one needed and at such a grand scale. Why not attend and support any of the other Baptist churches that are already here in Chatham County. One of the missions of Summit Church is to plant more churches. Summit Church has a goal of planting 1000 churches in a generation and they are up to 538 worldwide, 75 churches in North America, and 13 in the triangle. On their website it states, North America church planting is one of the primary ways we love our world is by planting the churches beginning right here in our backyard and reaching strategic cities all over the world. Today we have planted 75 North American churches through Summit collaborative believing that the most beneficial things for every community is a church to proclaim and live out the gospel of Jesus. From some collaborative, they say a family of churches that work together to help each other thrive and multiply. We started the church planting vision of the Summit Church in Raleigh. Now we are an international movement of 70 churches who believe thriving churches developing thriving leaders is the path to church multiplication. So that makes me wonder, does the church really help Chatham County, or is it just a check box on Summit's planting plan? Chatham County character and taxes, I do not believe a megachurch really matches the character of Chatham County. The tax-exempt status of a church on 6 parcels is not ideal with rising taxes, can we afford to turn over 100 acres to a tax-exempt entity. Environmental impacts, impervious surface with a portion of 2/3rds of the 50 acres is environmentally bad. Why are the eastern and western parcels contingent on the sale of the Herdon Farms parcels? What long tern plans does the church have for the areas that directly border Briar Chapel, what does R1 allow? Adjacent land owners actually have no sense whatsoever what is planned in the future for the western parcels and the eastern parcel adjacent to the O&I rezoning request. Finally, I just have to submit my disapproval for this project and hope that you and the Board of Commissioners eventually will concur.
- Mr. William Lawrence of 211 Bennett Mountain Trail said I live in the Briar Chapel community. I speak in opposition to the request for rezoning 50 acres in Williams Township looking for a church and place of worship. This proposal will create the largest privately owned auditorium in Chatham County with 1,200 seats which will make it 5 times the size of the Hugh Chapin auditorium in Galloway Ridge. The primary use may be worship on Sunday mornings and regular church activities on Sundays, but it would be a privately owned space whose use would be controlled by the owners and could be occupied, rented, or made available at the owners discretion to other activities and gatherings. The capacity of 1,200 persons could be more than one service that we heard from the presentation, thereby drawing groups of people 2 or 3 services on Sunday. The events could be on other days and other times, whether they are church events or activities by groups

that have been permitted to use the space. The nearest traffic control intersections to this location are sites of many collisions that has already been recorded, but the traffic patterns for this proposed site would all be northbound and that creates problems of traffic patterns trying to make U-turns through crossovers and so forth. The proposed parking area in this site is approximately twice as many spaces as the Chatham Downs site, which is north of the proposed site, meaning, exiting northbound traffic would conflict with traffic trying to enter Chatham Downs shopping center. Unlike Chatham Downs where vehicles enter and exit scattered throughout the day, the arrivals and departures for this proposed site would be concentrated and congested in blocks of time. Whether it is wise to remove 50 acres from the taxable property rules is one issue. Whether it is wise to remove 50 acres from the taxable rules and create server traffic congestion is another issue. It would impose a burden on the existing road system and it would impose traffic control burdens on county personnel, county traffic control technology, possible State Trooper controls, and on county tax payers. Mr. Lawrence thanked the Planning Board for their time.

