

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, August 1, 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 and read the opening statement explaining the type of meeting being held and the process of the meeting.

Roll Call: Chairman Williams

Pender County Planning Board Members:

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

Chairman Williams stated that Board member Carter was absent due to the passing of her father and asked that all keep her and her family in their thoughts and prayers.

- 1. Adoption of the Agenda:** Director Breuer stated that agenda items eight (8) and nine (9) were labeled as Zoning Map Amendments which was incorrect, the items were Zoning Text Amendments. Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to adopt the agenda with the corrections; seconded by Board member McClammy. Chairman Williams stated that a request was made to table agenda item nine (9) until the September meeting. Board member McClammy requested that the email sent by Cameron Moore, Wilmington-Cape Fear Home Builders Association, requesting that the item be tabled, be read into the record. Attorney Thurman read the following email that was sent to the Chairman of the Planning Board from Cameron Moore:

"Mr. Williams we understand the Pender County Planning Board will be reviewing and potentially voting on the following text amendment ZTA 385-2016 tonight. This amendment specifically, amends the density calculation and provides clearer standards for how to obtain density bonuses for mixed-use development in the RM, Residential Mixed and PD, Planned Development zoning districts.

We understand that this amendment has had a lot of discussion as it relates to the overall calculations, and as well the technical specifics that must be obtained to gain additional density on a specific project. At this point the development community still has some lingering questions, and thoughts on this proposed amendment that we thought we could address with the Planning Staff before the meeting. One such specific issue was the gross density vs. net density calculation. We were, and still are in the process of running some of these numbers on other approved projects that have been engineered and land planned within the County to see how this calculation could affect a project. This information would not only provide the development community but also the planning department a clear understanding of any positive or negative affects it could have.

With that said we would respectfully request that the Planning Board table – continue this item tonight to your September meeting so that we can have a little more time working with the planning staff to see some of the overall impacts of this proposed amendment. We understand that tonight's agenda is very lengthy and we want to make sure that we have an adequate amount of time to review and deliberate upon the proposed changes in the front of the board tonight. We are very

appreciative of the County, and its staff in its efforts to address what we see will become some positive changes for all the stakeholders involved as development projects move forward within the County.”

Vice-Chairman Fullerton requested that the Board vote on the pending motion to amend the agenda with the correction for agenda items eight (8) and nine (9). The vote was unanimous.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to approve the request to table agenda item nine (9) until the September meeting; seconded by Board member McClammy. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

- 2. Adoption of the Minutes: (July 5, 2017 Meeting)** Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to adopt the July 5, 2017 minutes as presented; seconded by Board member Nalee. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

- 3. Public Comment:** None

(Public Hearings Open)

- 4. Master Development Plan Revision:**

Oak Ridge Properties at Olde Point, LLC, applicant and owner, requested the approval of a revision to the previously approved Master Development Plan for the mixed-use development known as Oak Ridge at Olde Point. The request is to consider a payment in lieu of constructing sidewalks. The proposed project is located along the east side of US HWY 17 between Ravenswood Road (private) and Country Club Road (SR 1565) in the Topsail Township and may be further identified by Pender County PINs: 3293-86-0162-0000, 3293-85-0858-0000, 3293-75-7714-0000, 3293-75-6669-0000, 3293-95-1967-0000, 3293-96-2122-0000, 3293-96-3164-0000, and 3293-75-6604-0000. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item four (4). Chairman Williams asked if the funds went into a general account for any area of the County or if it was held for a specific area. Director Breuer stated that the general statutes would require that the funds be used for pedestrian elements within the subdivision or general area. Board member Baker stated that he would request that the funds be spent in the subdivision, not in the immediate area.

