

**Draft
Smithfield Planning Board Minutes
Thursday, November 1, 2018
6:00 P.M., Town Hall, Council Chambers**

Members Present:

Chairman Stephen Upton
Vice Chairman Mark Lane
Oliver Johnson
Ashley Spain
Leslie Lazarus
Alisa Bizzell

Members Absent:

Teresa Daughtry
Michael Johnson

Staff Present:

Stephen Wensman, Planning Director
Mark Helmer, Senior Planner
Julie Edmonds, Administrative Support Specialist

Staff Absent:

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Stephen Upton recognized the two absent members. He told the two new board members they would be sworn in tonight. Mr. Upton told Ms. Bizzell being an alternate you will be able to vote when in-town members are present. However when they are present you can speak or give your opinion but will not be able to vote as an alternate.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mark Lane made a motion, seconded by Ashley Spain. Unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES from October 4, 2018

Oliver Johnson made mention that Michael Taylor was counted present and it should have read Michael Johnson. Mark Lane made a motion, seconded by Oliver Johnson, to approve the minutes as written. Unanimously approved

NEW MEMBERS SWORN IN

Stephen Upton swore Mark Lane in as Vice Chair.
Mark Lane swore in Stephen Upton as Chairman
Stephen Upton swore in Leslie Lazarus
Stephen Upton swore in Alisa Bizzell

SUB COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Upton stated in the past he asked Oliver Johnson, Michael Johnson and Mark Lane to serve on the UDO Sub Committee. He made the recommendation and all three members have accepted to serve. Mr. Upton asked for a nomination of the three person board. Ashley Spain made a nomination, seconded by Leslie Lazarus. Unanimously approved

Mr. Upton told new members Leslie Lazarus and Alisa Bizzell to browse through the UDO in their free time and try to become acquainted with it. If they have any questions at all, please feel free to ask. Mr. Upton also reminded everyone to please speak into the microphone when talking so it would be easier for the administrative assistant to understand the minutes later.

BOARD MEMBERS RECOGNIZED

Mr. Upton asked each board member to go around and state their name.

NEW BUSINESS

S-18-01 East River: Sam's Branch Development is requesting a preliminary plat for East River Subdivision. It is a 298 to 315 proposed residential PUD (Planned Unit Development) on 67.8 acres. The number range is due to future development not in phase 1 or phase 2, but later on they may change out some single family homes for townhouses. Therefore we don't know yet if it will be a 298 or 315 lot subdivision. The subdivision is located near Booker Dairy and Buffalo Road, just to the North on the river. The property was zoned PUD last year from R-8. It was rezoned with a master plan. A PUD is a Planned Unit Development. It is a district that creates its own regulations based on the plan. It's in the watershed district as well, so there are regulations related to protecting the watershed that need to be complied with as they develop. It will be in the Town of Smithfield's fire district and will add more students to area schools. The developer has proposed public trails that will be privately maintained. There will be trails within public access easements. There is no park dedication of land. They have to provide park land if the Town designates the need for it in that area or give the Town equal amount of money in lieu of the land for park dedication. At the time of final plat they will pay a fee in lieu of park land dedication. They are requesting annexation and that will be required before final plat. They will be on Town water and sewer. The properties surrounding this site to the North are R20-A residential agricultural zoning, right now it is farm land. To the South it is the same, there is some B-3 zoning on the East side of the road that touches the State Employees Credit Union. To the East is vacant R-10 single family residential zoning. Then the West is the river and more R-20A. This was the master plan that was approved last year with 7 conditions. Essentially the plan creates the rules. It has to develop according to this plan or significantly similar to this plan. From the master plan, a traffic impact study was required and they have done that. They will be voluntarily annexing before final plat. They have applied for a right-of-way permit for access onto Buffalo Road. They will not be providing single-family attached units in the first or second phase.

Mr. Upton suggested that any board member ask questions on certain phases as they arise and not wait too long or they may forget and miss the opportunity.

