

Jeff Wenzel
Mayor

Pamala Hall
Mayor Pro Tem

Rena Bragg
Councilmember

Greg Hines
Councilmember

Dexter Sholar
Councilmember

Carolyn Stanley
Councilmember

Town of Holly Ridge

*Post Office Box 145
Holly Ridge, North Carolina 28445*

*Telephone (910) 329-7081
Fax (910) 329-1593*



Heather Reynolds, CMC
Town Manager

Tracy Martin
Deputy Town Clerk

TOWN OF HOLLY RIDGE PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES March 15th, 2022 6:00 P.M.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 PM. Members present were John McIver, Toni Hardin, Dave Mosey, and Nicholas Tripp. Also present was Nathan Rhue and Marsha-Gray Kircher from the Community Development Department. Applicant Charles Riggs from Charles F. Riggs & Associates was also in attendance.

Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

Board paused for a moment of silence. John McIver led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Adoption of Agenda (Additions and/or Deletions)

A motion was made by *Dave Mosey* and seconded by *Toni Hardin* to adopt the agenda as is. *All Agreed.*

Adoption of Minutes

A motion was made by *Nicholas Tripp* and seconded by *Toni Hardin* to adopt the minutes from Planning Board Meeting held on February 15th, 2022. *All Agreed.*

New Business

A. Zoning Map Amendment – Graham Lane – Charles F Riggs & Associates

Presented by Nathan Rhue – this is an application from Charles F Riggs & Associates with Mr. Charles Riggs in attendance for any supplemental questions. Owner of the property is Wellmans Properties, LLC, pertaining to 5 properties, off Graham Lane which is at the border for the ETJ for the Town. With all 5 properties it is approximately 14.88 acres, currently zoned as Commercial, the request is to rezone to RA (Rural Agriculture).

Toni Hardin requested that she discloses that she has a business relationship with David Wellman but has no direct financial interest or benefit relating to this item on the agenda. No Board Members had any issue with the information disclosed.

Nathan Rhue showed an aerial of the properties, explaining that they are down past the VFW, and are the last jurisdiction of the Town. Planning Board was presented with a largely printed plat showing a green shaded area indicating the properties in question. The properties are mostly vacant and undeveloped with the exception of Parcel 072179 at the end of Graham Lane which contains a single-family dwelling. From a zoning perspective, both Holly Ridge and Onslow County maps were provided for clarification of location and zoning.

Nathan Rhue explained that the request is for a split zone, for the lower parcels to be Rural Agriculture, and the acreage along US Highway 17 be left Commercial. The future land use map recognizes this as Commercial designation. Nathan Rhue mentioned that the applicant is requesting a Zoning Map amendment from Commercial to RA (Rural Agriculture). The purpose of the Commercial District purpose is to accommodate the development of retail, service and related businesses abutting major roadways throughout the town that cater to the traveling public with minimum lot areas of 15,000 square feet.

Nathan Rhue mentioned to that Board that development permitted in the RA zoning districts allows for low and medium density residential developments. Minimum lot area within the RA zoning district is 20,000 square feet as well. The description of the district RA Rural Agriculture is the purpose of this district is to maintain a rural development pattern where low and medium density single-family, modular, on frame modular and manufactured homes are intermingled with agricultural uses. This district is also designed to protect rural areas from the intrusion of non-agriculture land uses that could create a nuisance, detract from the quality of life, and/or present a danger to the natural environment.

Nathan Rhue explained that the surrounding properties consist of both vacant properties and some that contain single-family dwellings. The request is to split zone some of the properties that extend to Hwy 17 with the intentions of subdividing/combining parcels in the near future. The surrounding zoning districts consist of both Commercial and Rural Agriculture. Nathan Rhue mentioned that in reviewing a general zoning map amendment, consideration of all permitted uses must take place in approving or denying the request as submitted, and all uses are mentioned in the staff packet.

Nathan Rhue explained that the future land use designation for these sites is Commercial which denotes high-density development. However, the adjoining sites denote low-density development which would be in line with the Rural Agriculture District. This would also be

consistent with the existing single-family uses currently found both on some and adjoining the parcels subject to this request. While the request is specifically not consistent with the Future Land Use Map, it would be in the public's interest as the request would leave the Commercial designation along a major thoroughfare while affording low to medium-density development comparable to the area.

