

**TOWN OF YOUNGSVILLE**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**Youngsville Community House -- 115 East Main Street**  
**June 1, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

Chairman Mark Hurt called the meeting to order at 5:58 PM.

In attendance were Chairman Hurt; Vice-Chairman John Cyrus; Members Keith Tew, Ben Rupert, and Bobby Ayscue; and Planning and Zoning Administrator Erin Klinger. Members Robert Martin and Scott Anderson; Planning and Zoning Officer Bob Clark; and Town Administrator Phil Cordeiro were not present.

Chairman Hurt then addressed Minutes prepared of the Planning Board meeting held on May 4, 2021. Without further discussion, the following motion was made by Member Ben Rupert, seconded by Vice-Chairman John Cyrus, and unanimously carried:

**MOTION: The Minutes of the Planning Board meeting held on May 4, 2021, are approved, as presented.**

In keeping with the Agenda, Chairman Hurt asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Ms. Klinger informed him that no one from the public had signed up to speak, but asked Mr. Jim Moss, a citizen who was in attendance, if he wanted to make any comments. Mr. Moss replied that he was just there to observe the meeting.

As there were no comments from the public, Chairman Hurt moved to item number four on the Agenda, appointment of a temporary stand-in Chair to the Planning Board. Ms. Klinger mentioned that, when she drafted the Agenda, she had not been sure if Vice-Chairman Cyrus would be in attendance. She added that they would just need a motion to make Mr. Cyrus the Chair for item number five and that Chairman Hurt would also need to request a motion to be excused from consideration of item number five as there was a conflict of interest. Without further discussion, the following motion was made by Chairman Hurt, seconded by Member Ayscue, and unanimously carried:

**MOTION: Vice-Chairman Cyrus is appointed as Temporary Stand-In Chair for Item Five of the June 1, 2021, Planning Board Meeting and Chairman Hurt is excused from consideration of Item Five on the Agenda.**

Interim Chairman Cyrus then turned everyone's attention to item five on the Agenda, consideration of an application and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for a development agreement for two lots located at 2468 Cedar Creek Road, near the intersection with Hicks Road (PINs 1863-12-4659 and 1863-13-8086) for the purposes of a 144-unit apartment complex. Ms. Klinger recalled that the Planning Board members had heard the rezoning petition for this site at the March meeting. She stated that the complex would be constructed over a ten-year time period and mentioned that the developers had already received water allocation for the first forty-eight units, adding that the property had already been annexed

into town limits. She said the site was within the MU-2 zoning district and the plan complied with the standards for that district. She added that NCDOT had requested a signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Cedar Creek and Hicks Roads. The plan also showed future development at the corner, but it would occur much further down the road. Ms. Klinger explained that she was still working with the town attorney to arrive at the final draft of the development agreement document as they had made some very minor changes to the draft and were waiting to hear whether the developer agreed with said changes, but she did not believe any portion of the document would change substantially prior to the public hearing the following week. She then told the Planning Board she was happy to answer any questions.