- Ms. Erin Carter of 34 Hunters Way said I am the closest person to this site we have heard from tonight. The neighbors and I are horrified. It is going to create so much danger for us, many of us cross the street to go to the shops at the veranda and the restaurants. That is going to be incredibly dangerous. I am a mother to very young children and there are several families with very young children, I know of 4 other families with children under 4 years old on the street. You cannot walk down Vickers Road without seeing somebody having a walk with a stroller being pushed or kids on hoverboards. This is going to take that away from us. An 88,000 sqft megachurch is going to take up our evening, our weekends, our ability to get in and out of our neighborhood. The only thing I can think of that is comparable along Hwy 15/501 would be St. Thamos Moore and if you have ever driven through Chapel Hill at the wrong time then you will know what I am talking about when I say you can wait up to 30 minutes in traffic just based on just that church being let out. This is a really bad fit for the area. We accept that it cannot be our way forever, but let us do a compact community, we made our peace with Vickers Village. We are not anti-development, but this is wildly out of character with the rest of the area. It is going to create so many problems and we are very much opposed to it. Ms. Carter thanked the Planning Board.
- Ms. Marinda Cossid (sp) said my husband and I have lived in Fearington Village for a decade now. When we first moved to Fearington Village we loved the rural atmosphere the preponderance of green, and trees, and deer, and all the animals in our neighborhood. Of course, development is going to happen, there is Chatham Park and the roads have become more and more congested in the decade that we have lived here, and I am vehemently opposed to a megachurch. It is simply out of character and I wanted to add my voice to this, and there are only two of us from Fearington Village here, I do not think they knew about this.
- Mr. Brian Perry said I am on the northern site which is right at the top of the green area. My neighbor on the closest side to the green area had a big concern about the buffer areas because that property line runs right through his backyard. It was mentioned that the buffer was increased from 25 feet to 50 feet, it is still not enough. The battle that we fought with Herndon Farms earlier was that the tall buildings were going to look directly into his second-floor bedrooms, I understand that this is a different setup, that is the irrigation side of the property, but it literally runs through his backyard. It will be a burden on Him, I live at the end, so it is less on me, but I am here speaking on behalf of all of our neighbors especially for him, he was not able to attend tonight. I second the motion on everything that was said today, it just does not fit, it is not our community, it is not needed. We have the churches that are here, find one of those little churches and have fun with those. This would be a sore thumb in the middle of a great area that is already very busy. Mr. Perry thanked the Planning Board.
- Ms. Diane Cashin of 214 Serenity Hill Circle said I live in Briar Chapel and I want my voice heard as well. I agree completely with the other folks who are against this development and my husband does too. I only found out about this meeting on Next Door. I should not have to find out about this very important meeting on

Next Door. Something is wrong with the communication here. The people, the residents who are offended and deeply affected by this development must be given a chance to know about it and react to the proposal. Otherwise, you folks have no idea what we who will be in close proximity will be going through. As far as I am concerned and so do other that are here, this should all be put on hold and tabled and proper notification given to all the people who would be nearby and impacted by this before you make any decision.

- Chair Spoon said we will now close the public input session for this item and move onto the general use rezoning item for this project.

2. A legislative request by Qunity, PA to rezone Parcels 2752, 93852, 18909 from CD-CC Conditional District Compact Community to R-1 Residential, being a total of approximately 46.607 acres, located off US 15-501 N, Baldwin Township.

Ms. Plummer said a legislative public hearing was held on August 19, 2024. Planning staff presented the request. One person spoke and expressed concern about larger areas of the county being developed and commented that the county did not need more churches. These parcels were historically zoned R-1 Residential. In February 2022, they were rezoned for Conditional District Compact Community for a project called Herndon Farms. These parcels were slated to be utilized for the wastewater treatment facility that was to serve the 151 - 55+ residential units, congregate care facility, one-story daycare/office, community gardens, and barn for events on the opposite side of US 15-501 where the actual compact community was to be located. These parcels would not be needed for the proposed conditional district rezoning case submitted by the applicant. Therefore, they wish to rezone these parcels, 2752 and 93852 on the west side of US 15-501 and 18909 on the east side, back to R-1 Residential zoning.

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 by right or require a special use permit. Uses listed as SUP³ are permitted uses by right if connected to public water and sanitary sewer. 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, which 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.** Since the approved compact community, Herndon Farms, is no longer going to be developed, the applicants wish to revert these parcels to their original zoning of R-1 Residential. These properties would not be needed in connection with their other conditional district rezoning request. The adjacent parcels are zoned R-1 Residential and Conditional District Compact Community (Briar Chapel) and across the highway is Conditional District Compact Community. There is no development planned for these properties.
3. **The manner in which the proposed rezoning will carry out the intent and purpose of the adopted Land Use Plan or part thereof.**
 - Chapter 2, page 18, encourages preserving rural character as one of the most important goals during the planning process. Returning to R-1 Residential would steer potential future use to residential, lower density development.
 - Chapter 3, Goals & Objectives, encourages helping to preserve rural character as well as conserve natural resources. These parcels are undeveloped, undisturbed areas therefore maintaining rural character.
 - Chapter 4, page 61, land use goal is to preserve rural character and lifestyle in the county. Returning these properties back to R-1 Residential is consistent with the majority of the surrounding parcels and will help maintain that rural character. These parcels are also within the Compact Community node of the

Comprehensive Plan Map where a mix of uses could effectively be approved. Future development of the site should be encouraged to preserve as much open space and natural areas as possible. The property has access from US 15-501 and Oak Island Drive. There is no development planned for these parcels.