Mike Gallant, PE, stated that he was on board with everything that had been discussed except for the construction of a sidewalk along US HWY 17, that they had never agreed to that and would request to make payment in lieu of that sidewalk as well once development began on the out parcel. Director Breuer stated that the payments would be administered as phases were developed, payments would be collected prior to final zoning approval was given for each phase.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to approve the requested Master Development Plan Revision as presented, with the condition that payments made in lieu of constructing sidewalks be dedicated to the Oak Ridge at Olde Point development; seconded by Board member Baker. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

- 5. Preliminary Plat:**

River Rock Farms, LLC., applicant, on behalf of HCT Pender, LLC., owner, requested the approval of a Preliminary Plat for Phase I for the previously approved mixed use development known as Lane's Ferry (Case 11369). Phase I includes two hundred (200) single family detached conventional lots on approximately 125.40 acres. The portion of the property for Phase I is located along the north side of NC HWY 210, at the intersection of Moore Town Road (SR 1518) and NC HWY 210 in the Rocky Point Township and may be further identified as Pender County PIN: 3245-84-0109-0000. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item five (5). Board member Baker referenced the aerial map provided by staff and asked if the Lane's Ferry parcel was included in the project, Senior Planner Crowe pointed out the project boundaries that were highlighted in blue on the map and stated that the Lane's Ferry parcel was not included. Discussion ensued regarding the

design of the project in relation to active and passive open space requirements and concerns of flooding.

Jim Cirello, and Tim Clinkscales, Paramounte Engineering, introduced themselves and stated they were available to answer any questions. Mr. Clinkscales stated that they would be at least two (2) to three (3) feet above the minimum elevation requirement for the finished floors on the lots and there were no structures in the flood zone for Phase I.

Chairman Williams asked for an explanation regarding the accessibility of the passive open space areas via sidewalks, Mr. Clinkscales reviewed the map showing all the proposed sidewalks and the connectivity and stated that all open spaces would be designed for pedestrian access via walking or bicycles.

Board member McClammy asked if any telephone calls or comments had been received from residents in the area with concerns about flooding or drainage and what would be done to address concerns or issues regarding flooding, Senior Planner stated that staff had not received any calls or comments in regards to Phase I, Mr. Clinkscales commented that the project would be designed for flood events. Mr. Clinkscales added that they took flood issues very seriously because if there was a flooding problem there would be a selling problem, so it is important to make sure the integrity of the area is maintained through reasonable and scientific engineering practices. Mr. Clinkscales was given a note from an audience member that he read to the Board as follows: *"Folks in the area spoke in favor of the project in the beginning and are still in favor of it"*.

There were no sign ups for public comments.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to approve the requested Preliminary Plat as outlined by staff in their report and presented; seconded by Chairman Williams.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton asked how many phases did the project have, Mr. Clinkscales answered three (3). Vice-Chairman Fullerton asked staff if there had been any discussions regarding recreational facilities, Senior Planner Crowe stated that in the original Master Plan there was a proposed amenity center for Phase II and the walking trail for Phase I which met the development standards.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton stated that it was his observation that the Board was not jumping to approve the subdivision and he believed there were reasons for that, the County's intent is to have quality subdivisions and he just didn't see that in what was presented, he made a motion to approve the request due to it meeting the requirements, but would have to wonder would the subdivision be one that lots of people would want to live in. Chairman Williams asked what was the basic issue, why didn't Pender County need this subdivision. Board member Nalee commented that her issue was the proposed stormwater pond being near the river and in a flood zone, potentially causing flooding issues. Board member McClammy stated that he believed it was a high reward and high risk area, that if the development had reasonable open space, retention ponds, elevation, and amenities then it could be a very high quality development but without those things the development could exacerbate the existing flooding and/or environmental issues in the area and that he was hesitant to approve what was being presented. Board member McClammy added that it might be helpful if the applicant gave an overview of the vision for the Master Plan since it had been two (2) years since it was approved. Mr. Clinkscales stated that they followed the road configurations, pond locations, and open space requirements that was approved in 2015 and gave an overview of the vision for the Master Plan. Mr. Clinkscales added that their intent was to follow the approved plan, but if any changes were made it would have to be heard by the Board for approval.

Brief discussion ensued concerning the location of the stormwater ponds, and the natural flow of water run-off being downhill to the river. Chairman Williams stated that if there were no further questions or comments he would like for the Board to vote on the motion that had been made and seconded.

The vote was three (3) in favor (Chairman Williams, Vice-Chairman Fullerton, and Board member Baker) and three (3) opposed (Board member McClammy, Nalee, and Jordan) of the motion. The motion did not carry.