Member Tew drew everyone's attention to Exhibit C on page 13 of the development agreement. He observed that ten years seemed like a long time for the entire project to be developed and asked if Ms. Klinger could elaborate on what a normal time frame would be. Ms. Klinger replied that she was attempting to remember what the timeframe was for the Wiggins Townhomes development agreement. She thought that it was five years but stated that that project also involved half as many units as the one currently being discussed. She elaborated that the timeframe really depended on the development as phasing was specific to water allocation. Development might take longer if more units were involved. Mr. Tew added that it appeared that the first two buildings and some of the infrastructure would be built within the first year; however, a deadline was not indicated for each of the three additional phases. In other words, the subsequent phases could all be built out in year ten. Ms. Klinger said what Mr. Tew described did not sound like how the developers were planning on constructing the project based on conversations she had had with their engineer. She knew they planned on starting with the first two buildings, along with the water and sewer infrastructure. Mr. Tew suggested the development agreement either have a shorter term or that the incremental deadlines for each be adjusted. Member Rupert agreed that adjusting the incremental deadlines made more sense. He also pointed out that the document stated there would be two buildings constructed in each of the four phases, but there were nine total buildings shown on the site plan. Ms. Klinger said that Planning Board members could make the motion to recommend approval of the development agreement with the condition that the incremental phasing deadlines be added. Member Ayscue questioned who decided the deadlines for each phase. Ms. Klinger responded that it would be the developer's decision. Mr. Ayscue asked about the procedure. Ms. Klinger answered that they had a few options. They could continue the meeting, in which case the development agreement would be heard at July's meeting instead, or they could recommend approval of the agreement with the condition that the incremental dates be added prior to Board of Commissioners meeting the following week and the Commissioners would have to final say as to whether the agreement was approved. Mr. Rupert remarked that ultimately, the developer could decide to stick with the deadlines as presented. Ms. Klinger said that she typically discussed with applicants any comments or questions the Planning Board members had before the Commissioners' meeting.

Interim Chairman Cyrus asked whether there were any other comments. Mr. Rupert asked if Ms. Klinger knew how far out NCDOT estimated traffic counts when requiring intersection and other roadway improvements. Ms. Klinger responded that this was done on a development-by-development basis and that she was not aware of what developments within Franklin County's jurisdiction had had to undergo a traffic study, adding that turn lanes would be required for this project. Member Tew added that if NCDOT kept requiring traffic impact analyses, eventually a development would reach the threshold required for improvements. He then asked if the Board

could hear from the applicant that evening. Ms. Klinger said that the developer was not in attendance. Mr. Tew suggested that if the term of the agreement was not reduced from ten years, the phases should at least have incremental deadlines. He proposed that a deadline be added every couple of years for each phase. Mr. Rupert thought that, as a developer, you would want to have the buildings constructed as soon as possible. Mr. Ayscue pointed out that they would need to receive water allocation for each phase, which could be a hang up. Mr. Tew asked if there were already utilities available for the site. Ms. Klinger believed that the water main was on Hicks Road and Mr. Rupert agreed. Mr. Tew asked about sewer, and Mr. Rupert was not sure where the main was, but knew there was a pump station at the bottom of the Stephen's Glen neighborhood. Mr. Tew thought that if the developers were having to take water and sewer infrastructure off-site, they would want to do so in a timely matter so they could recoup the costs up front. Mr. Rupert also pointed out that there was a pump station included on the site plan and that this would probably tie into the force main, but he did not know where that main was located. Mr. Tew asked if phasing would be indicated on the recorded plat. Ms. Klinger answered yes, as this was also how Holden Creek Preserve illustrated their phasing, but that this project would be slightly different as it was not a traditional subdivision. Mr. Tew then questioned if a motion was now needed. Ms. Klinger said yes, they would need to make a motion to recommend approval of the development agreement with that condition. Without further discussion, the following motion was made by Mr. Tew, seconded by Mr. Rupert, and unanimously carried 4-0 (with Chairman Hurt abstaining):

**MOTION: To accept the planning staff report and recommend the Board of Commissioners approve the requested development agreement conditionally upon the addition of incremental phasing deadlines because: (1) the request to establish a development agreement is governed by the statutory requirements of the North Carolina General Statutes Chapter 160D, Article 10, and the Town of Youngsville Development Ordinance; (2) the preliminary plan in Exhibit B complies with the requirements of the Youngsville Development Ordinance; and (3) the proposed development agreement is consistent with several of the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan, among them “Plan for Growth”.**

Vice-Chairman Cyrus turned Chair duties back over to Chairman Hurt for the remaining Agenda items.

