

**TOWN OF YOUNGSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD VIRTUAL MEETING
Microsoft Teams Teleconference
May 4, 2021
6:00 PM**

Chairman Mark Hurt called the meeting to order at 6:09 PM.

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

Chairman Hurt then requested a motion to approve the Minutes prepared of the Planning Board meeting held on March 2, 2021. Without further discussion, the following motion was made by Member Scott Anderson, seconded by Member Bobby Ayscue, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: The Minutes of the Planning Board meeting held on March 2, 2021, are approved, as presented.

The next item on the Agenda was the public comment period. Ms. Klinger reviewed procedure first. She stated speakers would be recognized in the order in which they signed up to speak. They would be limited to five minutes per person and participants would be timed and alerted when their time was almost up. All participants would remain muted until it was their turn to speak. She added that if participants were called in to the meeting via phone, they would need to press *6 in order to unmute themselves and would need to press the unmute button if logged on via Microsoft Teams. Lastly, Ms. Klinger asked participants to please remain muted unless they were speaking.

The first person signed up to speak was Ms. Barb Robison of 588 Fleming Road. As Ms. Robison was not present, Ms. Klinger asked the next person on the list, Mr. Glenn Ellington of 604 Fleming Road, to share his comments. Mrs. Faye Ellington stated she was disappointed in the Town of Youngsville for recommending approval of the rezoning request for 686 Fleming Road. She still opposed the project for several reasons. Her family purchased a home in that subdivision specifically for the large lot acreage, the beauty of the area, and the agricultural environment. She mentioned that the Fleming Farms subdivision was based on large lot sizes and deeded restrictions for all property owners, including Lot 0 as noted on the maps when they purchased their home. She felt that Lot 0 should resemble what had already been established in their neighborhood. As an adjoining property owner, their property would face five backyards. She said most often in a well-planned subdivision, a property will generally border at most three properties, two on each side and one in the front or one in the back. She stated the purpose of the deeded restrictions was to maintain the character of what they paid a premium price for. The other landowners have retained the character of their property with pride. The subdivision is a nice, peaceful place to reside, and they like it the way it is. Mrs. Ellington believed there was no comparable home on a three-quarter acre lot as to what most of the residents in Fleming Farms already have in place. She said even though the Town has stated otherwise, she does not see how

nine additional homes will benefit their community. The residents had written letters to voice their opinions, provided a petition, and spoken at all the online meetings, and they still did not feel as if their inputs had been considered. She added that they were not against growth and that Arrowhead Farms and Fleming Forest turned out to be nice areas, as they have buffered lots to maintain uniformity with the Fleming Farms landowners, which the residents of Fleming Farms feel like should be a standard. She thought the proposed project did not offer anything to the adjoining properties. Finally, she asked each one of the Planning Board members to put themselves in the Fleming Farms landowners' position and ask themselves whether they would like for the rezoning to happen in their neighborhoods.

Mr. Karl Warkomski of 385 Fleming Road was the next resident to speak. He stated he lived just north of the Fleming Farms subdivision on approximately three acres. His property aligned with the agricultural zoning standard of 2.5 acres minimum lot size. His concern was that when they had participated in the development ordinance charrettes to determine zoning for the Youngsville area, they were assured the entire area was to remain agricultural and they were convinced that zoning was going to be maintained. He said the smaller lots that were proposed were incongruous with what was discussed at the charrettes. If the residents of Fleming Farms and the surrounding communities wanted higher density, they would have vocalized that and the Planning Board would have said they needed higher density; however, this was not the decision that was made. What was decided was to maintain the agricultural zoning. He added that if the zoning is changed, an enormous number of impacts would be introduced, to include lighting, noise, traffic, and impacts to wildlife and riparian ecosystems. The roads in the area were based on the traffic associated with 1940s homesteads and were not designed for high-density subdivisions. He stated density made sense inside the urban core, but that this area was not inside the urban core, that it was considered the exurbs where agricultural zoning should be preserved. He said this density should not be occurring that far out and thought it was already bad enough they had the 500 lots at the Legacy subdivision to contend with. The integrity of the zoning in Fleming Farms needed to be maintained based on the inputs received at the charrettes. He concluded by inviting the Planning Board members to reach out to him for clarification if they had any questions.

