

09.28.09 Planning Board minutes  
Approved 10.26.09

VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
September 28, 2009, 7:00 PM

The Planning Board of the Village of Wesley Chapel, North Carolina, met in the Fellowship Hall of the Wesley Chapel United Methodist Church at 120 Potter Road South, Wesley Chapel, North Carolina, with Chairman Chuck Adams presiding.

**Present:** Chairman Chuck Adams; Members- Sandi Bush, Ray Davis, John Grexa, Stephen Keeney and Alternate Bill Fairman

**Absent:** Alternate Shirley Wilson

**Others Present:** Cheryl Bennett, Clerk; Joshua Langen, Planning/Zoning Administrator, Mayor Tracey Clinton

**Citizens:** Carol Mullis

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm; a quorum was present.

1. Pledge and Invocation

Chairman Adams led the pledge; Keeney gave the invocation.

2. Additions, Deletions and Approval of Agenda

Bush made a motion to approve the agenda; Davis seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Bush made a motion to approve the August 24, 2009 minutes, Davis seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion of Section 3.1.1 & RUC districts

Langen said there were only minor changes since the last meeting. Bush inquired what would happen if an undeveloped lot came in; they would not come in under RUC. A change was made to g. RUC Residential Union County District from “existing structures in subdivisions that were developed under Union County” to “existing structures on parcels that were approved for development under Union County”. In the next sentence “subdivisions” was changed to “parcels”.

Grexa made a motion to approve g. RUC Residential Union County District with the changes made above. Bush seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion of Turning Radii

Langen said he spoke to NC DOT; there is no set turning radii for driveways. DOT will handle it, they look at several factors. You can't put a uniform standard in the code due to the variables. To do a driveway, the applicant must get an encroachment permit.

Adams commented that we need to move traffic effectively; can we override their recommendation. Langen said he signs the permits, and in his cover letter he can make recommendations. The Ordinance Review Committee (ORC) will look at the LARTP suggestions, and can make some recommendations. Langen noted LARTP's recommendation is to have a traffic impact analysis for two hundred or more home subdivisions. However 30-40 home subdivisions could also impact traffic. Keeney noted traffic backs up at New Village School. Planning Board consensus was we need changes to the ordinance for deceleration lanes. Grexa asked about continuing review; Langen said they check once a year with traffic counts, but the problem is also funding.

6. Discussion of Essential Services

Article 2 was reviewed. Chairman Adams asked what is the deck line of a mansard roof. No one was sure. He asked about eaves and the edge of the roofline. Langen said this will come back to the Board. Essential Services Class I, II, III and IV were reviewed. Langen said he ran it by Union County and Union Power, and in general they thought it looked good. Grexa had attended the ORC meeting and noted they had added government as public uses. Langen said we need to go through the definitions of public use and government facilities.

Article 6.10.7 was reviewed next. Chairman Adams noted he would like to receive the information ahead of the meeting, not the night of the meeting. Sub-sections d., e., and f., had been added to this article. Chairman Adams questioned why we had picked 60% as the amount of the lot area that can be used for essential services structures, related facilities and storage. It was noted that Council member Pierce had suggested that from the ORC meeting. Bush questioned how we would know there was a documented safety and disaster mitigation plan and training for public safety services. Mayor Clinton said we would work with the Sheriff and Fire Chief.

Noise levels were discussed; since they are judgmental, we could add "as determined by the Zoning Administrator". We need to define what "structures and related facilities" are. Recognizing the difficulty in measuring noise level and what the noise level will be; Langen will look at the noise levels and why the 60% figure was used, and this will come back to Planning Board next month.

Article 4.2, Screening and Landscaping, was reviewed next. Article 4.2.4(a) refers to large mature trees; this should be "maturing trees". Bush asked about maintaining trees and replacing dead trees. Langen said Article 4.2.11 addresses this for stormwater; we will look at it as a separate item. A change was made to the definition of "public utilities" to "public safety station". We need a definition of public services. Article 4.2.10, "beginning" was struck because 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 cover screening for Class I and Class IV. Article 4.2.5 had "as determined by the Zoning Administrator" added; the pros and cons of this were discussed. It was noted that you must take into account what happens to the plants in a couple of years. Article 4.2.10 a. and b. were discussed, also why the buffer was changed from thirty to thirty-four feet; as well as why the number of

Approved 10.26.09

trees and shrubs was changed. Langen said he looked at the table for buffers, and picked the higher standards. We put in “as measured from facilities” because the buffer is used to screen the use, not to screen the lot. Landscaping was discussed; Langen noted now we have a sliding formula that you can’t apply to distribution lines. Concern was expressed that by requiring trees to be planted too close together, they might not survive. The Board decided to table this to next month, and ask David Grant the urban forester to come to the meeting.

7. Discussion of Sign Regulations

Article 8 was reviewed. In Section 8.2 (i) fire department will be left in, and the first part of the section will be moved to 8.8(d). Discussion was held on how many signs a church may have; since a church may have two driveways, Section 8.2(g) was changed to allow four signs. Banners were discussed; Sections 8.8(a) and (b) both deal with them; the time limit in (b) was changed to 60 days with a sign, and then 30 days with no sign before they can put up a sign again. Otherwise it was felt the sign becomes permanent, not temporary. The sentence “Sign placement shall maintain four feet (4’) of unobstructed sidewalk space.” was also added to section 8.2 (j).

8. Topics to Discuss at Next Meeting

Topics include: Planning Board Rules of Procedure, minimum housing standards, signs, and essential services.

9. Other Business- none.

10. Adjournment

Davis made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Keeney seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted

---

Cheryl Bennett, Village Clerk

---

Chairman Chuck Adams