Nathan Rhue reminded that Board that as with Section 7-7-4 provides policy guidelines that should be followed by the Planning Board considering amendments while making their recommendation to the Town Council.

(A) The proposal will place all property similarly situated in the area in the same category, or in appropriate complementary categories.

The proposal would place the parcel with a zoning designation of Rural Agriculture. This would allow for a rural development pattern where low and medium density single-family, modular, on frame modular and manufactured homes are intermingled with agricultural uses, as currently found in the area.

(B) There is convincing demonstration that all uses permitted under the proposed district classification would be in the general public interest and not merely in the interest of an individual or small group.

The request would leave the Commercial designation along a major thoroughfare and not extending into the lower density areas that currently exist. With the permitted low to medium-density development in this area, the general public's interest would be considered if developed in a manner consistent with the area.

(C) There is convincing demonstration that all uses permitted under the proposed new district classification are appropriate for the area included in the proposed change.

The surrounding areas consist of the Rural Agriculture District. The RA District is of low and medium density which would afford the parcels to include a variety of similar uses as those in the area.

(D) There is convincing demonstration that the character of the neighborhood will not be materially or adversely affected by any use permitted in the proposed change.

There appears to be no convincing demonstration that the character of the neighborhood would be adversely affected if developed in accord with the listed permitted uses, which are similar to those currently existing.

(E) The proposed change is in accord with the Holly Ridge Comprehensive Plan, and any other officially adopted plan.

The proposed rezoning from Commercial to RA is not consistent with the Town's comprehensive plan (Town of Holly Ridge Comprehensive Land Use Plan). The future land use designation for this area is Commercial allowing for high-density development. The RA Zoning District consists of uses identified with low to medium-density residential developments.

Nathan Rhue mentioned to the Board that the Staff's recommendation would be to approve as submitted, being that the current uses and zoning in the area are low to medium density, that is similar to the RA Zoning District, it would temporarily split zone the property to

allow for Commercial along US Highway 17 to prevent intrusion of land uses that create a nuisance as Commercial would, and that the Future Land Use plan indicates it as Commercial however the RA permits uses of low to medium density similar to uses in the area while keeping the Commercial district along Highway 17 – allowing more rural uses along Graham Lane.

Chairman John McIver asked if there was any discussion or questions for Nathan Rhue or Mr. Riggs. Nicholas Tripp asked if this would be a split zone. Nathan Rhue answered that is what is proposed, which is not illegal.

Mr. Charles Riggs, 502 New Bridge Street, Jacksonville. Mr. Charles Riggs mentioned that they wanted to clean the area up, by grouping the parcels together as RA and keeping it Commercial by Highway 17. The owner does live in the dwelling on the last parcel and has an accessory structure with an office upstairs which is does use for his business. Mr. Charles Riggs wanted to verify that would be compliant and not be a problem with the RA zoning district. Nathan Rhue informed Charles Riggs that it could be considered a home occupation per the Town's ordinance.

A motion was made by *Nicholas Tripp* and seconded by *Toni Hall* to recommend approval of the following resolutions: RESOLVED, that the Town of Holly Ridge Planning Board hereby finds the amendment to the Zoning Map is (i) inconsistent with the Town's comprehensive plan (Town of Holly Ridge Comprehensive Land Use Plan) and (ii) that it is reasonable and in the public interest as the request will allow for Commercial development along a major thoroughfare and allow for low to medium density development similar to that which is found in the immediate area and forwards the included Consistency Statement to the Holly Ridge Town Council. *All Agreed.*

B. Preliminary Plat – Camp Davis Industrial Park Phase II – Town of Holly Ridge

Nathan Rhue mentioned to the Planning Board that a survey of the preliminary plat was in the Staff packet, and also a large one was printed and put on the wall. The applicant is the Town of Holly Ridge, with the applicant also being the Town of Holly Ridge, concerning parcel 031667. The parcel is approximately 62 acres with the current zoning of Light Industrial, which is what is under consideration with the preliminary plat provided.

Nathan Rhue explained that per the Town's subdivision ordinance, Section 8-25.3 requires that a Preliminary Plat be submitted and approved prior to applicant submittal of a Final Plat. Once the Preliminary Plat is approved the applicant may proceed with construction of the required improvements that will serve the site.