Mr. Upton asked Mr. Wensman if the traffic impact study he mentioned earlier was approved by DOT.

Mr. Wensman said yes, DOT is going to be constructing the road improvements. They needed the impact study to form their design.

Mr. Upton asked if the Planning Department was ok with what DOT presents.

Mr. Wensman said DOT will show us the plans and he imagines they will have some input if there are any problems that they see. They are building it according to their needs and the needs identified in the traffic impact study.

Mr. Lane asked how far apart roads had to be to have a stoplight.

Mr. Wensman said he thought they had to be 660 feet apart.

Mr. Wensman showed product types of the single family homes. He said they're the only type proposed in the first phase of construction. The triplexes are proposed later on if the market pushes in that direction. They are not shown on any place in the plan right now. Town Council's condition was they couldn't show up in phase one or two. They didn't want them near the entrances. The attached row houses would be located on the far northeast section of the property and one of the last phases of the development. Earlier he mentioned watershed rules, the Neuse River and Blue line Stream are on the South edge of the site. They will require buffering. There is an increase in the buffer from 50 foot to 100 foot because of the watershed district. The developer is proposing a greenway trail on the Neuse River and they will provide easements for that. As an alternate, they will also show a trail along the frontages of Buffalo Rd. If the Greenway Trail never comes up to this property from the South, the Greenway alternate site will be along Buffalo Rd. He briefly touched the watershed rules. He went over them in more detail in the master planning process. The applicant has provided the required open space for the required watershed district regulations and the cluster regulations. Under the Cluster regulations, lot size cannot be less than 4,800 sq. ft. (60% of 8,000) (UDO Section 7.34.4.1). Many of the lots are less than 4,800 sq. ft. in size: Single-family Detached – 3,145 sq. ft. Single family attached (tri-plex) units – 2,000 sq. ft. Townhome units – 1,400 sq. ft.

The Council approved this deviation from the cluster provisions with the approval of the PUD master plan. Minimum lot width and lot frontage cannot be less than 40 feet. Many of the lots are less than 40 feet wide (UDO Section 7.34.4.2) (UDO Section 7.34.4.3): Single-family detached – 37 ft. Single family attached (tri-plex) units – 25 ft. Townhome units – 17.5 ft. The Council approved this deviation from the cluster provisions with the approval of the PUD master plan. The side yard setbacks cannot be less than 6 feet.

Mark Lane asked if the Planning Staff was ok with Town Councils approval of the above mentioned deviations.

Mr. Wensman said if you recall staff had a few more conditions of approval than were ultimately approved on the master plan. So some of staff's requirements did disappear. One was lateral connections to adjacent properties. The PUD required more roads, smaller blocks and more intensive road network. Staff had put in a condition requiring instead of the center trail, that it be a road consistent with the PUD ordinance. The Town Council deleted that condition.

Mr. Upton said so the Planning Department recommended and advised the Town Council on some of these subjects we are discussing.

Mr. Wensman said some of the recommendations to remove them came from the Planning Board such as the lateral connections.

The subdivision shows a mix of 50 foot and 60 foot wide public R/W. The outer loop road on the west side of the development is shown as a 60 foot R/W, whereas, the remainder of the R/W is proposed to be 50 feet wide. The streets appear to be 24' wide with mountable valley curb. The Town standard is not mountable valley curb; it's a B-612 type curb. The Town approved the valley curb through the PUD process. The west side of the subdivision consists of three long streets running in a north-south direction and two running east-west from the intersections on Buffalo Road. There are two cul-de-sacs, one identified in the first phase of the development and another in the sixth phase. The east side of the subdivision consists of a

looped road surrounding an open green space and a private road leading to the row-type single-family attached townhouses.

Sidewalks are shown on both sides of each street throughout the development. The UDO only requires sidewalks on one side. Sidewalks are required along Buffalo Road; however the developer is proposing a 10' trail rather than a sidewalk that weaves in and out of the Buffalo Road right-of-way along both frontages. Sidewalk crosswalks are shown as being striped for pedestrian safety throughout the development.