Ms. Klinger next recognized Mr. Michael Schriver of 734 Fleming Road. As he was not present, she moved to the next person on the list, Ms. Janie Raper of 617 Fleming Road. Ms. Raper stated she had submitted her thoughts recently in a letter to Ms. Klinger's office. She stated the main item she wished to share with the Planning Board was that, like Mrs. Ellington, she purchased her property due to the two to five acre minimum lot size. She added that she had no problem with any of the neighbors and that she had not yet met the applicant, but she would appreciate it if he gave a second thought to the division he had created. She thought that once the subdivision had been completed, the applicant would leave town because he would not be able to stand the unhappy neighbors any longer. Otherwise, the neighbors get along well with each other. The acreage seems to fit perfectly, and they had plenty of space for their animals to roam outside. She did not think it a wise move to subdivide a small piece of property into tiny lots and build large houses with no buffers. She finished by stating she hoped the Planning Board members had had an opportunity to review her letter and understand her perspective.

At the conclusion of Mr. Raper's remarks, Ms. Klinger went back through the list of those signed up for public comment to see if those who had not yet spoken were now on the call. When

neither Ms. Robison nor Mr. Schriver were present, Ms. Klinger informed Chairman Hurt that that he could continue with the meeting.

Chairman Hurt moved to item four on the agenda, consideration of an application and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for a Petition for Zoning Amendment for property located at 686 Fleming Road (PIN 1853-45-1677) to rezone the property from Agricultural (AG) to Single-Family Residential-1 (SFR-1) for the purposes of a ten-lot subdivision. Mr. Watts, the applicant, asked if he could have an opportunity to speak and Ms. Klinger answered that he could proceed. Mr. Watts said that when he purchased the property, there were no deed restrictions that tied it to the Fleming Farms subdivision. He added that last year, as of January 1, his proposed subdivision would have complied with the rules of the zoning ordinance. When the Youngsville Development Ordinance (YDO) was adopted, the zoning of his property was changed to AG. The smallest lot he is proposing is approximately 0.83 acres while the smallest lot in Fleming Farms is approximately 0.6 acres. He did not quite understand why the residents were saying that his proposal did not jive with the character of the surrounding properties. The sales prices of the homes he will build would start in the low-to-mid \$400,000 range and work their way up. With regards to traffic, there would be nine vacant lots in addition to the one that is already existing. If you were to add two cars per lot, that would amount to eighteen cars per day. He did not quite agree with the impacts he had heard from the other residents that evening as he was proposing a very small subdivision. The right side of Fleming Road was zoned Franklin County Residential-1, with which the proposed subdivision would fit in. To the rear of Ms. Robison's property is a commercial property. At the north end of Fleming Road is a property zoned Mixed-Use-2 (MU-2), which is zoned for a much higher density further away from town. He added that he was open to suggestions on how to make the proposal work for everyone involved.

Ms. Klinger thanked Mr. Watts for his comments and echoed what he had said. The subject property was not part of the subdivision that was referenced, and it also was not subject to restrictive covenants, which the town does not enforce. If the rezoning were approved, a type "C" buffer with a minimum width of 20' feet would also be required between the subject property and any adjacent lots that were otherwise zoned. Ms. Klinger stated that the buffers were not currently shown on the subdivision plan because that plan was preliminary in nature and was intended solely for review and discussion. Mr. Watts would be required to submit a more formal plan if the rezoning were approved. She said that, as Mr. Watts mentioned, they did first discuss this subdivision in December 2019 prior to adoption of the YDO, at which time the subdivision would have been permitted by right with Planning Board approval. The zoning requirements are very similar between what the property was zoned prior to the adoption of the YDO, Residential Agricultural, and the proposed SFR-1 zoning, while the AG district requirements were quite different. The plan indicated an average lot size of 1.26 acres and an average lot width of 152 feet, both of which were greater than the minimum required. She added that she was not able to speak to anything that was said in the public meetings prior to when she started working for the town, but that she knew that at the public hearing for the adoption of the YDO, Mr. Rick Flowe, the consultant that assisted the town with writing the YDO, told one of the Fleming Road property owners that the comprehensive plan recognized that the entirety of the AG-zoned area would become subdivisions in the future, and that they were zoned for a lower tax rate in order to help property owners save money until such time that a developer would be ready to build on their land. The proposed zoning was also consistent with both the