Nathan Rhue mentioned that the Camp Davis Industrial Park has continually expanded within the last several years. Operable industries are currently found within Phase I of CDIP with other industries currently under construction to included Crete Solutions, Onslow Bay Boatworks and Atlantic Seafood. With limited parcels available for development within Phase I, the Town has taken the steps to secure approximately 60 acres adjoining Phase I and identified as Phase II. The intention is to sell these lots in order to increase the industrial uses throughout CDIP. State permitting has been received for water/sewer infrastructure, stormwater, erosion/sedimentation control, etc.

Nathan Rhue mentioned that there are 9 total lots with 8 of them being buildable due to 1 lot being mainly wetlands. Within the Light Industrial district, lot sizes are minimum of 4,500 sq feet, which is signified in this site plan, the setbacks are also consistent with the ordinances. The roads are proposed to match those existing in Phase I, buffering proposed to match the ordinance requirements. There is permitting in place from Onwasa, DEQ related to stormwater, water and sewer infrastructure, sedimentation and erosion control and they have approved for construction. The proposed roads are to be Town owned and maintained, there may be a requirement later on from DOT relating to another access depending on how this is developed. All buffering, hydrants, roads are proposed to be per our existing standards.

Nathan Rhue expressed to the Board that the Staff recommendation for this preliminary plat would be to approve with conditions that the additional future accesses from the state maintained roads be conducted under their requirements and reviewed to their specifications, along with the Town's standards for that access road to be installed. Nathan Rhue also mentioned that the installation of additional infrastructure – water and sewer and stormwater to be approved by the applicable entities as required.

Chairman John McIver asked if there were any questions from the Board. There were none.

A motion was made by *Toni Hall* and seconded by *Dave Mosey* to approve the preliminary plat. *All Agreed.*

Old Business

Text Amendment – Construction Access Road

Nathan Rhue reminded the Board that this item is being continued from the last Planning Board meeting on February 15th, 2022, in order to request additional direction from Town Council. On March 8th, 2022, Town Council discussed this item to provide more information, the intentions behind this request being to look into a way to protect the Town road roads, particularly as it relates to construction traffic. This is the third consideration by the Planning Board with the background being from a request originated from a specific landlocked property with access that is provided through an existing subdivision – the Preserves at Morris Landing.

Nathan Rhue discussed the aerial shown displaying 2 arrows showing the entrances of Tralee Place and Cheswick Drive which is off Morris Landing Road. The property in question is an area behind Preserve at Morris Landing with the only access being off Lenox Drive. An easement was put in place for the use of this by the developer back in 2016, allowing access through Preserves at Morris Landing. Fast forward to today, and the Town on March 8th, 2022, accepted the roads found throughout the entire subdivision, causing the roads to be considered public.

Nathan Rhue explained that it is Staff's opinion that the Town would not have the authority to cut off access to all the roads being they are public. It would be equivalent to cutting off access to development as illustrated by another subdivision known as Holly Hills, these roads include S Dyson Street, S Hines Street and S Jenkins Street. There are several properties back there that are accessed off these roads, which are public roads. As in the case with the Preserves

at Morris Landing, access is granted through the public roads, any requirement for an alternate access would probably result in easements from other property owners which would run the risk of no easements being granted should nobody want to grant additional access. This in Staff's opinion, would be in contrary to the image that Town Council has tried to portray Holly Ridge as being a developer friendly environment.

Nathan Rhue mentioned that Staff has found it difficult to find verbiage to list all the names of roads where construction traffic is prohibited to travel on without it becoming capricious and arbitrary in nature. For example, Truss Builders is located on Hwy 17 next door to Smoky Tony's. As an integral part of construction, would they not be permitted to access their property from Lloyd Street or deliver their product down Cypress Avenue? Would a requirement for an alternate access apply to only single-family dwellings? If so, how many homes are able to be constructed before this requirement comes into effect? All Town roads lead to somewhere, at times that is to undeveloped property, is the intention to keep all construction traffic off Town roads? At what time would a new ordinance kick in? Does this apply to existing construction companies? Will this require easements from other properties? What if the easements are denied, and no one gives them an easement for construction entrance? Would additional standards favor the image of the Town for being developer friendly? Are we going to require bonds for any and all Town roads for construction traffic? This could easily snowball – these are questions Staff has had related to this whole issue.

