

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, May 2, 2017 7:00 p.m. Pender County Public Assembly Room 805 S. Walker Street, Burgaw, North Carolina

Call to Order: Chairman Williams called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call: Chairman Williams

Pender County Planning Board Members:

Williams: Fullerton: Baker: Carter: Jordan: McClammy: Nalee:

- 1. Adoption of the Agenda:** Board member Nalee made the motion to adopt the agenda as presented; seconded by Board member Carter. The vote was unanimous.
- 2. Adoption of the Minutes: (April 4, 2017)** Board member Carter made the motion to adopt the April 4, 2017 minutes as presented; seconded by Board member Jordan. The vote was unanimous.
- 3. Public Comment:** NONE

(Public Hearings Open)

4. Conditional Zoning Map Amendment:

Monkey Junction Mini Storage, applicant, on behalf of Pinnacle Property of Hampstead and Michael D. Hoover, owners, requested the approval of a Conditional Zoning Map Amendment for four (4) tracts totaling approximately 9.41 acres from PD, Planned Development zoning district to GB-CD2, General Business conditional zoning district 2. This request is to allow for multi-unit self-storage units (NAICS 531130). The subject properties are located along the west side of US HWY 17 approximately ± 2,500 feet to the north of the intersection of US HWY 17 and Sloop Point Loop Road (SR 1563) in the Topsail Township and may be further identified by Pender County PINs: 4204-76-8504-0000, 4204-86-1659-0000, 4204-77-7047-0000, and 4204-77-3088-0000. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item four (4), stating that staff is presenting the application to the Board for disposition on spatial separation and overall recommendation. Staff recommends that existing spatial separation between residential and nonresidential uses be utilized as a baseline for this decision or a combination of distance separation and increased buffering and recommends the following three (3) conditions: (1) All outdoor lighting shall be located in a manner that will not direct light on adjacent properties. (2) A C-2 Buffer containing a fifteen (15) foot wide strip with a six (6) foot high wood stockade, basket weave, or other solid wood fence and an evergreen hedge that will provide a continuous screen at least six (6) inches high within four (4) years and one (1) canopy tree, four (4) understory trees and a grass cover of at least ninety-eight (98) percent coverage (except within four (4) feet of the base of any tree), per one hundred (100) linear feet along the entire westernmost property line near building 'J'. (3) Architectural design standards for structures along US HWY 17 shall follow the submitted artistic rendering submitted by the applicant, as shown in Attachment four (4), containing a brick façade and two-story columns.

Robert Kenan, attorney for applicant, introduced himself and Trey McGirt to the Board.

Trey McGirt, applicant representative, gave a presentation to the Board, commenting that the location was a valuable option for self-storage, there was a large need for storage in convenient locations, the company already has existing facilities in two (2) other counties, and that the company takes pride in their design and landscaping. Mr. McGirt further explained that the plan adheres to the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance, there would be no access on Bay Ridge Road only an emergency exit. Mr. McGirt described and presented photographs of the plan and existing property, giving detailed information regarding the existing buffers and proposed buffers. Mr. McGirt stated that they believed the three hundred (300) feet separation was a poor baseline and explained why. Mr. McGirt stated that they hoped the Board would approved their request and could answer any questions.

Board member Nalee asked how tall the buildings would be, if there was a locked gate, and what would be the hours of operation, Mr. McGirt answered that the buildings would be single story and the typical height would be between ten (10) to twelve (12) feet, would be open seven (7) days a week and the automated gate would unlock at 6 am and lock at 10 pm. Brief discussion ensued regarding the lighting that would be mounted on the side of the buildings.

Chairman Williams asked if the size of the current retention pond be adequate and if the applicant generally paved all the drives Mr. McGirt stated the site had not been fully engineered, but according to his engineer the pond would be adequate and yes, generally all drives are paved. Brief discussion ensued regarding grub and guttering all landscape areas and the front of the site, development taking place in phases, so some paving would not be done until additional buildings were constructed, the primary access being in the front of the building off US HWY 17, and the architectural design. Chairman Williams asked Attorney Thurman for clarification on what conditions could be placed on architectural design, Attorney Thurman stated that if the Board agreed with what the applicant was offering then it could be an agreed upon condition.

Board member Jordan asked if the fences and buffers be built in phases; Mr. McGirt answered that they had not gotten that far in the plan, but fences would be around any developed areas, described the traffic pattern for developed areas, and stated that most likely all buffering would have to be completed in the beginning phase. Director Breuer added that fencing was a part of buffering requirements, so the fencing would have to be completed for final zoning approval.

Discussion continued regarding the traffic pattern of ingress and egress. Mr. McGirt stated that there would be two ways to enter and exit, Director Breuer commented that the one area on the site plan was labeled exit only, Mr. McGirt stated that they did have an updated site plan; Senior Planner Crowe stated that the plan presented was the most recent plan given to staff. Discussions continued regarding parking and the requirements being met.