6. Major Site Development Plan:

Director Breuer asked the Board how they wanted to proceed since agenda item six (6) was in regards to the Wastewater Treatment Facility for the development that didn't receive approval for the Preliminary Plat presented in agenda item five (5). Chairman Williams stated that if this agenda item was the complaint in the back of people's minds, he would prefer to hold the public hearing and give those folks the opportunity to speak, Vice-Chairman Fullerton stated that he did not see himself voting in approval for a Wastewater Treatment Facility when there was not an approved Preliminary Plat, but did believe the Board should hear from the citizens. Attorney Thurman stated that there were no provisions in the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance that prevented the Board from moving forward on this matter. After further discussions, the Board members agreed that it was only fair to hold the public hearing so that the citizens that signed up to speak would have that opportunity.

River Rock Farms, LLC., applicant, on behalf of HCT Pender, LLC., owner, requested the approval of a Major Site Development Plan for a Wastewater Treatment Facility (NAICS 221320) for the previously approved mixed use development known as Lane's Ferry (Case 11369). The Major Site Development Plan for the Wastewater Treatment Facility is included in Phase I, approximately 31.7 acres. The portion of the property for the Wastewater Treatment Facility is north of NC HWY 210 and approximately 2,000 feet to the west of the intersection of Moore Town Road (SR 1518) and NC HWY 210 in the Rocky Point Township and may be further identified as Pender County PIN: 3245-84-0109-0000. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item six (6). Director Breuer added that the Wastewater Treatment Facility's maintenance, operations, etc. would be governed by the Division of Environmental Quality and the Utility Commission would set the rates for the users within the Master Development Plan, that the County would not be involved after construction was completed. Chairman Williams asked if the facility would be solely for the approved Master Plan and owned by the subdivision, Director Breuer stated that it would only be for the development, it appeared that it would be owned by Old North State Water Company, and if there was ever the opportunity to extend wastewater outside of the established boundaries for the Master Plan, approval would have to be granted through the Special Use Permit process.

Tim Clinkscales, Paramounte Engineering, stated that the Wastewater Treatment Facility would be owned and operated by Old North State Water Company not a Homeowner's Association, the facility would treat the entire development and he was available to answer any questions.

John Thomas, 11981 NC HWY 210, Rocky Point, described the location of his property, stated that his property would be across the street from the proposed wastewater treatment plant, and that there is currently approximately twenty-five (25) homes in the scent cone of the proposed plant. Mr. Thomas asked how many homes, apartments, condos etc. were proposed for the final development, Director Breuer answered an estimated three thousand (3,000) total units. Mr. Thomas added that he agreed if the project was not developed right, sales will fail and he did not want to see the area diminish due to the project failing because of smells or flooding. Mr. Thomas asked that the developer consider moving the treatment plant to the South end of the property so that zero (0) homes would be effected by the smell and was the traffic study released to the public.

Cleveland Simpson, 12360 NC HWY 210, Rocky Point, stated that he approved the project two (2) years ago, was very excited about it then and now, but he was concerned about the wastewater treatment plant's proposed location since his home would be in the smell cone as well. Mr. Simpson asked that the developer consider moving the wastewater treatment plant.

J.K. Shiver, 27 Thankful Road, Rocky Point, asked for clarification on where Mr. Thomas and Mr. Simpson were requesting the wastewater treatment plant be moved and if the spray field would be above ground. Mr. Clinkscales stated that there would not be a spray field and could further explain and answer concerns once all sign ups had spoken. Senior Planner Crowe pointed out on the map where the request was to move the wastewater treatment plant, Mr. Shiver commented that if it was moved to the requested location it would be closer to his home. Mr. Shiver asked Director Breuer about the plant at Avendale, Dunn Farm, and the development on Shaw HWY. Director Breuer stated that there was a similar plant at Avendale which was also a private system, that he was not familiar with the Dunn Farm location, and the development on Shaw HWY would be using individual septic systems. Director Breuer added that there were several private wastewater treatment facilities throughout the County that were like the one being presented. Mr. Shiver asked if there any problems with them regarding smell, Director Breuer stated that if there were any problems they would be handled on the state level not the county, that complaints have been made during previous public hearings regarding smell and noise, but again the County has no mechanisms in place to handle those complaints, they would have to go through the State and the Utilities Commission. Mr. Shiver concluded by stating that he was in favor of the project if an agreement could be made regarding the spray field.

