

**TOWN OF YOUNGSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Youngsville Community House -- 115 East Main Street
January 14, 2020
6:00 PM**

Vice-Chairman Mark Hurt called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

In attendance were Vice-Chairman Mark Hurt; Members John Cyrus, Janice Pearce, Scott Anderson, and Hank Lindwall; Planning and Zoning Officer Erin Klinger; and Planning and Zoning Administrator Bob Clark. Member Robert Martin, Senior Planner Andy Thomas, and Town Administrator Phil Cordeiro were not present.

Vice-Chairman Hurt welcomed all attendees and addressed Minutes prepared of the Planning Board meeting held on December 3, 2019. Without further discussion, the following Motion was made by Member Scott Anderson, seconded by Member Janice Pearce, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: The Minutes of the Planning Board meeting held on December 3, 2019, are approved, as presented.

In keeping with the Agenda, Vice-Chairman Hurt asked for volunteers to be a temporary stand-in vice-chair for the meeting, as he had a conflict of interest with the projects on the Agenda. Mr. Clark and Ms. Klinger confirmed that it would be just for that night's meeting, and Mr. Clark further verified that the stand-in vice-chair would lead the meeting for items four and five on the agenda. Vice-Chairman Hurt stated that he likely could not be nominated, and Ms. Klinger confirmed this as well. Member Lindwall asked if someone could just volunteer, and Mr. Clark and Ms. Klinger verified that the temporary vice-chair could be any of the Planning Board members other than Mr. Hurt. The following Motion was thus made by Member Anderson, seconded by Member Pearce, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: Member Hank Lindwall is appointed as Temporary Stand-In Vice-Chair for Items Four and Five of the January 14, 2020 Planning Board Meeting.

Mr. Clark stated that Vice-Chairman Hurt also needed to request a motion to be excused from consideration of items four and five. The following Motion was then made by Vice-Chairman Hurt, seconded by Member Lindwall, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: Vice-Chairman Hurt is excused from consideration of Items Four and Five on the Agenda.

Interim Vice-Chair Lindwall then turned everyone's attention to item four on the agenda, consider and make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment on an application for a Special Use Permit submitted by Hurt and Coggins, LLC for property located on South College Street for a multi-family apartment complex. He asked if Planning staff would like to talk the Board members through the case. Ms. Klinger stated that the developers had proposed a 144-unit apartment complex on the east side of South College Street south of West Railroad Street. She said that the property is currently bordered by vacant lots on all sides. The development will

have walking trails in the rear of the property, a stormwater pond to the north, and a total of 218 parking spaces. She mentioned that the comments that were included in the packet provided to the Planning Board have been addressed by the engineer and those revisions had been incorporated into the set of plans included in the packet as well as in the large-scale plans that were available for viewing at the meeting. She continued by stating that Planning staff were recommending approval of the project and mentioned that the Planning Board could consider recommending approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the project to the Board of Adjustment for their meeting on February 6th.

Mr. Clark reported that the plans for the project were originally submitted and the applications were filed under the previous ordinance. He stated that even though the new development ordinance had just been adopted, the applicant can choose whether their project is reviewed under the rules of the prior ordinance or under those of the new one. Review of this project began several months ago and evolved under the previous ordinance. Mr. Clark pointed out that the standards in place for number of parking spaces, setbacks, and the like would thus be informed by the regulations of the prior development ordinance. He also commented that the parking regulations for multi-family development presumed a minimum requirement of 2.5 spaces per unit; however, the Planning Board can recommend, and the Board of Adjustment can approve, a lesser amount of spaces if reasonable and that this plan showed 1.5 parking spaces per unit. Mr. Clark stated that it was under staff's guidance that the developer had reduced the number of parking spaces shown on the plan. He said there were a couple of thoughts behind this reasoning, one of them being an attempt to match a feasible number of parking spaces with what the actual demand was for the overall development. The new ordinance also contains a standard that decreases the minimum number of off-street parking spaces, and this project would be in line with that recently-adopted standard. Mr. Clark reiterated that the Town's ordinance did not have a standard for the maximum number of parking spaces, it had a minimum, and to have less than that minimum there should be a rational basis for that decision. He stated that the next case presented a similar situation. Ms. Klinger acknowledged that including the lesser number of parking spaces allowed the developer not only to accommodate the required buffers but to add more landscaping in the parking area as well. Mr. Clark discussed a standard from the previous ordinance that required a 50-foot setback around the perimeter of the apartment complex. He wrapped up his summary by confirming that the prior regulations are still valid for this project. Interim Vice-Chair Lindwall asked when the Town would start reviewing applications under the new ordinance, and Mr. Clark affirmed that this began the Friday prior to the meeting on anything new that was submitted following adoption of the ordinance.