Future Land Use Map and the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. She concluded by stating that the Planning Board was more than welcome to take the residents' concerns into account and if they chose to recommend denial of the petition that evening, she would be more than happy to work with Mr. Watts on revising his preliminary plan to something that was more palatable to the neighbors but that that was not her decision to make.

Following Ms. Klinger's remarks, Chairman Hurt asked if the Planning Board members had any questions or comments. Member Ayscue asked if the homes would be served with water and sewer. Ms. Klinger responded that no, the lots would be served by well and septic. Mr. Watts added that he had conducted some preliminary soil studies on the whole of his lot and the studies showed that each of the proposed lots were suitable for a four-bedroom house. He mentioned that his homes would be similar to those in the Brookshire subdivision in type, style, and finish level on well and septic. Mr. Ayscue questioned whether this property was in the ETJ. Ms. Klinger answered that the lot was in the ETJ. Member Anderson asked if adding wells for the additional homes would change the water access and pressure for the existing homes in the vicinity. Ms. Klinger said she believed Mike Moss had mentioned at the neighborhood meeting that it would not. Mr. Watts responded that this was correct. He said that in his experience, adjacent lots can have different water pressures, and that this has much to do with how the aquifers run under the surface. Mr. Mike Moss, Mr. Watts' surveyor, added that his firm had been responsible for several subdivisions in the county. In their experience, additional wells did not generally impact neighboring properties as the wells would be permitted through and follow all state regulations and guidelines for separation of property lines and existing wells and septic systems. Typically, new wells are far enough apart from adjacent wells that there are no adverse impacts on neighboring properties. Chairman Hurt told Ms. Klinger that from what he was understanding and hearing, Mr. Watts had provided and met all the requirements to approve the rezoning as per the Town's zoning ordinance. Ms. Klinger responded that Mr. Hurt's assumptions were correct. Right now, they were not even considering approval of the preliminary plan and that that submittal would be considered separately. Tonight's meeting was just to consider recommending approval or denial of the rezoning to determine whether Mr. Watts would be allowed to build the proposed subdivision.

When there were no further comments or questions, Chairman Hurt solicited a motion from the Planning Board to recommend approval or denial of the rezoning. Without further discussion, the following motion was made by Member Anderson, seconded by Member Ayscue, 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 AG to SFR-1 because: (1) 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 (2) the proposed amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

Chairman Hurt turned everyone's attention to the next item on the Agenda, review and approval of the subdivision plat for Phase 7 of East Woods of Patterson. She mentioned that the Planning Board had approved the revised preliminary plan for phases 6 and 7 at their August meeting. Development of phase 7 took place along Black Swan Drive, Red Cardinal Court, and Quail Run. She added that the town's engineer completed and passed a road inspection on April 21,

2021. There were twenty-four lots involved in this phase. Staff was recommending approval of the plat with the conditions that were listed in the Planning Board's packet. Following Ms. Klinger's comments, Chairman Hurt solicited comments from the Planning Board. When there were no comments, he asked for a motion to approve the subdivision plat. The following motion was made by Member Ayscue, seconded by Member Ben Rupert, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: To approve the final subdivision plat for Phase 7 of East Woods of Patterson with the following conditions: (1) Water and septic systems meet standards and installation acceptable to the appropriate Franklin County departments; (2) information on the installation of streetlights from Duke Progress Energy will be forthcoming; (3) Homeowner's Association documents will be submitted prior to recordation; and (4) a temporary hammerhead turnaround will be added to the stub of Quail Run prior to recordation.