4. **Other factors/reasons for supporting the rezoning request.** There is no development planned for these parcels therefore no visual impacts or changes to the undisturbed state at this time.
5. **All other information required on this application or as offered by the applicant in support of the request.** There are no water or sewer needs, access roads, stormwater control measures, etc. required or needed as these are being rezoned back to R-1 Residential and no development of the parcels is planned at this time.

Ms. Plummer said the Planning Board has up to three meetings in which to make a recommendation to approve or deny to the Board of Commissioners. Should there be a recommendation to approve, a consistency statement has been provided for consideration.

- The general use rezonings are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan by preserving rural character and protecting environmental resources as outlined in Chapters 2 and 3.
- Ms. Plummer said when the applications are submitted and accepted by the county, we are required to send notice to adjacent property owners by North Carolina general statutes which was done in the timeframe in which we are required by law. Anyone that is outside of that requirement may hear about the application or may not, but the county notified everyone we were required to notify. Ms. Plummer said when the applicant approached the current developer, Herndon Farms, they did have to agree to involve all the parcels that was already rezoned to conditional district compact community to move forward, as the applicant did not need all these parcels, that is why the parcels we are discussing now will be rezoned back to R1. Ms. Colbert said to clarify, we have two separate zoning applications here. Because they are separate rezoning applications, they are required to be notified separately as well, so it will be two different groups of adjacent landowners that are going to get two different notices, one for one rezoning and the second set for the second rezoning. Ms. Plummer said that is correct. Ms. Colbert asked if the county sends out those notices, or does the applicant send them out to the homeowner? Ms. Plummer said the county sends out the notices once we accept and approve the application submittal. We mail notices to the adjacent property owners for each rezoning case, we post the properties with public hearing signs, and we place a legal ad in the newspaper that runs for two weeks and it is also placed on our Planning department website. Ms. Colbert asked if the letters are mailed certified mail. Ms. Plummer said no, they are mailed regular mail. Ms. Colbert asked if the county is required to have proof of delivery or anything like that. Ms. Plummer said no.
- Ms. Colbert said okay, the county has met the basic requirement which is to mail a notice to each set of homeowners. What date were the western notices mailed out? Ms. Plummer said we received both applications at the same time and both sets of notices went out on the same date. Ms. Colbert said the notices went out in April and people did show up on the western side rezoning. Ms. Plummer asked if Ms. Colbert was referring to the community meeting. Ms. Plummer said the county is not involved in the community meeting at all. The community meeting is between the applicant and the adjacent landowners, Planning does not get involved in that. Ms. Plummer asked Mr. Garrett when the notices were mailed out for the August 19th public hearing. Mr. Garrett said the ordinance requires staff to mail public hearing notices to the adjacent landowners no more than 25 days and no less than 10 days from the scheduled public hearing. Mr. Garrett said he mailed out both sets of notices on August 2, 2024.
- Ms. Colbert said this is where the confusion is and that is why the question was asked. So, the county is sending out the legal notices for the rezoning, but there is a separate set of notices from the applicant for the community meeting, is that correct? Ms. Plummer said that is correct, and the community meeting has to happen before the submitted application, that is why it was held in April. Ms. Colbert said there were two notices; one went out in April from the applicant, and the second notices went out on August 2nd by the county. Ms. Colbert said she thinks that is a little dissonance there, people were mistaking the notices for the

community meetings and the notices the county sent out. People were thinking the county was sending out the notices in April and that is not the case. Ms. Plummer said the applicant has to use the same set of adjacent property owners that the county uses; it is the same group of people. Whether or not someone else notifies an HOA and they notify their subdivision that something is coming, it is not on the county.