Mr. Lane asked if the trails just mentioned are on the map.

Mr. Wensman answered yes they are.

Mr. Lane asked if the trails were indicated using the green line.

Mr. Spain asked if there would be room later on to create uniformity for another developer.

Mr. Wensman said he wasn't sure.

The preliminary plat shows private and public trails. The public trails parallel the Neuse River in open space, and along both sides of Buffalo Road. There is also a trail running perpendicular to Buffalo Road connecting the Neuse River Trail to the Buffalo Road trail through the center of the development. The plan is configured such that either the trail along the Neuse River or Buffalo road can be designated as the Mountains to Sea Greenway.

Mr. Lane said so they will have a public trail going through the middle of their development.

Mr. Wensman answered yes.

The preliminary plat shows the public trail along the Neuse River as accessing the Street D cul de-sac, then continuing as a shared sewer pump station access road. Public Utilities, Parks and Recreation and the Planning Department are uncomfortable with this configuration because utility trucks will block the greenway when maintaining lift station and because the configuration invites pedestrians, bikes and strollers to pump station which is a security risk and uninviting as a trail feature. The public trail along the Neuse River does not extend to the north and south boundaries of the site, however, a public trail easement does. If in the future the Mountains to Sea Trail reach this development, the missing trail segments can be constructed at that time within the provided public trail easements. The trail easement on the South will cross a blue line stream and associated buffer area. The trail easement on the north side will cross a Piedmont Natural Gas easement which will require a permit from the gas company prior to constructing the trail segment. The developer is proposing that these trails would be public, but maintained by the HOA.

Trail street crossings are shown as being striped for pedestrian safety throughout the development.

Trails in the Right of Way of Buffalo Road will require an NCDOT permit.

Mr. Lane asked how accurate the 100 year flood plain line is.

Mr. Helmer said it is very accurate, it uses fresh data and the technology is better than it has ever been.

Mr. Lane said the cul-de-sac in Phase 6, brings concerns to him. There's one lot on the flood plain line.

Mr. Helmer said the Town of Smithfield doesn't have a policy saying you can't have a lot in the 100 year flood plain. It just says if you build in a flood plain you have to elevate in accordance with the Flood Plain Prevention Ordinance.

Mr. Wensman said The PUD narrative mentions the development of pocket parks within the common open space. The proposed pocket parks are shown as long green strips between rows of homes. The developer indicates that the pocket parks will include paved pedestrian trails and attractive landscaping that may be used for soccer, football, cornhole, horseshoes, fire pits and cook outs.

Mr. Wensman said the applicant will be modifying the existing pond by the river in Phase 2, instead of previous proposal during Phase 3. They will have to execute an operations and maintenance agreement for that pond area so the HOA is responsible for the pond.

There are no specific landscaping standards for residential development. No landscape plan has been provided. The master plans shows very conceptually, that landscaping will be provided within the common open space. The master plan indicates the development will include a +/- 50' perimeter landscaped Type A buffer. The road section details show street trees in the R/W. Street trees are not permitted over utility lines and any trees in the public right of way will be the responsibility of the HOA for maintenance, removal or replacement. Trees are not permitted within the PSNC gas line easement along the north edge of the development.

Mr. Lane said well we are not concerned with that tonight because there are no landscaping standards.

Single family residential requires 2 parking stalls per unit. This requirement will easily be accommodated with the garages and driveways. The issue really becomes when you have 37 foot wide lots and a driveway, that is a pretty high frequency of driveways to street frontage and there's really not a lot of front street parking. You have 24 foot wide streets, very little street parking and minimal driveway parking. There is no overflow parking throughout this entire development. I have been told by the former planner in Clayton it has been an issue in similar developments of his. If this is the plan we approve the Town Council will need to designate one side of the street as no parking so emergency vehicles can gain access.