Mr. Lindwall asked if it was correct that the developers would be putting in an eastbound left turn lane and Ms. Klinger confirmed that Scott Wheeler, the district engineer for NCDOT, had stated that both a left and right-hand turn lane would be required. Mr. Lindwall was also surprised that there was no water and sewer currently available for the site. Michael Hurt, the developer, stated there was a sewer main running down the east side of the property on their side of the railroad tracks. He said for water they would need to come up College Street and that Franklin County would eventually like to loop the water line from Cross Street all the way back around to College Street where the water tap is on Bayberry Lane. Doing so would help improve water pressure and performance. Mr. Clark then told Interim Vice-Chairman Lindwall that it might be helpful to have either Michael or Mark Hurt give an overview of the project.

Michael Hurt began his overview by stating that he and his father purchased the property a few years prior and that it was zoned Mixed-Use when it was purchased. He stated they combined a five and six-acre tract in order to obtain the land used for the current project. Mr. Lindwall asked if Mr. Hurt could speak to the fire hydrant request from the Youngsville Fire Department. Mr. Hurt responded that he thought that Scott Bumgarner, the engineer at Mack-Gay and Associates that who produced the layout of the project, had included the requested hydrants and Ms. Klinger confirmed that Mr. Bumgarner had made those changes. She also mentioned that the engineer had said that if what he laid out was not exactly what the Fire Department had requested, he would meet with Assistant Chief Graney prior to developing the construction plans to ensure that everything was located where Mr. Graney wanted.

Mr. Lindwall also inquired as to whether the Washington Manor project was physically adjacent to the addition at Hampton Village. Ms. Klinger and Mr. Clark explained that no, this project was located on South College Street on the left-hand side before reaching the cemetery. Member Anderson asked why this application was a Special Use Permit request and not simply a rezoning. Mr. Clark responded that under the previous ordinance, the zoning for the property was already in place and that under those regulations, several uses were allowed in the Mixed-Use district. This development, however, came under a set of regulations within the ordinance that required a Special Use Permit from the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Clark further explained that if the applicant was able to meet the standards, the expectation would be that the permit would be issued. He gave the example of the duplexes on Cottage Court as having undergone a similar permitting process. Mr. Anderson returned that he was thrown off by the phrase “a multi-family development is permitted with issuance of a Special Use Permit” as it seemed like the special use had to do with the zoning of the property and questioned whether this inference was accurate. Member Hurt responded that he believed that it had always been the case in the past that multi-family developments required a Special Use Permit. Mr. Clark mentioned that another way to word the statement brought up by Member Anderson would be to say that the use was allowed with a Special Use Permit and further affirmed that if the property was zoned agricultural or single-family residential, then the applicant would be required to undertake a rezoning. Mr. Lindwall wanted to confirm that under the old ordinance, a Special Use Permit would always be required for developments such as the one in question, and Mr. Clark and Ms. Klinger both assured him that this was correct.