Board Discussion

- Ms. Haddix said Ms. Wagoner suggested that there would be athletic fields or some other amenities that would be available to the community, is that right? Ms. Wagoner said at this time there is no plan to close them off to the community and there is no publication to say that they are for public use at this point. Ms. Haddix said she would like some more time with this and the community probably needs more time with it as well. Ms. Haddix said she thinks staff did an excellent job presenting the applications, but she just does not have enough information and this is a huge undertaking and very different from the churches that we have in the community and there seems to be strong feelings from both sides. Ms. Haddix said the gentleman that mentioned this will be the largest private auditorium really resonated. Just what this facility would be used for by itself is enough to give pause.
- Ms. Colbert said she has a suggestion about how to proceed on this without getting into some of the details. We have heard from the applicant, we have heard from staff, and we have heard from the public, it would be helpful if we would each go around the table in order to briefly summarize their concerns and after we heard from everyone we offer a motion to table this item until the next Planning Board meeting so we can go back and look at the materials and look at some of the issues that had been raised and then bring it to a vote at our next meeting. That would allow us to give this our full attention and a full discussion.
- Mr. Andrews asked if that was a motion to table this item. Ms. Colbert said no, it was just a suggestion but will make the motion as long as we have a general discussion. Chair Spoon asked the Board if that sounded like a reasonable way to handle these applications. Ms. Haddix asked for clarification about the two rezoning cases, because it does not seem to be problematic to agree to the rezoning on the western side back to R1. Ms. Colbert said we really need to vote on each one of these applications at the same time because you may create a condition that causes one application not to be able to meet its zoning. Currently, these parcels are all zoned conditional district compact community and if we were to rezone just those parcels back to R1 it would create a condition where they do not have enough land to offset the built upon area. Ms. Colbert said it is unlikely it can be separated and done that way.

Motion made by Ms. Colbert to table this item until the October 1, 2024 Planning Board meeting after a short preliminary discussion from each person on the Board regarding these rezoning cases. The motion was seconded by Ms. Robertson.

- Chair Spoon said we have a motion and a second to table this item. We will go around the table to share our opinions and if there is anyone who does not wish to share them right now just say, pass. However, if you do want a chance to express your initial thought on things you will be able to do that.
- Mr. Frazier said the bulk of the traffic will be on Sunday, which is a fairly light traffic day compared to other days. It would be beneficial to look at the traffic on different days and get a sense of that. Mr. Frazier said he is concerned about tax and potential events. This seems less impactful than the compact community in many ways. Mr. Frazier said he is in favor of preserving the rural character of Chatham County but does not think Hwy 15/501 is the place where that is going to happen.
- Mr. Smith stood up and said he wanted to stand so the audience could see him. Mr. Smith said he arrived in North Carolina on January 1, 1953. During those 71 years there have been a lot of people that has moved into my community and state with varying opinions of what they want done within the community and state.

Mr. Smith said this seem odd to him. He was baptized in 1961 and does not attend church, it is not the institution, but rather the people inside the institution. Traffic impact, and taxes, for every dollar taken in as tax revenue it costs a dollar and a quarter, that is a losing proposition. But all of those parishioners pay taxes, property taxes, income tax, sales tax, we all do that. It seems to be a problem with this one institution because of its size. Mr. Smith said a lot of people in his family are educators and ministers. Some of the family members had some of the biggest churches in their communities, which was not favorable with a lot of people, whether it was in Fayetteville, Harnett County, or Wilmington. Mr. Smith said this has been a problem with his entire life. We have a job to do here and that is to protect both interests and it is a hope that we get a chance to do that, we know when we make that decision we are still going to offend someone. Mr. Smith said remember one good thing about all of this, you are still neighbors and you should be willing to help one another instead of being so divisive.

