

VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
WESLEY CHAPEL TOWN HALL
6490 Weddington Road, Wesley Chapel, NC 28104
March 25, 2019 – 7:00 PM

The Planning Board of Wesley Chapel, North Carolina met in the Town Hall at 6490 Weddington Road, Wesley Chapel in North Carolina.

Planning Board Members Present: Chair John Souza, Chuck Adams, Michael Kenary, and Sandra Ells; Alternate Deb Bledsoe (seated as regular member)

Planning Board Members Absent: Regular Member David Boyce, Alternate Ty Jaiyeoba and Vince Gahren

Others Present: Clerk Cheryl Bennett; Planning/Zoning Administrator Robyn Byers, Ph.D.

1. Pledge, Invocation, and Determination of Quorum

Chair Souza led the pledge of allegiance, and Chuck Adams gave the invocation. A quorum was present.

2. Public Comments

Council Member Mike Como gave a reminder of the Advance which is scheduled for March 29th and 30th, 2019.

3. Additions, Deletions and Approval of Agenda

Chuck Adams motioned to adopt the agenda as is, and Michael Kenary seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes of February 25, 2019 regular meeting

Deb Bledsoe requested a change be made to the minutes, by replacing “cut down” to “reduce” in the minutes of the tree ordinance discussion on page 10, paragraph 3 of item 7.a. She then motioned to approve the February 25, 2019 minutes with this change; Michael Kenary seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Council Member in

Council Member Como reported on progress with the band shell and new gate at the park, and that security cameras have been approved for town hall entrances. Planning Board member Chuck Adams questioned why council members get paid if they miss a meeting (Planning Board members do not get paid if they do not attend the meeting). It was noted that Planning Board is appointed, while Council members are elected. Also it is an incentive for Planning Board

members to attend meetings. Council Member Como will bring this up at the Advance. He also gave an update on roundabouts planned for construction.

Planning Board chair John Souza noted the County Planning Board voted against a recent development, that the Board of County Commissioners subsequently approved. He noted our Planning Board unanimously voted against a re-zoning, that was sent to Council and is now back again. He hopes Council will take Planning Board input as significant.

Council Member Como noted residents, town representatives and the County Planning Board were all against the project. At the County retreat, the commissioners, department heads and planning staff discussed water and sewer capacity. Council Member Como added he does not try to overturn a planning board vote, he hopes others would listen to their planning board and citizens.

6. New Business

a. Rezoning Request RZ-19-2 – NC 84 & Potter Rd.

Planner Robyn Byers, Ph.D. noted nothing had changed from their last re-zoning request. They withdrew their first request on Thursday, and re-applied on Monday. The reason given was “unforeseen circumstances”. The planner noted she had concerns regarding the Piedmont Natural Gas sub-station, and noted in October 2018 Piedmont Natural Gas had emailed the towns regarding sites with specific criteria near their facilities. Building classifications are used to calculate high consequence areas which supports her conditional zoning recommendation. A question was asked regarding FEMA designations; the flood map layers are shown on Union County GIS. Chair Souza asked about the uses “continuing care” and “rest homes”. Planner Byers read the definition of the uses. Anything over 2,000 square feet requires a CUP. Michael Kenary noted we don’t know when a traffic circle will be built, and our road infrastructure is lacking. If they have to widen the road, DOT will have to buy land, and if the land is re-zoned it will be more expensive. Chair Souza noted a developer for the other two corners was also at the Council meeting. Planner Byers said she told him we prefer conditional zoning.

Michael Kenary motioned to recommend denial of RZ-19-2. Deb Bledsoe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Board recommendation form will be updated to add Chuck Adams’ input.

b. Requirement for subdivisions to have two exit lanes

Discussion was held that a wider entrance road would help for safer turn-ins and especially for school buses and trucks.