Chairman Hurt moved the meeting to item six on the Agenda, consideration of text amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance, Section 2.14 – Single-Family Residential Grading; Section 7.1-1(A)(4) – Construction Plans; Section 7.7-1(G)(1)(E) – Site Construction Plan required; Section 9.2-2(A) – Detached House Lot Type: Building Placement, Parking, and Vehicle Access; Section 9.2-3(A) – Detached House Building Type: Permitted Height, Uses, Encroachments, and Resiliency Standards; Section 9.3-2(A) – Attached House Lot Type Standards and Specifications: Building Placement, Parking, and Vehicle Access; Section 9.3-3(A) – Attached House Building Type: Permitted Height, Uses, Encroachments, and Resiliency Standards; and Section 9.4-2(A) – Multi-Family Lot Type Standards: Building Placement, Parking, and Vehicle Access. Chairman Hurt told Ms. Klinger that he thought the Planning Board needed to sit down and go over the proposed amendments and that he thought it would be good to review them when they were able to meet face-to-face again. Ms. Klinger said that made sense, and Chairman Hurt asked the other board members for their opinions. Ms. Klinger inquired as to how they needed to handle this procedurally, since the matter had already been advertised for a public hearing the following week. Mr. Clark suggested the Planning Board make a motion to table the discussion to the next meeting with the recommendation that the Board of Commissioners continue the hearing until their next regularly scheduled meeting subsequent receipt of the Planning Board's recommendation. He said that way, the town would not need to readvertise for the hearing. Without further discussion, the following motion was made by Chairman Hurt, seconded by Member Anderson, and unanimously carried:

MOTION: To table the discussion and vote until the June 1, 2021 regularly scheduled meeting.

The meeting then turned to the next item on the Agenda, consideration of an application and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for a Development Agreement for two lots located on Holden Road, near the intersection with Fish Stallings Road (PINs 1842-77-3389 and 1842-76-1367) for the purposes of a 244-lot single-family residential subdivision. Ms. Klinger informed the Planning Board that staff had been working with the engineer and the developers on the project for quite some time to finesse both the road and lot layouts. The subject properties were already zoned accordingly for this development and the preliminary plan included in the board's packet does conform to the standards of the applicable zoning districts. Ms. Klinger added that she was still working with the town's attorney and the applicant to finalize the

language in the development agreement document, but the final draft would be provided to the Board of Commissioners prior to their meeting the following week. Staff felt they had sufficient evidence to support the request and they recommended forwarding the application to the Board of Commissioners for their approval. She mentioned that one of the engineers as well as a representative from the firm that conducted the traffic study for the project were in attendance that evening and recognized them in the event they wished to add any comments.

Mr. Chris Lewis, a principal engineer at FLM Engineering, spoke first. The developers were proposing 244 single-family lots. He pointed out that the main ingress was located along Holden Road and included that this ingress would require both left and right turn lanes. The second point of ingress would be located in the northwest corner of the property and was proposed as a connection point between this development and the townhome development next on the agenda. The lot sizes varied within the subdivision, but they all met the requirements of the YDO. The subdivision entrance road from Holden Road was shown as slightly wider than the remainder of the road further south so as to give more room on the thoroughfare. The preliminary plan also accounted for the right-of-way for the Youngsville bypass on the eastern side of the site and provided adequate space for the future corridor. The road layout was coordinated with the town, NCDOT, and the US-1 Council of Planning. Mr. Lewis pointed out the proposed amenity area towards the bottom of the plan and said the proposed usage of that space was still undecided, but that it would provide a benefit to the future homeowners in the subdivision. He also made note of the proposed sewer lift station located in the southern portion of the plan, stating it was intended to serve this subdivision as well as the proposed townhome subdivision. The proposed lift station could turn into a regional lift station to serve additional properties, but the area would need to be studied by Franklin County Public Utilities' engineer first. Mr. Lewis added that there are five proposed stormwater areas within the development that would all meet State standards for stormwater ponds. There would be buffers on the site that complied with the standards of the YDO, and the proposed planting section was shown on sheet C-2. He said as the Planning Board knows, water and sewer allocation could not be requested from Franklin County Public Utilities until they received approval from the town and mentioned that the next Utility Advisory Committee (UAC) meeting had not yet been scheduled, but that it should be held sometime that fall. The project would be phased based on the allocation ordinance and the infrastructure needed for each phase. He concluded by stating he was happy to answer any questions the Planning Board members may have.