- Mr. Andrews said he will pass because he is not sure if we will vote to table the item or not. Chair Spoon said there is a motion and a second to table the item.
- Chair Spoon said he hears the tax loss argument, but also feels that churches can bring a great deal of civic value to a community, so discounting something solely on the loss of tax is not fair. Chair Spoon said his main concern for this is just the two times a day when it is going to be putting out up to 400 to 500 cars directly onto Hwy 15/501 without any traffic lights. St. Thomas Moore was brought up early in the discussion and how that works, and how it can completely shut down a major road on certain periods of the day. Chair Spoon said his major concern is that it will hinder the traffic.
- Vice-Chair Roodkowsky said she has several concerns and one of them is that churches are consistent with the rural nature of our plans for Chatham County, but it was pointed out that this proposed church is not like the other churches we have in the county. When she thinks of a rural church it looks something like Lighthouse church or Martha's Chapel, this is a very large building as one person mentioned maybe better suited in a more urban environment. It is not a rural church when you picture a rural church. Vice-Chair Roodkowsky agrees Hwy 15/501 is not the most rural area in Chatham County, but we are trying not to have mega stores there, and we should not group a megachurch into the same group as much smaller churches. Vice-Chair Roodkowsky said her second point is traffic, the peak time on Sunday there will be 900 trips, so 450 trips in and 450 trips out in 1 hour, that is 15 trips in a minute. St. Thomas Moore is about 80% in size of the proposed church in terms of seats and we all know what that is like when that church is let out. St. Thomas Moore school has 390 students and we know when school is let out what that does to traffic. That would be about 300 trips, siblings probably ride in the same car with their parents, so it is most likely less than 390 trips. Vice-Chair Roodkowsky said she is deeply concerned about the traffic, especially when we know that this improvement that NCDOT has proposed will not be made until mid-2030's. What Mr. Lawrence said about the traffic needing to travel south, with the turnarounds you need to cross a couple lanes of traffic just to turn around and that raises extreme concern. Vice-Chair Roodkowsky said to her third point, there is nothing wrong with non-profits not paying taxes, but this is a large piece of land that will incur very large costs. Finally, it is interesting to hear that this will be the largest private auditorium, most churches like to recoup some of their own costs and the use of an auditorium for purposes they deem useful and charge people for it. An auditorium is not going to sit vacant and the concern is that we would have other peak times of heavy traffic. Vice-Chair Roodkowsky said there were a lot of comments on Next Door and there are people who showed up tonight to share their concerns. She could vote tonight, but if we want to table it, she could vote to do that too, but we do have quite a bit of information here.
- Ms. Robertson said she shared all the same points as Vice-Chair Roodkowsky mentioned. Ms. Robertson said she heard loud and clear what a lot of the residents in the area had to share and their concerns, this Board does listen and we do care what is said and thanked the public for coming out to the meeting tonight. Ms. Robertson said she attended the Board of Commissioner meeting when Commissioner Mike Dasher spoke about the enormous amount of tax base revenue that the county would lose and also heard the concerns from the public about the taxes considering where our taxes are right now. Certainly, that is a concern and it is a concern of our commissioners. Ms. Robertson said she had sent an email to the County

Attorney concerning the tax loss and the Planning Director Mr. Sullivan and asked if the County Attorney replies to forward it to the Planning Board.

- Ms. Colbert said she would like to talk about Plan Chatham and the current zoning of the compact community and the proposed changes because that is what is before us as a board. She wants to address some of the discrepancies she sees and does not care that this is a proposal for a church and the design of the church does not bother her, she feels it is attractive and what comes from the pulpit does not figure into anything whatsoever. Ms. Colbert said Commissioner Howard is the Chair of the Board of Commissioners and at their August 19th meeting Commissioner Howard had said the Board has not abandoned the idea that there still needs to be a balance along northeast Chatham and preserving the rural aspect. The current compact community zoning also allows for some exempt uses that are not religious institutions, but there is a tradeoff, because what happens is, for example, if you have open space, that is an exempt use, we do not receive tax revenue for it, but it adds to the rural character. In taking a look at what was proposed and approved back in 2022, what we have at that point is some exempt use but offset by the fact that we would be adding additional open space, which she believes is 30% for the compact community.
- Ms. Colbert said the other thing about the current use is it is required to have a minimum of 100,000 sqft of commercial space. Ms. Colbert said she had run some numbers in terms of the completed parcels that are currently in the compact community ordinance (CCO), this excludes some of the parcels where construction has not been completed on them, or they have not gone through the tax process, mostly on the eastern side of Briar Chapel. That involves 8 parcels on 31 acres, and the total 2024 tax value for the CCO commercial was \$445,000. Projecting that over a 10-year period that is 4.5 million dollars, and when we talk about in a general way, balancing the need for commercial development and residential development, that is what makes up the CCO. If we are talking about changing that, then it is a simple analysis of, is this better or worse? Is it more or less? How are we comparing the apples to apples on this? If we are going to be making a change to the compact community, will we be getting more or less open space? Will we be getting more or less rural feeling to it, and those are the kinds of comparisons we as a board should be thinking about.
- Ms. Colbert said this is the reason why she wanted to frame it this way and why she wanted to take time to think on this for a little while and vote on it at our next meeting, as well as additional time to look at the details in this package. The traffic situation clearly is something that does need to be addressed, and even when you look at the numbers on a weekly basis, it is not quite fair, because you are going to get surges at certain times and at other times no, but it will create problems and there be an undefined period of time where current infrastructure supports expansion and was never designed to handle this growth. Whether that happens sooner or later, we do not have an answer for that today about how likely or unlikely that is. Ms. Colbert also said whether it is preserving open space, the rural character, promoting business in the community, a general tax revenue, any of those things, it is not about any single one. It is not even about the specific uses being presented in these applications, is it more than one thing, what is the big picture here? Is the current zoning a better fit not only for that specific area, but compared to what we would get in exchange for that? Lastly, traffic in general, it is a little tedious to hear that if you are not immediately across from something that it does not impact you. A lot of people drive up and down that corridor at different times, so it is not fair to say that other citizens do not have a reason to be concerned, just because they do not live across from something does not mean that we should not be looking at those concerns. Ms. Colbert said if we do a rezoning like this there is a lost opportunity cost because if you go from the Orange County line down Hwy 15/501 to Hwy 64, it is almost exactly 8 miles, and that is our main commercial corridor in the northeast. We cannot create more space on Hwy 15/501, even if it is widened, it is still 8 miles long. All of the opportunities of things that support the services that we require, if it does not go there, it is going to be more disruptive in other places. This particular type of Office & Institutional use, you might be able to get something of that scale to work in Chatham County, but Hwy 15/501 is not the right place for it because that is not a great location to meet the needs of the entire community, but rather just the needs of a specific applicant.