Mr. Clinkscales approached the podium to respond to the public comments and concerns. Mr. Clinkscales stated that there would be no lagoons on the property like there is on poultry farms, that the wastewater is cleaned to a standard known as reuse water so the ponds will not store sewage, they will store treated wastewater, the ponds would have fences around them, and today's technology minimizes smell. Mr. Clinkscales further described the size and processes of the plant.

Mr. Simpson asked how long would the treated water be held in the holding ponds, Mr. Clinkscales answered somewhere between two (2) to five (5) days.

Chairman Williams called for a recess at 9:20 pm.

Chairman Williams called the meeting back to order at 9:35 pm.

Mr. Clinkscales stated that he understood the concerns of the neighbors asked Attorney Thurman if the request was denied, what would be the timeframe for the request to be re-heard, Director Breuer answered that the applicant would have to reapply before the next meeting's deadline and if the applicant chose to request the item be tabled, it would be placed on the next meeting's agenda.

Mr. Clinkscales requested that their request be tabled.

Board member McClammy made the motion to table the Major Site Development Plan until the next meeting; seconded by Board member Baker. Vice-Chairman Fullerton stated that he had concerns with where the ponds were proposed to be located and would like to see them further away from the flood zone. Board member Nalee commented that she hoped the applicant took the comments into consideration, that they wanted a good development and a desirable place to live.

The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

7. Conditional Zoning Map Amendment:

Hardison Building Company, applicant, on behalf of Gerald D. Hardison, owner, requested the approval of a Conditional Zoning Map Amendment for one (1) tract totaling approximately ±326.15 acres from RA, Rural Agricultural zoning district to RM-CD3, Residential Mixed Conditional zoning district 3, and an additional three (3) tracts as part an overall Master Development Plan for a total of ±347.23 acres. This request is to allow for single family and single family townhome residential units. The subject properties are located along the south side of NC HWY 210 approximately ± 2,100 feet to the east of the intersection of NC HWY 210 and Island Creek Road (SR 1002) in the Topsail Township and may be further identified by Pender County PINs: 3273-50-0693-0000, 3273-71-1319-0000, 3273-61-9426-0000, and 3273-32-7562-0000. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda item seven (7).

Board member Nalee stated that there seemed to be a lot of comments from the TRC members and asked if staff had any concerns regarding the comments, Senior Planner Crowe explained that the applicant had made changes to the plan after the TRC meeting was held.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton commented that the staff report stated that the request met all requirements, but in the presentation and in the staff's report it was stated that the request conflicted with a policy within the 2010 Comprehensive Land Use Plan in regards to environmental issues, Senior Planner Crowe stated it potentially conflicted with one (1) policy regarding directing development toward suitable land areas, the majority of the policies are in favor of the request. Vice-Chairman Fullerton stated that he didn't see anything in the conditions that would address development in the area classified as environmentally sensitive, had staff addressed that? Senior Planner Crowe responded that staff had talked with the applicant regarding the uplands of the development of the property, there is no jurisdictional determination because the primary concern is wetlands which is based on their preliminary analyses, at this point they are impacting the wetlands, which staff has identified as a problem, that it may be better suited for the applicant to be asked for a better design for the property.

Attorney Thurman stated that the proposed development is in an area where there was a previous bypass map, the map no longer exists so he would advise the Board that it would be improper to consider what did previously exist in their review of the request.

Dean Hardison, property owner, developer, and builder, stated that he engaged Paramounte Engineering to design the project and they were available to answer any questions on his behalf and thanked the Board for their consideration.