Next to speak was Mr. Josh Reinke of Ramey-Kemp and Associates, the traffic engineer for the project. His firm conducted the traffic impact analysis (TIA) as a master TIA for the single-family homes as well as the townhomes that were next on the agenda. They collaborated with town staff and NCDOT on the study area, project assumptions, and review. The team looked at seven total study area intersections. Trips expected from both the single-family homes as well as the townhomes were included. They used as much data for the peak hours that they could that was pre-COVID, grew that up to the existing years, and adjusted any counts they had to obtain the counts for the existing volumes. The analysis also included the traffic associated with five other developments being constructed in the area and grew the traffic up at typical historical growth rates in order to look at all traffic that is to be expected at the build-out of this project. Improvements were considered at four of the study area intersections, including turn lanes at the site driveway on Holden Road and signal timing adjustments at three other intersections to help improve traffic flow. The TIA had been reviewed by NCDOT and town staff and they both

concluded with the findings and improvements that were recommended. He added that he was happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Anderson asked which other intersections aside from the one at Holden Road and Capital Boulevard were included in the analysis. Mr. Reinke responded they looked at Sunset Drive near where Rolling Acres was located as well as the intersection of West Main Street, Holden Road, and College Street. He stated that with the growth patterns of the adjacent developments they would start to see more significant delays and recommended looking at signal timings for that intersection to make NCDOT aware of some of the ways they could optimize traffic flow there. The site driveway along Holden Road was where they were recommending right and left turn lanes into the site due to the traffic volume on Holden. Mr. Reinke said to remove turning movements from the through road in order to minimize delays and help with safety. He summarized that these were the four intersections that needed improvements and NCDOT concurred with their recommendations. He added that NCDOT would likely require the improvements be installed before the development was constructed. Mr. Lewis said that typically, NCDOT allowed a certain number of lots to be constructed without improvements to the infrastructure but he was not sure if those conversations had occurred yet. Mr. Gordon Poulson, the developer, inserted that the turn lanes would be constructed in the beginning and the full through lane between the two developments would be completed prior to the second phase, adding that each phase would have a maximum of 50 lots. Mr. Reinke added that they were installing improvements that would be required to accommodate the maximum amount of traffic possible very early on in the project.

Mr. Anderson followed up by asking if the vote they were taking that evening was just for the zoning. Ms. Klinger responded that no, since staff had been working with the applicant since before the YDO was adopted, the lots were already zoned the way they needed to be. Tonight's vote was to recommend approval of the development agreement document which included the preliminary plan. She explained that this development was similar to the Wiggins Townhomes development approval heard at January's meeting. Mr. Anderson replied that when reviewing the packet, he thought some of the documents might have been duplicated. Ms. Klinger said that the two development agreements looked very similar on the surface and that they were more or less the same with two exceptions: one referred to a single-family subdivision and one referred to townhomes, and each one was associated with a different developer. Mr. Poulson added that the reason they took so long to submit their proposal was because of the agreements they had to come to with NCDOT and the US-1 Council of Planning for the road layout. Ms. Klinger included there had been several different iterations of the road and the subdivision layout before they arrived at the one before the board that evening.