Continuing with the Agenda, Chairman Hurt addressed item six, consideration of an application and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for a development agreement for a lot located at 1484 Gilcrest Farm Road (PIN 1852-41-3254) for the purposes of a boat and recreational vehicle storage facility. Ms. Klinger said that the facility would be developed over a three-year period. The lot was within the MU-2 zoning district and the final plan would need to conform to the standards of that district, as the one that was included in the Planning Board's packet was a preliminary plan. The site would have fifty storage spaces as well as a small office building, and appropriate buffers would be installed between the subject property and adjacent sites zoned SFR-2. Construction plans would need to show landscaping, stormwater, and parking details. Ms. Klinger added that the town's attorney agreed with the language of the development agreement document before the board that evening. She introduced the applicant, Mr. Jordan, and asked if he had anything to add. Mr. Jordan wanted to address an issue Ms. Klinger had brought up in an email regarding decorative fencing. He provided everyone with a photograph of

wrought iron fencing and suggested that was the type of fencing he would install. He said this fencing would be installed along the road frontages and requested he be able to install chain link in the rear of the property to reduce his costs. Ms. Klinger asked him to clarify whether there was an existing tree line at the rear of the lot and Mr. Jordan responded in the affirmative, saying that he would install shrubbery where there were not existing trees. Ms. Klinger said this would be the portion of the lot where a Type “B” buffer would be required. Mr. Jordan also clarified that the office building at the front of the lot would not be a part of this development and was currently being used as the maintenance area for his mother’s mobile home park. He would utilize the existing driveway for access, and had already obtained a driveway permit from NCDOT. Mr. Jordan mentioned they would be extending the culvert pipe another four feet to provide a better turning radius. There will be approximately seventy feet between the road and the electronic gate so traffic on Gilcrest Farm Road would not be impeded. Ms. Klinger told Mr. Jordan she saw no issues with the fencing he proposed.

Mr. Tew asked at if the preliminary site plan had been approved or if the Planning Board’s recommendation constituted the approval. Ms. Klinger stated that the preliminary plan would be approved by the commissioners as part of the development agreement, but official site and construction plans would be submitted and approved separately. Mr. Tew clarified that the Board of Commissioners would officially approve the plan, allowing the applicant to then submit construction drawings. Ms. Klinger responded that this was the case. Chairman Hurt added that those plans would have to be reviewed and approved by planning staff. When there were no further questions or comments, the following motion was made by Mr. Rupert, seconded by Mr. Tew, and unanimously carried:

**MOTION: To accept the planning staff report and recommend the Board of Commissioners approve the requested development agreement because: (1) the request to establish a development agreement is governed by the statutory requirements of the North Carolina General Statutes Chapter 160D, Article 10, and the Town of Youngsville Development Ordinance; (2) the preliminary plan in Exhibit B complies with the requirements of the Youngsville Development Ordinance; and (3) the proposed development agreement is consistent with several of the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan, among them “Plan for Growth”.**

The meeting moved to Agenda item seven, consideration of an application and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for a petition for zoning amendment for property located on NC Highway 96, near the corner of NC Highway 96 and US-1 (PIN 1843-92-3676) to rezone the property from Commercial (C-1) to Mixed-Use-2 (MU-2). Ms. Klinger stated the applicant intended to sell the subject property to a developer who wanted to construct retail and office space at the portion of the lot fronting Highway 96, with multi-family residential towards the rear of the lot. She added the property was bounded by MU-2 zoning to the south, which was compatible with the proposed zoning, and thus this case did not constitute spot zoning. A Type “D” buffer would be required between this parcel and adjacent parcels zoned C-1 and a thirty-five-foot-wide Type “A” buffer would be required between this parcel and the industrial-zoned parcels along Jeffrey Way. The proposed zoning was consistent with both the future land use map and the comprehensive plan. Ms. Klinger concluded that planning staff supported the rezoning request and said there was a representative for the property owner in attendance that evening. Mr. McArn added their preference for the lot would be to have retail fronting along

Highway 96, with office space in the center of the lot to better transition to residential in the rear. He mentioned they had had interest from a large church as well as several apartment developers and thought the highest and best use of the property would be more residential than commercial. The subject tract, which is fifty-six acres, is much larger than the adjacent Youngsville Crossing shopping center, where there are still vacant outparcels. Mr. McArn commented that they had a community meeting, but none of the adjacent landowners had any issues with the proposal and concluded by asking if any of the board members had questions.