Mr. Lane asked if this was already in the master plan.

Mr. Wensman answered yes it is.

Mr. Lane asked Mr. Wensman what were the recommendations regarding parking.

Mr. Wensman stated it meets all the Town's standards. There isn't a lot that staff can do.

Mr. Upton asked who can do something about it.

Mr. Wensman said we can always change our standards, we could require overflow parking or park somewhere in a development. As a PUD you can often negotiate in that type of situation.

Mr. Upton said well you have been forewarned by a former Planner in Clayton.

Mr. Wensman said we took pictures of the development as well and shared with the Town Council.

Mr. Upton said so you're proceeding with improvements.

Mr. Wensman said yes, it is just something the Town will have to deal with moving forward.

Mr. Lane asked, when you say standards can be changed, is that something that can be changed in the UDO.

Mr. Wensman said yeah between the UDO and the Engineering Standards.

Mr. Spain asked how long on the UDO though, you're talking about a huge outlay that is supposed to already be fixed so to speak.

Mr. Wensman said he anticipates the Town Council to come back and limit parking to one side of the street and address the emergency services issues. People will complain about parking, but they are buying into this development so it is what it is.

Mr. Spain asked who would enforce the parking issue when the time comes.

Mr. Wensman said the Town of Smithfield

Mr. Upton asked how you recommend something when there isn't a lot you can do about it.

Mr. Lane stated this should have been thought about when the UDO was last updated.

Mr. Wensman said to be fair, we haven't had this type of development before. The trend now is smaller lots and bigger houses so this is a new type of development we have to deal with. The multi-family dwellings require 1.5 spaces per 1 bedroom units, 1.75 spaces per unit for 2 bedroom units, and 2 spaces for 3 or more bedroom units. The 30 townhomes shown in phases 8 and 9 have 55 parking stalls. The exact number of bedrooms in each unit is unknown. Parking requirements will be determined when the townhomes are proposed for construction. Throughout the development overflow parking for guests will be limited given the narrow lots and frequency of driveways.

Mr. Spain asked how we would do anything about the lack of parking to accommodate the number of homes.

Mr. Wensman said as the developer comes in with the individual phases, we will address the issue of parking at that time.

Mr. Spain asked if there is a mechanism to change it.

Mr. Wensman said yes minor changes, we can't require but we can encourage the change.

Mr. Upton asked if the Planning Board would have to recommend that change.

Mr. Wensman said no.

Mr. Upton said it's hard for this board to recommend something that we know isn't right.

Mr. Spain said if we have to approve something with no way to change it, then why approve it?

Mr. Lane said however it meets the UDO and we don't have a leg to stand on.

Mr. Wensman said I think a general condition could be added that the developer should look for opportunities for overflow parking throughout the whole development in each phase. It's a suggestion but I think it is as good as we can do with this phase.

Mr. Upton asked that Mrs. Edmonds, Planning Department Administrative Assistant, make note in her minutes to the Town Council Planning Board's concern on this issue.

Mr. Wensman said at the end, the board can make a recommended condition for approval.

The developer proposes to construct the subdivision over 9 phases (approximately 40 units per phase), one phase per year depending on the market. The approximate phase lines were shown on the approved master plan but are subject to change based on market conditions. As proposed, the replacement of single family detached units with single family attached will also be with each phase and depend on the market with the restriction that no townhome units be constructed within phase 1 or 2. The necessary infrastructure is proposed to be constructed as needed for each phase and designed for build-out.

Mr. Wensman said the developer proposes to construct the subdivision over 9 phases (approximately 40 units per phase), one phase per year depending on the market. The approximate phase lines were shown on the approved master plan but are subject to change based on market conditions. As proposed, the replacement of single family detached units with single family attached will also be with each phase depending on the market with the restriction that no townhome units be constructed within phase 1 or 2. The necessary infrastructure is proposed to be constructed as needed for each phase and designed for build-out.

