

Pender County Planning and Community Development

Planning Division

805 S. Walker Street
PO Box 1519
Burgaw, NC 28425



Phone: 910-259-1202
Fax: 910-259-1295
www.pendercountync.gov

MINUTES

Pender County Planning Board Meeting Tuesday, November 1, 2016 7:00 p.m. Pender County Public Meeting Room 805 S. Walker Street, Burgaw, North Carolina

Call to Order: Chairman Williams called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm

Roll Call: Chairman Williams

Pender County Planning Board Members:

Williams: Fullerton: Baker: Carter: Edens: McClammy: Nalee:

- 1. Adoption of the Agenda:** Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to adopt the agenda as presented; seconded by Board member Edens. The vote was unanimous.
- 2. Adoption of the Minutes: (October 4, 2016 Meeting and October 18, 2016 Special Meeting)** Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to adopt the October 4, 2016 minutes as presented; seconded by Board member Carter. The vote to approve the October 4, 2016 minutes was four (4) in favor with Board member Baker abstaining from the vote due to his absence. Board member Edens made the motion to adopt the October 18, 2016 minutes as presented; seconded by Vice-Chairman Fullerton. The vote to approve the October 18, 2016 minutes was four (4) in favor with Board member Baker abstaining from the vote due to his absence.
- 3. Public Comment:** None

(Public Hearings Open)

4. Zoning Text Amendment:

D. Logan, applicant, requested a Zoning Text Amendment to the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance, Section 4.7.3 RM: Residential Mixed zoning district requirements and Section 4.8.1 PD: Planned Development District zoning requirements. Specifically, the amendment proposed is to increase the allowable density on multi-family projects, and to provide clear standards for multi-family developments. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item four (4). Senior Planner Crowe explained that staff had provided the Board with an updated packet at the beginning of the meeting that included additional policies from the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which may be relevant to the case. Senior Planner Crowe gave a detailed presentation of how density is currently calculated for the Planned Development (PD) and Residential Mixed (RM) zoning districts, stating that the Unified Development Ordinance allows a maximum of five (5) units per acre and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan allows a maximum of eight (8) units per acre in certain areas and explained that staff had been working with the applicant to determine standards that would allow an increase to density based on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Senior Planner Crowe gave a detailed review of the applicant's proposed method of how to calculate density and the proposed eighteen (18) standards for allowing a density increase, with the maximum of eight (8) units per acre, if five (5) of the standards were met. Senior Planner Crowe stated that staff had

reviewed the proposed standards and only could recommend nine (9) of the standards, which are supported by the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, would have to be met for an approval of density increase. Senior Planner Crowe concluded the presentation by stating that staff did not make a formal recommendation, they have worked with the applicant on their request and now needed a consensus from the Board before moving forward with a formal action.

Board member Baker – Asked staff to consider adding page numbers on all documents included in the Board’s packets and made recommendations on how criteria for density should be written and defined; Senior Planner Crowe responded that staff would work with the Board on wordsmithing but, at this time staff needed feedback on the content.

Board member Edens – Asked if staff was recommending removing Collector Streets from the density calculation; Senior Planner Crowe answered yes and the recommendation was based on a policy in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the transportation goals of the Pender County Collector Street Plan.

Director Breuer – Explained that there was a multitude of options before the Board, the Board could recommend simply changing the units per acre from five (5) to eight (8) or reform the density calculation and create standards for increased density; at this point staff needed direction from the Board not a recommendation.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton – Stated that the decimal in the packets was different then what was in the presentation, that the correct decimal should be 0.375 as written in the packet; that an increase of eight (8) units would be a sixty (60) percent increase which would be excessive, would prefer a cap of fifty (50) percent increase; would recommend using five (5) percent increments; the focus should be on superior design, the applicants did a good job beginning the process, maybe the Board could work with staff to prioritize the nine (9) criteria presented by staff and not calculate all items the same.

Chairman Williams – Gave a brief history of how the calculation of density came to be and stated that he believed the issue would be resolved once the update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan was completed.

D Logan, applicant, stated that his intent was to have an open discussion to address density, how it is calculated and how to obtain an increase; the current ordinance is very complicated. Mr. Logan gave an example of how he believed the Zoning Districts should exist in the County, stating that the current ordinance is not functional for the growth that is coming to Pender County. Mr. Logan praised staff for all of their hard work.