Mr. Clark mentioned that these would be 3-story units and that they would be sprinkled as required by building code. Mr. Lindwall mentioned he would also like to know whether sprinklers would be added to the proposed buildings. Both members of the development team responded that yes, sprinklers were required for any buildings over three stories in height. Member Hurt stated that they had also changed the layout of the buildings so that residents would enter via hallways and the stairs would be contained under the roof. All entrances to the apartments would be within an inside corridor. Mr. Lindwall asked whether the exterior styling of the apartments was relevant. Mr. Clark answered that architectural styling was not part of the old ordinance unless the building was in a historic district.

Member Anderson inquired as to whether planning staff had any concerns regarding the comments from the Fire Department about the proximity of K-Flex and the potentially hazardous chemicals that they use. Mr. Clark responded that this would always be a consideration, but that the difficulty lay in determining what that proximal distance would be and whether any new

development was uphill or downhill from the site using said chemicals. He mentioned it was also important to consider the nature of the proposed development itself and whether residents could enter and exit with ease. He then gave an example of a senior housing development that was ultimately approved by the Board of Adjustment and was much closer to a potentially dangerous facility. He further explained that the Planning Department did not currently have a prescribed distance standard for proximity to these types of developments and that he did not have a technical difference of opinion on what was stated by Assistant Chief Graney. Mr. Lindwall asked what the actual distance was between the proposed development and K-Flex, and Mr. Clark responded that he wasn't sure. Member Anderson inquired as to whether it was in the realm of the Planning Board to dictate what kind of precautionary measures would be required. Mr. Clark answered that if the Board had recommendations to make or consider, they could discuss this with the applicant. He also explained that conditions could go forward to the Board of Adjustment as recommendations that had been discussed with the developer.

Mr. Clark then commented that the developers had included pedestrian walkways and open space in their proposal and that the plans also showed sidewalk along South College Street. He pointed out the location of the mail kiosk in the center of the development and stated that this was an accessible location for all residents. He mentioned that the Town had been exploring a stormwater utility arrangement with the developer, but that they did not have the precision requirements set for this yet and so the developer had located their stormwater pond in the northern portion of the site. Mr. Clark also discussed that a 2017 pavement condition study showed South College Street as being in fairly good condition overall but that wear and tear could occur during construction and that conditions should be documented prior to construction to make sure any damage occurring during construction would be the developer's responsibility to fix. He said the staff report indicated that the project appeared to meet the current applicable standards and that staff recommended the reduction in required parking as well.

Mr. Lindwall asked whether anyone on the Board had any additional questions they wanted to pose to the development team. When there were none, Mr. Clark stated that the Board should make a motion recommending, recommending with conditions, or denying the project. Mr. Lindwall confirmed the recommendation of staff was to approve the project and asked if there were any additional comments regarding that recommendation. Mr. Clark expressed that the items that staff and the other members of the Technical Review Committee requested be modified on the plan had been addressed and that staff did not have any other recommendations to make at this time. Mr. Lindwall asked if anyone on the Board wanted to put forth a motion. The following motion was then made by Member Anderson, seconded by Member Pearce, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: To make a favorable recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to approve a Special Use Permit application made by Hurt and Coggins, LLC to construct a multi-family apartment complex on South College Street, Youngsville, NC, provided that adjustments recommended by NCDOT and Franklin County Public Utilities are met.

The meeting then turned to the next item on the Agenda, consider and make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment on a Special Use Permit submitted by Hurt and Coggins, LLC for a property located on the corner of Highway 96 and Wolfpack Lane for the expansion of the existing Hampton Village apartment complex. Mr. Michael Hurt explained that this would be a

continuation of the existing apartment community with a similar building layout. He mentioned they were required by NCDOT to include a turn lane and that all utilities were already available for the site.