Allison Engebretson, Paramounte Engineering, introduced herself and Tim Clinkscales. In regards to the environmental concerns, Ms. Engebretson described the properties topography and stated that the only areas of impact in the wetlands are where roadway crossings are required, they were being made to connect the roadway across the large wetland for connectivity based on the ordinance. Ms. Engebretson pointed out the areas of roadway connections that were required. Ms. Engebretson added that approximately five (5) acres out of the one hundred forty-two (142) acres of wetlands were being impacted and that they were reserving more in passive space such as the working farm that was located outside the project area and there was an industrial site on the property as well.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton stated that he was not opposed to the request, however with the number of wetlands and the impact in the area, he would personally be interested in seeing a buffer in between individual house lots and the delineated wetlands. Ms. Engebretson stated that she understood what he was saying and believed that the topography would do that naturally and if the Board approved the request they would move forward with obtaining a jurisdictional delineation. Brief discussion continued regarding impacting the wetlands.

Donna and Mike Treolo, 3113 NC HWY 210 W, stated that they would have no access to their property with the proposed plan, requested that developer consider moving the proposed entrance for the development, expressed concerns regarding the impact the development would have on traffic, schools and the County's Building Inspectors, requested that an independent wetland analyses be done and released to the public, and requested that more buffer such as a wall or brick be required between their lot and the development.

Rachel Adeleye, 866 Harrison Creek Road, stated that her and her mom live at one of the proposed secondary entrances of the development and have a major concern about the traffic increase, an increase would be a major lifestyle change, would cause difficulties trying to get out of their driveway and on and off their street. Ms. Adeleye asked if the developer would consider using another roadway besides Harrison Creek since that community has been there for generations and is a nice quiet community and if they could not use a different roadway could they install a traffic light. Ms. Adeleye's mother stated she questioned if the developer had enough land for the access. Ms. Adeleye thanked the Board for their time and hoped the developer would take the request into consideration.

Sue LoRusso, 1973 NC HWY 210, stated that her concerns were the amount of density in an environmentally sensitive area, townhomes, traffic, impact on schools, water supply for all the new subdivisions, the proposed buffer needing to be larger, who would pay for sewer lines, and the minimal comments from the TRC regarding the project. Ms. LoRusso asked if anyone could respond to her concerns. Chairman Williams stated that the Utilities had responded that they would be able to service the development, the developer would be responsible for paying to install sewer lines, unfortunately not all TRC members respond and in some cases their interactions with projects come at different stages of a development, and that the County's Collector Street Plan requires the connecting of the roadways.

Julie Milam, 150 Winnie Pearl Lane, stated that she lived next to the proposed road "E" and that she strongly objected to the location of that road and believed it needed to be moved, that she lived on a power line easement and a ditch was dug many years ago, by Mr. Hardison, which has now eroded into her property and if that is any example of how they will be treated, it is not going to be great.

Tim Clinkscales, Paramounte Engineering, responded that the developer is only developing half of what is permitted in regards to density, any improvements to the water supply or sewer would be the responsibility of the developer, DOT only requires sixty (60) feet of right away for road, so they have plenty for access, a traffic study would be done and any road improvements will be the developer's responsibility, no one's access would be blocked, and further explained the reasoning for the placements of the proposed roads having to also meet the DOT and power company's requirements.

Allison Engebretson, Paramounte Engineering, added that in addition to the requirements that have to be met, the area that had been suggested to move the road to would impact the owner's working farm and he does not want to impact that farm anymore then he has to until that farm is no longer a working farm. Ms. Engebretson stated that the applicant held a community meeting with the neighbors and the discussion was concerns regarding the thirty (30) foot buffer and they are willing to augment the buffer as needed with vegetation, the area is currently thick with vegetation and should remain that way after the roadway is completed, but if not they are committed to going forward with the identified C4 buffer which is the thickest buffer required by the County, if additional conversations are needed with the neighbors the applicant is certainly open to those conversations.

Mr. Clinkscales added that certain TRC members would not have responses, for example the project was not in a CAMA area so the Division of Coastal Management would have no comments since it was not in their jurisdiction and other members would simply respond that their requirements would have to be met and explained some of the agencies requirements. Mr. Clinkscales stated that the

amount of traffic would not warrant a traffic light and DOT would not allow a developer to install a traffic light just because they wanted to.

Mike Treolo, 3113 NC HWY 210 W, stated that there was no working farm, there was nothing but a grapevine and nothing had been planted on the property in five (5) years.