Mr. Oliver Johnson stated they stress no townhomes in phases 1 and 2 but it is his assumption they will have tri-plexes and rowhomes and Phases 1 and 2.

Mr. Wensman said no

Mr. Oliver Johnson said the language and the phasing section, stresses townhomes and doesn't say anything about triplexes or rowhomes.

Mr. Wensman said they are specifically not allowed in Phase 1 and 2. We don't want Townhouses loaded up against our entrance.

Mr. Oliver Johnson said he understands that, the language was specific on townhouses but not triplexes.

Mr. Wensman said if you look at their detail they are calling their triplexes townhomes.

Mr. Oliver Johnson said it was mentioned the inclusion of townhomes would be determined by market conditions. That seems to be a nebulous term that they would determine market conditions.

Mr. Wensman said if the single family home market goes down and the Townhouse market comes back up, they will build more townhomes than single family homes. One of staff's original concerns is showing where that would be done. The location of those will matter. The cul-de-sac is a great place for townhomes because it is segregated off. Then again that might be their prime lots because of the open space back there. We did not get the Town Council or the developer to come forth with alternate plans for townhomes. I wanted an alternate plan. What would happen if you decided to go that way, but we didn't get that?

Mr. Upton asked are you going to get it.

Mr. Wensman said we will get it per phase and negotiate at that point whether it works or not.

Mr. Oliver Johnson stated it seems they would want to retain that information as long as they can. It seems like they want single homes at that location and load up at the back with townhomes.

Mr. Wensman said they have limited it to a number though, so we do have a maximum number. It can't all be townhomes; it can only be 76 additional units in the end. They haven't committed to having all townhomes and the city isn't going to allow it.

Mr. Lane said so Phase 1 and 2 will not have any townhomes.

Mr. Wensman said correct, they will not.

Mr. Lane said no matter what the market says.

Mr. Wensman said that's right, which was a condition of approval. Staff was asking for an alternate plan so we knew where those townhomes would go in the future if the market dictates. However staff was overruled on that one.

Mr. Wensman said the development will be a maintenance free development with the HOA responsible for maintenance of yards and shared open space and amenities. Submittal of deed restrictions and covenants will be required with this development. It'll address a statement of compliance with state, local and federal regulations. Also, operation and maintenance of shared open space, amenities and stormwater management facilities. These documents have not been provided as required. They will require Town Attorney review prior to recordation.

They have shown subdivision signs at all three entrances to the subdivision. Those will require separate approval. We do like them shown on the plans so we know what is being proposed.

Mr. Wensman stated the Planning Department recommends approval of the preliminary plat for the East River PUD subdivision with the following conditions:

- 1) That the final plat be contingent on the execution of an annexation agreement with the Town of Smithfield.
- 2) That the developer obtains a NCDOT Right-of-Way Permit for the street access onto Buffalo Road prior to construction approval.
- 3) That the developers dedicate additional right-of-way for Buffalo Road as required by NCDOT.

4) That Homeowners Association deed restrictions and covenants will be submitted for Town Attorney review to address among other items, a statement of compliance with state local and federal regulations, and operation and maintenance of shared open space, amenities and stormwater management facilities. These documents will require Town Attorney approval prior to recordation.

5) That there are no attached single family residential units within phases 1 or 2 as identified on the approved master plan phasing plan.

6) That a park dedication fee in lieu of parkland be paid prior to recording the final plat approval of each phase of the development consistent with Article 10, Section 10.112.8.

7) That the public trail is constructed and easements be dedicated for trails adjacent to each phase with the final plat of that phase consistent with the preliminary plat.

8) That the public trail in the cul-de-sac of Street D be modified such that it is independent of the sanitary sewer pump station access way.

9) The utilities shall be designed such that that extension can be made conveniently and without undue burden or expense to serve future adjacent development.