Nathan Rhue explained to the Board, that while looking at everything, Staff believes that there are already ordinances in place that may already correct this with some minor modifications. The Town ordinance section 10-4 tells us that streets are not to be damaged, it would be unlawful any person to damage it, they would have to fix it, they would be liable, if not they are guilty of a misdemeanor subject to criminal and civil action should it not be repaired per the Town's ordinance. The subdivision ordinance of 8-42.1 talks that new roads must be installed per standards or a performance guarantee, which is usually a bond, must be secured in the amount of 125% of the cost. That bond is released upon completion of the improvements covered until that guarantee.

Nicholas Tripp asked that Nathan Rhue stops for a second, that this is getting out of control. Nicholas Tripp asked if the Town is solely just looking at the road damage for this ordinance – because with the landlocked pieces of property we are not just talking about the damage. Nicholas Tripp mentioned to the rest of the Board that he went to the Town Council meeting based on an unrelated topic and was called out while sitting in the back for being on the Planning Board and asking why we keep going back and forth of this topic. Nicholas Tripp asked what happened to the request of the get together meeting with the Town Council. Staff responded that the Planning Board did not vote on a get together, rather the Town Manager suggested that Staff come up with suggestions, and then if it was felt that it was still necessary that a joint meeting would be arranged.

Nicholas Tripp stated that there is another issue, these landlocked pieces of property, with a subdivision that has already been developed with Town roads, and now construction traffic, noises, construction times, and one of the Town Council members mentioned that these questions will be addressed in a new ordinance. Nicholas Tripp asked if that was correct. Nathan Rhue responded that is generally the practice, when Town Council directs an item that they are looking for such as an ordinance or a recommendation, that is where the Planning Boards role takes effect to look into that request – what recommendation the Planning Board is going to

provide Town Council. Generally, Staff puts it together as far as their opinion and recommendation, the Planning Board does not have to follow that, the same as the Planning Boards recommendation does not have to be followed by the Town Council.

Toni Hardin mentioned that another issue that needs to be considered is that Town Council is trying to prevent damage to Town roads, but the problem is when you legislate, you have to be careful because you effect other things – construction traffic for example, does that mean the Truss Builders cannot drive down Lloyd Street with their materials even though their business is located there. Also, what about full build out – what does full build out look like? Toni Hardin mentioned that she could purchase a lot and sit on it for 10 years before deciding to build on it, so does full build out happen? How is that defined? Is it when the developer sells all the lots? Is it when the last house is built? What happens if a house burns down and now you have construction traffic again to rebuild it? Toni Hardin mentioned that when you look at things you cannot look at it as you just want to stop the damage to the road, you also to have look at everything else.

Nicholas Tripp mentioned that it got brought up at the Town Council meeting, what is considered construction equipment? Is it from the big machinery all the way down to the guy installing the trim? What about the landscapers? Toni Hardin mentioned that her husband is a landscaper who drives on public roads everyday to go to our house. How is this defined?

Dave Mosey stated that at the last Planning Board meeting Nicholas Tripp mentioned that there was no teeth in anything that we have, but now what Nathan Rhue is leaning to here is that there is some teeth – there is Section 10-4 stating there cannot be any damage on the streets and if there is it can be result in criminal and civil penalties. Dave Mosey stated that this is the teeth that you are looking for, unfortunately as always, you cannot holler foul until you have been hurt. The trucks go down the street and cause cracks, and then we could go after then due to this ordinance – we cannot make an ordinance that states in case you do, there is too much of a fine line. It could not all be in an ordinance.

Dave Mosey stated that you were looking for teeth last time, Nathan Rhue has found those teeth, that we use as a means to control the damage that may occur on the Town's streets. Toni Hardin stated that another thing that the Town has is the fact that the Town does not have to take over the streets if they are not up to the Town's standard. Dave Mosey stated that is the correct, and they should not. Toni Hardin stated there is nothing that requires to Town to take them, so if they are not up to par, it is either fix the roads or we are not taking them. Dave Mosey mentioned that the only issue is timing – how can you generate an ordinance that says you have a particular time to do this. Nathan Rhue mentioned that the Town does have the capability of designating roads for no heavy trucks, such as tractor trailers etc., that it is based on a certain weight.