Mr. Hardison commented that it was a farm, there were grapevines, farm equipment, and he had a farm identification number

Ms. Engebretson stated that they would like to clarify that there was discussion regarding the proposed park being dedicated to the County and the applicant is open to dedicating the proposed park to the County but the necessary conversations with Pender County Parks and Recreation have not happened and they are not at the point to say that the park will be dedicated.

Board member Jordan stated that according to Mr. Clinkscales comments regarding the County, DOT and the power company's requirements and reviewing the plans it appeared that moving the road would not be encroaching the wetlands anymore so he believed the road could be redesigned to avoid impacting the neighbors.

Board member Nalee stated that she agreed with Board member Jordan's comments and would ask that Mr. Hardison consider working with the neighbors that he would be affecting.

Mr. Clinkscales stated that the applicant would agree to adding a condition to have a fifty (50) foot separation and a six (6) foot high wood fence maintained by the homeowner's association along the east side of street "E" to the powerline easement and a C4 buffer along the rear of the neighborhood park adjacent to the properties accessing Winnie Pearl Lane. Discussions continued between the applicants and the neighbors regarding buffers.

Chairman Williams stated that the conversation taking place really needed to be during a community meeting and then brought to the Board, that there was too much negotiating taking place and that the Board needed to discuss the conditions, the applicant stated that they were not in a place to confirm park dedication to the County, but it was a condition. Director Breuer stated that General Statutes allow the County to enforce the required dedication, it is not a willingness to say they will do it, it is controlled through the language of subdivision and Unified Development Ordinances, that states it would have to be dedicated once the first phase for the development is recorded. Mr. Clinkscales stated that during the TRC meeting they were told that there would be compensation for the park, Director Breuer stated that after the meeting he had instructed staff to provide the General Statute so that everyone would be on the same page. Mr. Hardison stated that before he agreed to what had been stated he would have to have his legal counsel review it.

Board member McClammy stated that the meeting had exceeded the 11:00 pm time period and he felt uneasy about acting on the matter since they were still in a negotiation stage, he would recommend that some of the details be worked out and then presented to the Board, if that was acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. Clinkscales stated that they were fine with tabling the request, but would like to bring it back at the next meeting. Senior Planner Crowe commented that the only concern would be that the applicant address the concerns and provide the submittal back to staff in time to prepare a report for the Board.

Vice-Chairman Fullerton made the motion to table the requested Conditional Zoning Map Amendment until the September meeting; seconded by Board member Baker. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

Chairman Williams stated that the meeting traditionally ends at 11:00, what was the pleasure of the Board on moving further or continuing the remainder of the agenda to the next meeting. Vice-Chairman Fullerton stated that he would be in favor of moving forward to hear the last item. The Board was in agreement with moving forward.

8. Zoning Text Amendment:

Michael Nadeau, applicant, requested the approval of a Zoning Text Amendment to the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance. Specifically, the request is to amend Section 5.2.3 Table of Permitted Uses to allow for the addition of 'Others Schools and Instruction (NAICS 6116)' as a permitted use by right in the GB, General Business zoning district. Senior Planner Crowe presented and gave background information for agenda eight (8).

There were no sign ups or discussion.

Board member Nalee made the motion to approve the requested Zoning Map Amendment; seconded by Vice-Chairman Fullerton. The vote was unanimous. The motion carried.

9. Zoning Text Amendment: (Tabled until September meeting)

Pender County, applicant, requested the approval of Zoning Text Amendments to the Pender County Unified Development Ordinance. Specifically, the request is to amend the density calculation and provide clear standards for density bonuses for mixed-use developments in the RM, Residential Mixed and PD, Planned Development zoning districts. Section 4.8.1.C shall be moved to Section 4.6.7 with further clarification of superior design elements for additional densities.

(Public Hearings Closed)

10. Discussion Items:

a. Planning Staff Items:

- i. Staff Report Format: Senior Planner Crowe asked the Board to review the samples provided to the Board and give staff feedback. Board member Nalee complimented staff on the current format of the staff report stating that the recent changes have made the report easier to read and understand.
- ii. Comprehensive Plan Update: Item not discussed due to time.
- iii. TRC Update: Item not discussed due to time.

b. Planning Board Members Items: None

11. Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 6, 2017, Work Session at 6:00 pm

12. Adjournment: 11:21 pm

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