If the Planning Board wishes they can add another condition such that the developers provide overflow parking for each phase of the development. That would at least give them your request. We will have to work with them as a staff and fit it in somewhere.

Mr. Upton said at least the board can bring it to their attention. This board use to be different. Now it's just recommendations to the Town Council. We do spend our time and efforts to do right. I would like to thank the Planning Department for bringing all these things to our attention so we can digest some and give conversation. Personally, I would like to see these conditions brought to their attention. As Mr. Wensman said I still would like it in print and show we gave it thought.

Mr. Lane asked if Mr. Wensman felt good about the trail going into the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Wensman said no, but we had a staff review with the Town Manager and some compromises were made. Originally my request was it would avoid the cul-de-sac, pump station and blue line stream because the Town will have to bare that expense. Utilities want it away from the lift station. I don't think it is good for a trail to go through a cul-de-sac. That is a change from the master plan.

Mr. Lane said if that happens and the greenway does connect, that could bring a good number of people through there. I cut the greenway and know at times it can be busy. I wouldn't want it going through my front yard.

Mr. Wensman thinks it is reasonable for the Planning Board to make a recommendation.

Mr. Lane asked where it could go.

Mr. Wensman said they would have to lose some lots.

Mr. Lane said the lot where the 100 year flood plain is, doesn't need to be there.

Mrs. Lazarus thinks they will have issues selling the homes once buyers find out or see the trail going through their yards; they will not want to be there for safety reasons.

Mr. Spain said if someone walks through your yard and trips that would be a problem.

Mr. Lane said I don't care where it goes as long as it isn't in the cul-de-sac. If that means losing lots then so be it.

Mr. Upton said this is a good and smart board. They pick cases apart and I commend them for that. It is hard for the board to sit and study and make recommendations and not be able to have the final say.

Mr. Spain asked if there is a mechanism to stop that from happening.

Mr. Wensman said here's the masterplan with 7 conditions and it went around the cul-de-sac in the masterplan. When they found out it didn't work they placed it through the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Upton asked why it didn't work.

Mr. Wensman said they ran out of space. So a strong recommendation from the Planning Board to the Town Council that as a board you are not ok with the greenway trail going through the cul-de-sac. Staff had concerns about it going in front of the lift station as well.

Mr. Lane said so this wasn't on the master plan. It hasn't been approved.

Mr. Wensman said correct

Mr. Spain said we can make our recommendation but can Town Council go with our recommendation and say no.

Mr. Wensman said Council can do what they want, but it puts more pressure on Council to follow staff and Planning Board recommendations

Mr. Spain said if it is allowed within the UDO is there still that mechanism there.

Mr. Wensman said the UDO doesn't talk about how a trail interfaces with a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Lane said we just need to put a condition on it that it needs to go around the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Wensman said ok what I am hearing as a recommendation for parking would be that the developer work with staff to identify overflow parking spaces with each phase of development as possible.

Mr. Spain said I would like it added that parking be allowed only on one side of the street.

Mr. Wensman said that is a separate thing that Town Council would have to do. It's an ordinance issue. I would do it after your motion for the preliminary plat, it's a separate item. It's a future action the Council would have to make.

Mr. Lane said this will not take place at the next Council meeting, this will possibly be years down the road.

Mr. Wensman said correct.

Mr. Spain said when this thing goes through and phasing starts, there is no mechanism on parking now. You can park anywhere you want. What will happen if emergency vehicles need to get through those streets?

Mr. Wensman said if the Fire Chief notices there is an issue, it will come to a staff level, then to the Town Manager level, to the Mayor and then a discussion on a no parking ordinance. As a side recommendation after the preliminary plat, this will get the Council thinking about it and know that you're aware of it. It also lets the developer know, as they sell this development there's likely going to be one side of the street parking.

Mr. Lane said he wanted the developer to be held accountable as well.

Mr. Upton asked if that could be part of the condition.

Mr. Wensman said I don't think you can because it is a separate action required by the Town Council not the developer.