Chairman Williams read the opening statement explaining the type of meeting being held and the process of the meeting.

James Burns, 220 Quarter Horse Lane, Hampstead, expressed concerns regarding the landscape buffer, stating that the existing landscape buffer is his and is located on his property, the second buffer that should be there was never put in place when the Second Wind gym was built, would like to see that buffer completed and enforced by the County prior to any other projects being done. Would like to have the current swell properly constructed because water flows onto the road causing swale damage. Mr. Burns also expressed concerns regarding the pond and stormwater permits, the

design for the emergency only exit, and the proposed height of the fence; Mr. Burns requested that the height of the fence be ten (10) feet.

Jim Verteramo, 575 Quarter Horse Lane, Hampstead, stated that his concerns were flood and traffic; felt the project would be an eyesore and was against the proposal.

Mr. McGirt responded that the water from the project would flow to the pond not the ditch, they would obtain all required stormwater permits from the state, his company did not build eyesores, and their proposal would have less traffic than any other kind of business that was approved for the location.

Chairman Williams closed the public hearing and opened the floor for the Board's discussion.

Board member Jordan asked for clarification on the location of the buffer between the applicant's property and the existing gym, Mr. McGirt pointed out the existing buffers.

Board member Carter stated that she was concerned with the maintenance of the road, if it was to wash out who would be responsible for repairing it. Chairman Williams stated that he wasn't sure what the agreement if any would be.

Board member Nalee stated that her concerns were that the setbacks were not sufficient for Rural Growth, twelve (12) foot high buildings, the proposed six (6) foot fence, should be a higher fence and lighting; would recommend a ten (10) foot fence along with landscape buffering and eliminating building "J".

Mr. McGirt responded that the lighting would not escape the project area, they are designed to shine down and inward, building "J" would be a buffer for light, a ten (10) foot fence wouldn't block the facility anymore then the building would be, and there is no definition as to what Rural Growth defines as separation. Mr. McGirt stated that they are willing to follow staff's recommendation of a fifteen (15) foot separation and a C2 buffer.

Board member Carter made the motion to approve the Conditional Zoning Map Amendment as presented with the following conditions: a fifteen (15) foot C2 buffer with a six (6) foot fence, no direct light on adjacent properties, and for the applicant to adhere to the Architectural designs presented; seconded by Board member Jordan. The vote was three (3) in favor of the motion with Board member Nalee opposing. The motion carried.

Chairman Williams called for a recess at 8:54 pm.

Chairman Williams called the meeting back to order at 9:04 pm.

5. Zoning Text Amendment:

Pender County, applicant, requested the approval of Zoning Text Amendments to the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance: Section 4.6.10 Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards, Section 5.3.2 Residential Uses, Section 7 Design Standards for; Sight Triangles (7.4.3), Waste Water System Requirements (7.7.1.B), a reorganization of Section 6.3 Major Site Development Plan Contents and Appendix D Surveyor and Engineer Forms. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item five (5).

Chairman Williams asked if the items listed under section 4.6.10 applied to residential or commercial, Senior Planner answered mostly residential uses but, applied to both. Brief discussion ensued regarding the proposed language for 4.6.10 A. 19. (attachment 1 of the staff report), it was recommended to add the word residential.

Board member Nalee asked if the meeting would be much longer may she be excused, Chairman Williams stated that the meeting would only last a few more minutes.

Board member Carter made the motion to approve the Zoning Text Amendment as presented with the recommended text change to 4.6.10 A. 19. (attachment 1 of the staff report); seconded by Board member Nalee. The vote was unanimous.

(Public Hearings Closed)

6. Discussion Items:

a. Planning Staff Items:

- i. Density: Senior Planner Crowe reviewed the memo provided to the Board and stated that if the Board would like a work session could be scheduled with the Zoning Text Amendment subcommittee to work on language and standards for the amendment. It was the Board's desire to have a work session, Senior Planner Crowe stated that she would notify the Board of the date and time.
- ii. Comprehensive Plan Update: Director Breuer reviewed the memo provided to the Board stating that the department was holding area meetings throughout the County tailored to the specific area and that they had received almost eight hundred (800) survey responses

Board member Nalee was excused at 9:13 pm.

- iii. TRC Update: Senior Planner Crowe gave a brief TRC update and invited the Board to attend the meetings.

b. Planning Board Members Items: None

c. Announcements: None

7. Next Meeting: June 6, 2017, Work Session at 6:00 pm.

8. Adjournment: Board member Carter made the motion to adjourn at 9:15 pm; seconded by Board member Jordan. The vote was unanimous.

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