When there were no further comments from the Planning Board, the following motion was made by Member Rupert, seconded by Member Ayscue, 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 turned to the next agenda item, consideration of an application and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for a Development Agreement for two lots located on Fish Stallings Road, near the intersection with Holden Road (PINs 1842-56-2932 and 1842-66-1923) for the purposes of a 126-unit townhome development. Ms. Klinger began by stating that this was the sister project to the one that was just discussed and that everything they had just reviewed also applied to this project, except that this development would have 126 townhome units instead of single-family homes. Mr. Lewis added that this project was slightly different in that the point of ingress was located on Fish Stallings Road. There would also be secondary ingress connected to the previous agenda item that would cross over an existing stream with a buffer that would be permitted accordingly. The subdivision plan also showed stubout roads to the north for future connectivity. He said the development would be a typical townhome lot subdivision and confirmed that it met all the requirements of the YDO. The townhomes would have single-car garages with a single parking pad. The plan also included additional parking lots to meet parking requirements. Mr. Lewis noted that the parking exceeded the minimum required by 42 spaces. Townhome owners would have access to the amenities in the single-family subdivision. The proposed sewer in this subdivision would connect to that in the single-family subdivision and would utilize the sewer lift station that was discussed under the previous agenda item. The plans also indicated a stormwater pond located in the southeast corner of the project and it would meet all State stormwater requirements. Buffers were again provided along the property lines per the YDO, and the proposed plantings were included on the plan. As with the single-family subdivision project, Franklin County utility allocation could not be requested until the project was approved. He reminded the board that the next UAC meeting had not yet been scheduled but should occur sometime that fall.

Mr. Reinke mentioned that the master TIA considered the townhomes as well as the single-family units to ensure all trips were captured. Chairman Hurt asked if a turn lane would be needed at Fish Stallings and Holden Roads. Mr. Reinke responded that one was not needed as the volumes were much lower there than on Holden Road. NCDOT typically had developers look at adding turn lanes if the roadway reached a certain volume regardless of the additional construction and mentioned that this project was below that threshold. Chairman Hurt noted that, if coming from Fish Stallings road north to this complex, the intersection with Holden Road might get rather busy. Mr. Reinke confirmed that Mr. Hurt was referring to the intersection of Fish Stallings and Holden. He explained that the TIA considered a full build year of 2027, which meant that they were looking at future traffic volumes, and it considered all site traffic as well as traffic from adjacent developments during the peak hour. There would be about fifty vehicles coming from Fish Stallings Road. On the other hand, Holden Road would have over 700 vehicles going in each direction during the peak period. In the area of Fish Stallings Road near the site driveway, there would be less than fifty vehicles during the peak hour, which was quite a bit less than the volume on Holden. Turn lanes are not as crucial when there are lower traffic volumes.

Mr. Anderson wanted to clarify that cars turning onto Fish Stallings Road from Capital Boulevard heading north to enter the new townhome development would also be able to access the single-family development. Mr. Lewis said that this was correct and that there would be a connection point on the southeastern side of this project. Mr. Reinke added that the

interconnectivity would help relieve some of the traffic from Holden Road. Mr. Anderson wondered whether the increase in traffic from the new developments would cause any major hiccups for the residents of the existing Rolling Acres subdivision. Mr. Reinke responded that the level of service (LOS) at the driveway on Fish Stallings Road was LOS A. Usually, improvements were needed around LOS D. At Holden, the levels of service were poorer. He added that the nearest signal was too close to consider adding another one at this intersection. Mr. Ayscue wanted to confirm that the number of daily trips on Fish Stallings would be fifty vehicles during peak hour and asked whether those numbers took COVID into consideration. Mr. Reinke explained their TIA methodology. He said that they already had counts for some of the intersections. They thought the best methodology would be to grow those intersections up to the current year. For the intersections where they were concerned about collecting data during COVID, they not only took counts during the peak time, but they also determined how that compared to historic data so they knew what numbers should be fine-tuned. He believed they adjusted around thirty-four percent. To be even more conservative, they balanced that number with other intersections where they had pre-COVID counts. They also added in adjacent developments that expected to finish construction before this one. They then accounted for the typical area growth rate before the site trips were finally added in.