Mr. Spain asked if all these perceived problems down the road were known at the onset of this project, why they weren't addressed then.

Mr. Lane said because it meets UDO requirements.

Mr. Wensman said staff probably didn't highlight it, as strongly as we have now. We have more details about the development and it's a little clearer about what's happening. I did not make it an issue at the master plan level because I was looking at larger issues. But now we are getting more into it. It has become very obvious to me we have narrow lots and looking at how the driveways will be laid out, it's going to be tight.

Mr. Upton asked Mr. Wensman if he would be attending the Town Council meeting.

Mr. Wensman said yes.

Mr. Upton asked if he would be presenting this to them.

Mr. Wensman said yes, this presentation will be updated and presented back to them with the board's additional recommendations.

Ms. Bizzell asked if there would be houses on both sides of the street.

Mr. Wensman said yes

Ms. Bizzell said ok well as a homeowner I would have to deal with people parking in front of my house that I don't even know. An example is on Martin Luther King Drive my mom has visitors but they can't park in front of her house. Others are parked there, yet visiting several houses away. Not having adequate parking could really become a problem.

Mr. Lane asked if Council could take action or do they have to wait until there is a problem.

Mr. Wensman said for the parking ordinance, yes.

Mr. Wensman said the other condition concerning the trail should say that the developer reroute the trail outside of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Upton said I am looking at the master plan, I am curious if the adjacent property owners have contacted you about this development.

Mr. Wensman said no, they haven't contacted me.

Oliver Johnson made a motion to adopt staff's recommendations with two conditions as presented, seconded by Ashley Spain. Unanimously Approved.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS REPORT

Mr. Helmer came forward to discuss the site plans currently in review.

SP-18-10 Dupree Strip Center is on East Market Street between Dogwood and Pine Street. The general purpose is for retail space and the developer also wants to include a restaurant in this strip center as well.

Mr. Wensman said he wanted to point out two issues staff has been dealing with. One is patio space; we don't have standards for parking for patio seating. It should be part of the overall seating for the entire restaurant.

Mr. Helmer said our parking standards changed with this current version of the UDO. We use to have restaurant parking based on the number of seating whether outdoor or indoor. The new ordinance is based on gross square footage of the space and doesn't really deal with the number of seats in the restaurant. Staff is working with the developer to make sure there is adequate parking.

Mr. Wensman said another issue with this particular site plan is dedicated dumpster driveways. Loading and unloading for every other use is internal to the site and I've made the decision that dumpsters are no different. But we don't have a specific requirement that prohibits a separate driveway for a dumpster. First we said we didn't want them backing up into the right of way. The developer is aware of this concern.

Mr. Helmer stated the positive things on the site plan are the developer will provide a solid visual screen from these adjacent properties, as well as sidewalks all the way around.

SP-18-11 O'Reilly Auto Parts Expansion This project was administratively approved some years back. They now want to expand their existing location. Originally they subdivided the front portion out, leaving a land locked tract in the rear and a strip of lot to access the land locked parcel. The tenant that did live here and sold the properties passed away. O'Reilly's will be adding a substantial amount of square footage to the rear of the structure where the existing storm pond is. They will remove the storm pond and relocate it behind the new addition. They will add additional parking and reconfigure the dumpster screening.

SP-18-13 Frank Lee Warehouse Complex will be located at the corner lot of Wal-Pat and Brogden Road. It was rezoned a few months back from B-3 to Heavy Industrial. The plan shows 7 warehouses and 3 proposed driveways. They're showing compliance with Town standards that states, all of the paved areas in front of the warehouse need to be paved. They have a preliminary storm water plan.

Mr. Wensman wanted to point out the rear loading areas of this project would be all gravel.

Old Business

There was none

Adjournment

Being no further business, Ashley Spain made a motion seconded by Mark Lane to adjourn the meeting. Unanimous approved.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Julie Edmonds". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Julie Edmonds
Administrative Assistant