Interim Vice-Chair Lindwall asked a question regarding the occupancy of the current apartment complex. Mr. Michael Hurt responded that they were currently at 97-98% capacity. Mr. Lindwall asked whether staff had heard any feedback from the community on this project. Ms. Klinger answered that no, they had not received any outside feedback. She mentioned that this project had a similar situation with regards to the parking as the project on South College Street. The site was quite limited due to the required buffer and the developers reduced the amount of parking spaces and the number of buildings proposed in order to make the site work for the project. She continued by stating that all comments had been addressed on the plans. Mr. Clark acknowledged that technically this project is actually an amendment of a previously issued Special Use Permit that involved roughly half of this property. He said that in the late 1990s, commercial development had been proposed for the front of this site. The tract on the right of the current proposal was purchased after the original permit was issued. Mr. Clark recounted that the key elements for discussion with regards to this project involved what would work best for traffic flow, which led to DOT requiring a right-in, right-out travel lane off Wheaton Avenue. Modifications involving pedestrians had also been included in the plan. He also mentioned that the stormwater pond would be located on the property of the existing apartment complex.

Mr. Lindwall asked what the square footage of each unit would be, and Mr. Hurt answered each unit would be roughly 800 square feet and that the total square footage of the development would be approximately 19,000 square feet. Member Anderson posed a question regarding the number of acres called out near the top of the site plan. Mr. Michael Hurt responded that these numbers denoted the acreage for each parcel in the development and Mr. Mark Hurt further clarified that the 1.91-acre site was what they owned originally, while they had purchased the 0.99-acre tract later. Member Pearce asked a question about whether the number of required handicap spaces was a set number per unit. Mr. Clark responded that the standard was one handicap space per every 25 units and that this was part of the State code as well as the local ordinance. Mr. Mark Hurt also explained that all the downstairs units could be adapted to be handicap units, but that only five percent of them were required to be fully handicapped.

Interim Vice-Chair Lindwall asked for staff's recommendation on the project, and Ms. Klinger stated that they were recommending approval. Mr. Clark affirmed that they didn't have any suggested conditions other than ensuring that the developers complied with the requirements of any outside agencies. Mr. Lindwall then solicited additional questions from the Board. When there were none, the following motion was made by Member Pearce, seconded by Member Lindwall, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: To make a favorable recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to approve a Special Use Permit application made by Hurt and Coggins, LLC for the expansion of the existing Hampton Village apartment complex on the corner of Highway 96 and Wolfpack Lane.

Mr. Michael Hurt left the meeting.

Member Lindwall then turned Vice-Chair duties back over to Vice-Chairman Hurt for the items remaining on the Agenda.

In continuing with the Agenda, Vice-Chairman Hurt asked if the Planning Board had any comments. When there were none, he next solicited comments from the public. Mr. Jim Moss mentioned that Youngsville Cemetery was nearly across the street from the Washington Manor Apartments project and he hoped that the developers would maintain the streetscape in an attractive condition.

Following Mr. Moss' comments, Vice-Chairman Hurt called for the Around-the-Town Report from Planning staff. Ms. Klinger mentioned that the Youngsville Development Ordinance (YDO) had been adopted the week prior to the Planning Board meeting and went into effect the previous Friday at 12:01 a.m. Mr. Clark indicated that the second reading of the Design Specifications Manual would be heard by the Board of Commissioners at their meeting on February 13th. Ms. Klinger stated that there was a link on the website to the draft of the Standards and Specifications Manual. Mr. Clark continued by discussing the US-1 Planning Council meeting he and Ms. Klinger had attended earlier that day. Mr. Clark also mentioned the Hadley Sketch Plan. Ms. Klinger stated that the Special Use Permit for this site was originally intended to be included as part of the agenda for this meeting, but once the ordinance was adopted, the developer decided to pull his proposal from the agenda in favor of returning at a later date. Mr. Clark also briefly touched on the update of the Northeast Area Study. He also reiterated that the Town was still looking for an extra-territorial jurisdiction member for the Planning Board and that if the Board had any recommendations to please let Planning staff know. Ms. Klinger mentioned there was an application on the website and that they could also get in touch with her for any requirements or questions. Member Lindwall asked how many openings there were, and Ms. Klinger responded that there was just one opening at this time.

At the conclusion of Mr. Clark's and Ms. Klinger's statements, Vice-Chairman Hurt adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.