As there were no further questions, the following motion was made by Member Anderson, seconded by Chairman Hurt, 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”.

Item nine on the agenda was consideration of text amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance, Table 17.1 – Permanent Sign Standards and Criteria. Ms. Klinger said that the Youngsville ABC Store would be relocating from their existing location to the Food Lion shopping center and wanted to install new signage on their storefront. However, the YDO currently limited wall signs to thirty-two square feet in area. The existing signage in that shopping center was installed prior to the adoption of the YDO and had thus been grandfathered in as legally non-conforming. She added that the master sign plan for the shopping center also allowed tenants to have signs as large as eighty percent of the area of their building façade and that many of the businesses had signs larger than thirty-two square feet. The ABC Store wished to be treated equitably with their neighbors since the current regulations not only put them at a disadvantage, but any businesses that wished to relocate to Youngsville or new businesses would be at a disadvantage as well. The proposed amendments would change the allowable square footage for wall signs from thirty-two square feet to 1.5 square feet per linear foot of storefront for front facades and one square foot per linear foot of building wall for side and rear facades. Businesses would be limited to one wall, projecting, or v-type sign per business per street or parking frontage. The amendments also clarified that the allowable square footage for projecting signs was sixteen square feet per side. Ms. Klinger said planning staff supported the amendments

and were suggesting that the Planning Board recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners. She then recognized Bridget Stanley, the General Manager of the ABC System.

Ms. Stanley echoed Ms. Klinger's comments about the ABC Store wanting to be treated equitably with their neighbors. She said they looked at signage options within the thirty-two square foot requirement, but that it was a drastic difference from the other signs in the shopping center and it would be more of an eyesore. She appreciated the board's consideration and thanked them for their time.

Mr. Rupert had a question regarding the eighty percent limitation. He asked if the existing signs were no larger than eighty percent and if the ABC Store was asking to go up to eighty percent or if there was a cap. Ms. Klinger said the cap would be whatever the 1.5 square foot limitation would be on their façade and that it was less than the eighty percent. Ms. Stanley added that their proposed sign was 57.3 square feet. She explained that they would be taking over two suites in the shopping center, so they had a larger storefront than what was originally planned for. While the thirty-two square feet would have been large enough for one storefront, it looked very small with them combining two suites.

Without additional discussion, the following motion was made by Member Rupert, seconded by Member 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 new businesses that wish to locate in Youngsville to be treated equitably with existing businesses and (2) the amendments are consistent with the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan of “Downtown Business Retention” and “Attract New Businesses”.

The next item was consideration of text amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance, Article 3 – Definitions and Table 8.1 – Table of Uses. Ms. Klinger explained that the proposed amendments would allow indoor gun ranges as a special use in the industrial zoning district. Right now, they were only permitted as such in MU-2, CP-1, and C-1. Several of the nearby municipalities, including Creedmoor, Zebulon, and Franklin County, did permit such a use in their industrial zoning districts. The applicant planned on relocating his existing business, Tar River Arms, from Wake Forest to a location in the Youngsville Industrial Park. He proposed to sell firearms and other related materials at his business, as well as to provide a safe space for firearm owners to learn about and discharge their weapons and to provide training opportunities for law enforcement. The proposed amendments would allow him to do this at his desired location with the approval of a special use permit. Planning staff supported the proposed amendments as they helped support small businesses and were consistent with the goals of the comprehensive plan. She added that she had a preapplication meeting with the applicant in March. What he wrote on the application was slightly different from how the amendments were drafted because Ms. Klinger's research showed the draft language to be more in line with the ordinances of surrounding municipalities.

Mr. Anderson asked why a special use permit would still be required if they voted to amend the text of the ordinance. Ms. Klinger explained that, for the districts in which indoor shooting

ranges were allowed, the use table presently lists that use as a special use. The special use permit was thus already required, so the amendments would just be adding that same requirement to the industrial district.