The planner provided three options:

1. Leave the Subdivision Ordinance as is, and have discussions with developers during the sketch plan phase and at preliminary plat preparations stage, especially if a Traffic Impact Analysis is triggered,
2. Add Subdivision Ordinance language to require an additional right exit lane from any subdivision onto a major or minor thoroughfare, collector street, etc., and

3. Add language to the Subdivision Ordinance that would require subdivisions of a certain size to have an additional right exit turn lane.

One question is whether DOT would accept the road with the extra lane. Planner Byers noted DOT said it is not a bad idea. When we had talked to DOT a couple of years ago when they did not want to take over any more subdivision roads, they had said they did not want to take on maintenance for any more than the minimum DOT required amounts of pavement. After some discussion, Chuck Adams motioned to adopt option 2; Deb Bledsoe seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Text will be brought to the next meeting.

c. Conditional Zoning

Planner Byers spoke to our attorney about this, and he suggested it might be a property rights concern. Another option is to add a policy to our Future Land Use Plan to suggest conditional zoning is a goal. A local jurisdiction that does this has a conditional zone as their only non-residential zone, and request any re-zoning goes to that zone. To our knowledge, they have not been challenged on it. When we update the Land Use Plan we can add this, and the planner will also talk to the School of Government on the subject.

Dr. Byers posed six questions to the Board regarding development, and got their input.

1. Are you most concerned about the style of development, size, or the uses? Uses most important, and next size.
2. Do you want to have more or less flexibility on the uses allowed in each zone? Less flexibility was preferred.
3. Are you striving to create a more collaborative approach to planning in the Village? Yes.
4. Do you wish to have more unique non-residential areas in the Village? Examples are mixed use, and mixed commercial. Response - we are a bedroom community, we don't have a lot of land, and not in favor. A zone for tiny businesses with very little traffic was an idea.
5. Do you feel comfortable being flexible with any existing standards? Examples are an incentive to go through conditional zoning, such as density or setbacks. Responses ranged from no, to some flexibility when certain things arise, to possibly another zone for ma and pa type businesses.
6. How much oversight do you feel the Planning board should have with non-residential development? More oversight.

The Clerk mentioned the Downtown Committee Document that brought up some of these items and might be a source to review.

d. Table of Uses Review

The entire Table of Uses needs review, but first a text amendment was drafted to make the continuing care use in Office-Institutional consistent with the rest homes use. Michael Kenary motioned to approve the proposed text amendment to make Continuing Care facilities a

conditional use in Office Institutional, with the statement of reasonableness that it creates consistency between similar uses within the Table of Uses and the statement of consistency that it is consistent with the Future Land Use Plan as it established a process that regulates new non-residential zoned development, ensuring it is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhoods. Deb Bledsoe seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

e. Parking Requirements

The Planning Board wants to look at all non-residential parking standards. This will come back to the Board in a couple of months.

7. Old Business

a. Sign Ordinance Updates

Proposed text was discussed. In Section 156.161 Prohibited Signs, Chuck Adams preferred to change item G to prohibit any permanent sign that is an inflatable device. The text for item L Handwritten signs, was proposed to be deleted, but will be left in.

Sandra Ells motioned to approve the proposed sign text with the above two changes, and the statement of reasonableness that it removes confusing language and updates the Village's code to be consistent with a 2015 Supreme Court ruling on sign regulations, and the statement of consistency that it is consistent with the Future Land Use Plan as it addresses signs in every zoning district and seeks to maintain the strong single family low-density residential character of the Village, while also ensuring non-residential signs are attractive and in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. Michael Kenary seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

b. Tree Ordinance Updates

Council Member Fuller had asked for a quick amendment to remove tree save areas from individual lots. To do so we can add tree save areas to the suitability of land section. The Board wanted to see the written text before they vote on it.

8. Other Business

The Clerk was asked to send an email to the Board members from the Rules of Procedure that has the attendance requirements.

9. Adjourn

Chuck Adams motioned to adjourn, Deb Bledsoe seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting ended at approximately 9:30 pm.

2019.03.25 PB meeting minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Bennett, Clerk

Chairman John Souza