- Mr. Mayer said there are many great opinions and thoughts and it is complicated. However, in his opinion, there are not any really clear reasons to object this. What stands out with this megachurch does not feel in fitting with the rural character, there are some megachurches in Burlington that are just giant metal building surrounded by asphalt. On the other hand, there are beautiful church campuses that have large trees and forested areas, and he is trying to imagine this project more on that side of things. Someone could also try to put in a big box store here, or a school, or a giant Goodwill. There are other things that do not pay taxes that increases traffic and there are all kinds of things developers would like to put on this site. This does not seem like a particular bad one. It is nice that there is a lot of woods left on this proposal and they did not max out their impervious surface. Mr. Mayer said he is opposed to objecting to a development because of the type of use would be different than what he personally would like to see there, it is the developer that is putting the money down gets to say what they would like to see there. If the county wants to buy it and put a park up there, let us do that. Ms. Colbert has a good point and would like to look at the current zoning and compare it to the proposed zoning and get a sense of what we are trading for or giving up. Along those lines it would be helpful to have more time to research.
- Chair Spoon said we have heard from everyone and we do have a motion and a second to table this item. Chair Spoon took a vote, and the vote was 8-1 to table both the conditional district application and the general use application until the October 1, 2024 meeting. Opposed by Mr. Andrews. Chair Spoon encouraged all the Planning Board members to do their research and comparisons of the current zoning and the proposed rezoning request.
- Mr. Garrett addressed the public and informed them that the October 1, 2024 meeting will be located at the Old Agriculture building located at 65 E. Chatham St., Pittsboro.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

No new business to report.

IX. BOARD MEMBERS ITEMS:

1. Update from the Planning Board liaisons.

- Chair Spoon asked Mr. Mayer about the Agriculture Advisory Board. Mr. Mayer said their October meeting is coming up and will report.
- Ms. Colbert said she had volunteered to be the backup to the primary liaison for Siler City and said she is going to withdraw as the liaison until we as a Board have new members and can split those responsibilities. Chair Spoon said if there are any Board members that would like to take that responsibility on for Siler City to let him know.
- Ms. Robertson said the Pittsboro meeting had the Alston Chapel item on their agenda, but they recommended denial for it.
- Chair Spoon said he has been in conversations with Mr. Mullis about the UDO and they have not finalized any dates as of yet, but we are reaching out to the consultants to see what their availability is. If the Planning Board were to hold a special meeting with the consultants it would need to be a remote meeting or a meeting after the BOC meeting when the consultants are in town.
- Ms. Colbert asked if the Planning Board could hold a special meeting without the consultants to discuss the UDO document as a whole now that the full draft is completed in preparation for the meeting with the consultants? There was some Board discussion on holding a special meeting to discuss the final draft of the UDO as a whole and it was agreed to have a remote meeting on September 24, 2024 at 6:30pm.

- Mr. Sullivan sent the final draft to each of the Planning Board members via email for them to review.

2. Discuss and decide the September Planning Board meeting location.
The Board discussed and agreed the October meeting will be held in person at the Chatham County Old Agriculture building.

X. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

Mr. Sullivan reported on the following:

1. Minor Subdivisions / Exempt Maps - See Attachments.
2. Unified Development Ordinance Update.
3. September Public Hearing Items.
 - o Vickers Village Conditional District Revision

XI. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion made by Vice-Chair Roodkowsky to adjourn the Planning Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Smith. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Signed: _____ / _____
Jon Spoon, Chair Date

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