Mr. Tew said usually there are neighborhood meeting minutes included in the packet and asked Ms. Klinger to corroborate Mr. McArn's statement that the adjacent landowners did not have any issues or comments. Ms. Klinger confirmed this was correct. Chairman Hurt verified that this parcel was directly behind Food Lion and Ms. Klinger responded this was also correct. Mr. Rupert asked if the only industrial-zoned properties were along Jeffrey Way and Ms. Klinger said this was correct as well. Mr. Hurt mentioned the water issue and said that the applicant would have to go through the rezoning process before even applying for water allocation.

Chairman Hurt asked if there were any further comments. When there were none, the following motion was made by Chairman Hurt, seconded by Vice-Chairman Cyrus, and unanimously carried:

**MOTION: To accept the planning staff report and recommend the Board of Commissioners approve the requested rezoning of the applicant's property from C-1 to MU-2 because: (1) the zoning map amendment is harmonious with the surrounding zoning in the area and (2) the proposed amendment is consistent with several of the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan, among them “Plan for Growth” and “Attract New Businesses”.**

Chairman Hurt moved the meeting to item eight on the Agenda, discussion of text amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance, Sections 2.14, 7.1-1(A), 7.7-1(G)(1)(E), 9.2-2(A), 9.2-3(A), 9.3-2(A), 9.3-3(A), and 9.4-2(A), standards for mass grading and slab construction. He stated he had read through the proposed amendments, and did not see any issues with the changes. Mr. Tew asked if this was in the email Ms. Klinger had sent out that month and she answered that the amendments had been included with the March agenda packet. Chairman Hurt added that the reasoning behind the amendments were in the minutes for previous meetings. Ms. Klinger mentioned she had incorporated all Planning Board comments. She said that for anyone who was not familiar with how she drafted text amendments, underline indicated text that was added while strikethrough indicated text that had been removed and included additional background for Vice-Chairman Cyrus's benefit.

Mr. Tew said he had a question about bullet two on the first page of the amendments. He thought the purpose of mass grading was to clear the streets and the lots much more than what was needed for utility infrastructure and easements. However, according to this bullet, the above would not be allowed. Ms. Klinger said this was not the intent and that she would strike this provision from the proposed amendments. Mr. Tew asked what the basis was for the lot sizes indicated in bullet three. Ms. Klinger said that this number represented a half-acre lot. Mr. Rupert explained that, in his experience, when a builder develops lots larger than half an acre, they are not doing so far the purposes of mass grading; rather, they installed infrastructure and

then sold individual lots to home builders. When there were not further questions, Mr. Rupert made the following motion, which was then seconded by Mr. Ayscue and unanimously carried:

**MOTION: To accept the planning staff report and recommend the Board of Commissioners approve the requested amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance because: (1) the revisions will allow developers to choose whether to construct homes on a slab or crawlspace foundation while also providing standards by which they must abide when mass grading in a residential subdivision and (2) the amendments are consistent with the goal of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan of “Plan for Growth”.**

For item number nine, Planning Board comments, Chairman Hurt remarked that he was glad to return to in-person meetings, and the rest of the board members agreed. Ms. Klinger then gave her around-the-town report. She said that as of that evening, there had been no submittals for the July meeting. However, she was expecting one application and the submittal deadline was not until that Friday, adding that if there were no submittals, they would not have a meeting. She also mentioned that it was good to finally meet the members that she had not yet had the opportunity to meet.

Following Ms. Klinger’s remarks, Chairman Hurt adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.