As there were no further comments, the following motion was made by Member Anderson, seconded by Member Rupert, 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 Town does not currently allow indoor shooting ranges in IND zoning, whereas surrounding municipalities do, and the Town strives to be comparable to their peers and (2) the amendments are consistent with the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan of “Business Retention” and “Attract New Businesses”.

The next item on the agenda was consideration of text amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance, Section 5.3-3(B)(2) – Method of procedure for mailed notice of Zoning Map Amendments; Section 6.14(B) – Action by the Board of Adjustment; Section 7.8-8 – Public Notification; and Section 7.14-1(B) – Notices and Public Hearings – General notice requirement. Ms. Klinger asked the board to recall it was requested that she research modifying the notification requirements for zoning map amendments. Right now, only parcels adjacent to the subject property must be notified. The proposed amendments would modify the notification requirement from just adjacent parcels to parcels within 500 feet of the subject property for rezonings and parcels within 100 feet of the subject property for variances. She added that this did align with how other jurisdictions notified their residents. Planning staff supported the amendments, as the revisions allowed more residents to be notified of upcoming developments and encouraged more public participation in the planning process. They were also consistent with the goals of the comprehensive plan.

Member Anderson made the following motion. It was seconded by Chairman Hurt and unanimously carried:

MOTION: To accept the planning staff report and recommend the Board of Commissioners approved the requested amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance because: (1) the amendments align with how neighboring jurisdictions have codified their notification requirements; (2) the revisions will allow for more residents to be notified of upcoming developments; (3) the proposed amendments will encourage more public participation in the planning process; and (4) the amendments are consistent with the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan of “Town Board Puts Things Off” and “Easier Governing Board Relationships”.

The final action item on the agenda was consideration of text amendments to the Youngsville Development Ordinance, Section 2.13-1 – Accessory uses and structures and Section 2.13-2 – Fences and Walls. Ms. Klinger stated that these amendments were straightforward. She often received inquiries from residents about constructing a fence on their property. The way the regulations were currently worded was both contradictory and confusing, especially to the average homeowner. The revisions clarified the allowable height for fences in front, rear, and side yards, as well as the distance that accessory structures must be set back from rear and side

property lines. Planning staff supported the proposed amendments as the revisions allowed residents to better comprehend the fencing standards which in turn would lead to decreased inquiries to town staff.

Mr. Anderson what the actual text change was. Ms. Klinger explained that there were two major changes. The first corrected a contradiction in the allowable setback. In one place in the YDO it said four feet and in another, it said five feet, so this had been amended to make the standard five feet. The second change made the allowable height for fences in side and rear yards seven feet. The rest of the changes cleaned up issues with grammar.

When there were no further questions, the following motion was made by Member Rupert, seconded by Member Anderson, 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 proposed amendments will allow more residents to better comprehend the standards for fencing; (2) the aforementioned understanding will lead to the decreased inquires to Town staff to help contractors and residents interpret the regulations; and (3) the amendments are consistent with the goals of the Town Plan 2040 – Comprehensive Land Use Plan of “Plan for Growth”.

Chairman Hurt then solicited comments from the Planning Board. Member Anderson thanked Ms. Klinger for her hard work and Chairman Hurt echoed his remarks.

As there were no other comments, Chairman Hurt moved to the Around-the-Town report from planning staff. Ms. Klinger asked the board members if they were comfortable moving back to in person meetings starting in June, and the board members all said that they were. She mentioned that next month’s agenda would consist of the discussion of the text amendments for mass grading, a development agreement for the apartment complex at the corner of Cedar Creek and Hicks Roads, and a rezoning case for a parcel on Highway 96 to the southeast of the Food Lion shopping center. She asked Mr. Clark if had anything to add. Mr. Clark replied there had been good participation and input into the Northeast Area Study update. Ms. Klinger said that Brandon Watson from CAMPO would be making a presentation to the Board of Commissioners at their June meeting if any of the Planning Board members were interested in hearing it.

At the conclusion of the planning staff report, Chairman Hurt adjourned the meeting at 7:40 PM.