Allison Engebretson, Paramounte Engineering, explained that the request was to address density in two (2) ways, first being to modify the way density is calculated and second creating standards that would allow a density bonus. Ms. Engebretson gave a detailed review of the applicant’s proposed method of calculation and criteria for density bonus, stating that the applicant’s proposal allowed more flexibility for landowners and that there was no parcel in Pender County that could meet the requirements for a density bonus based on staff’s proposal.

Chairman Williams – Commented that he believed the intent of the current method of calculating density in a Planned Development (PD) zoning district was that the total amount of units would not include residential and commercial, the commercial units would be excluded. Brief discussion ensued regarding what type of areas should be excluded from the density calculation, such as amenity centers; which the Board felt amenity centers etc. should be included. Chairman Williams suggested

tabling the request; Senior Planner Crowe stated that staff would need some direction from the Board in order to prepare material for the Board's recommendation.

Tim Clinkscales, Paramounte Engineering, commented that a text amendment was needed for the interim to address density while waiting for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan update.

Chairman Williams – Suggested that the Zoning Text Amendment Sub-Committee, Board members, staff, and applicant meet to discuss the proposals and create an amendment that would capture the needs of the County and the development community.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to table the requested Zoning Text Amendment to allow staff time to work with the applicant and the Zoning Text Amendment Subcommittee to create new language based on of the Board's comments and discussions; seconded by Board member Carter. The vote was unanimous.

Chairman Williams called for a recess at 9:01 pm.

Chairman Williams called the meeting back to order at 9:10 pm.

5. Zoning Text/Plan Amendment: (*Agenda item 6 was included with Agenda item 5*)

Pender County, applicant requested a Zoning Text Amendment to the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance Section 7: Design Standards and Appendix A: Definitions. Specifically, the amendment proposed is to amend the access standards related to subdivisions on collector streets, add alternative design street standards and associated definitions and an amendment to the Pender County Collector Street Plan which was adopted on March 21, 2016. Specifically, the amendment proposed is to add an additional map, demonstrating a hierarchy of proposed and existing collector streets within the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) planning boundary in Pender County. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda items five (5) and six (6); stating that the Board would have to make two (2) separate motions.

Marge Ulcickas, 102 Soundview Dr., Hampstead, stated that she had a concern regarding the Collector Streets and the existing developments. Ms. Ulcickas asked if there would be some consideration as to the character of the existing development verses the new development connecting to it via a collector street; was there flexibility in the plan to address that concern; Director Breuer answered that the goal of the plan was to promote connectivity.

Houston Mearns, 301 Pelican Walk, Hampstead, stated that he was in favor of the Zoning Text and Plan amendments.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to approve the requested Zoning Text Amendment as presented; seconded by Board member Edens. The vote was unanimous. Vice-Chairman Fullerton thanked the staff, public and board for all of their hard work.

Board member Edens made the motion to approve the requested Plan Amendment as presented; seconded by Board member Carter. The vote was unanimous. Chairman Williams thanked the staff, public and board for all of their hard work.

6. Plan Amendment: (*Agenda item 6 was presented with Agenda item 5*)

(Public Hearings Closed)

7. Discussion Items:

a. Planning Staff Items:

- i. Bike/Ped Prioritization: Senior Planner Crowe gave a brief overview of the memo included in the Board's packet and stated that staff would be coming to the Board for assistance and direction on ranking the projects.
- ii. TRC Update: While at the podium, Senior Planner Crowe switched the order of the agenda and gave a brief overview of the memo included in the Board's packet stating that there were no cases for TRC review in October and there would be one (1) case for the November meeting.
- iii. Comprehensive Plan: Director Breuer gave a brief overview of the memo included in the Board's packet; highlighting staff's initiated Public Outreach Plan.
- iv. Announcements: Director Breuer announced that Planner Fiester had taken a position in Onslow County.

b. Planning Board Members Items:

Chairman Williams thanked the Board members and staff that attended the subdivision training, stating that it was very helpful and interesting. Director Breuer commented that it is great to be able to provide training opportunities to the Board.

8. Next Meeting: December 6, 2016, Work Session at 6:00 pm

9. Adjournment: 9:52 pm

The entire recording of the Planning Board Meeting is on file with the permanent records in the Planning Department office.