Nicholas Tripp mentioned that these are already existing, that this is supposed to be in lieu of the construction access. Nathan Rhue stated that it is Staff's opinion, as this is another example of it, that you are not going to find an ordinance that is going to cover every basis of this situation; that is why it is Staff's opinion that the ordinances that the Town have in place as far as streets, road requirements, street and maintenance policy, these things are adequate. Toni Hardin asked if it is Staff's recommendation to deny the construction access. Nathan Rhue responded that what the recommendation is based on is that all public streets should be petitioned for acceptance by the Town within one year of approval of the final plat (previously),

but to change that to full build. Nathan Rhue mentioned that they can get into that definition of full build – to be prior to the last CO for example. Toni Hardin stated that could be 100 years, if someone buys a lot and never builds on it.

Toni Hardin mentioned that Town Council is worried about phased development and running all the heavy construction traffic throughout the whole development, through phase 1, which is usually built at the front. Nathan Rhue mentioned that what they usually do is leave that final layer of asphalt off while they are constructing those roads, then once all of it is built out, that final layer is placed on there. Nathan Rhue reminded the Planning Board that this is something that is in an existing policy where Public Works inspects the roads prior to that last layer of asphalt – the recommendation here was that it could not be installed prior to that full build out. Nathan Rhue mentioned that he believed that most developers are not going to put their finish product down knowing that all that traffic going through particularly if they are subject to public dedication.

Nicholas Tripp mentioned that the developer who built the Preserves at Morris Landing is not the same as the one who will be completing the build out in the back on the landlocked property, so there was no consideration there. Nathan Rhue asked what if that developer gains that property, purchases it to build out – this is an example of how complicated this can become.

Charles Riggs stated that he is the surveyor for that particular landlocked property and that the property owners received an easement 6 years ago that allows them access across the streets before majority of the houses were even built in the Preserves at Morris Landing. The easement states that they have the right to use it as they wish, and that any damage to the streets will be the responsibility of that new subdivision. That is already protection in the easement. Nathan Rhue mentioned that it is also in the ordinance. Charles Riggs mentioned that before it became Town streets, it was already an understanding that his client had to handle any damage to any existing streets. Charles Riggs mentioned that he has already advised his client to video all the streets so the status/condition of the existing streets are recorded and video at the end of the build and then compare the two recordings.

Charles Riggs stated that personally as a surveyor, and talking about easements and access to properties, you are going to have a hard time restricting people from using Town streets in any manner in which they wish – you are starting to talk about rights and taking civil rights away from people. Charles Riggs mentioned that he believes the focus should be on damage control, damage is the issue. Nicholas Tripp stated the intent of the Town Council is not only physical damage, but it was also discussion of mud and rock and nails and debris on the streets as things are being built. Toni Hardin stated that happens everywhere on every road. Nicholas Tripp stated the Town Council has already made up their mind, they just want the Planning Boards approval, and does not understand why we keep having this conversation.

Charles Riggs mentioned that the debris goes back to a general statute where trucks covering loose items must be covered and have mudflaps installed, there are already things in place to cover that. Nicholas Tripp responded that the whole point of the construction access is that Town Council wants to keep the stuff off the streets. Last time it was discussed that the access needs to be on the plats. Nicholas Tripp stated that he is done with this project, just approve it.

Nathan Rhue reminded the Planning Board that it is the duty of the Planning Board to develop and recommend policies, ordinances, administrative procedures, and other means for carrying out plans that the Town Council may direct, and to advise Town Council concerning the means for carrying out plans. Nathan Rhue mentioned that he does not like discussing this anymore than they do because there is so many caveats that could be considered but would be impossible to cater all of them where it would be a fair and equitable enforcement of it.

Toni Hardin mentioned that Charles Riggs brought up a good point about potentially effecting rights of people, which could be actionable. Nicholas Tripp asked if Staff have looked into what other Towns and municipalities are doing. Nathan Rhue responded that they mirror the same thing as the Town as far as a subdivision ordinance related to that. Nicholas Tripp asked if they require a construction access. Nathan Rhue responded that the ones that he reached out to do not.

Nicholas Tripp asked what the action on the table is. John McIver mentioned that he has a question first – about landlocked properties – is there any protection for the existing residents as far as noise pollution etc for items that could disrupt their lives. Nathan Rhue responded that there is, depending on what time they are working, but as somebody working for construction, no there is not. There is a lot of undeveloped areas which could be developed in the future, which they have property rights to as well.

Nicholas Tripp stated that the reason Councilman Hines keeps bringing up the Preserves at Morris Landing in particular is because there is no sidewalks on either side of the roads so you are very limited as far as passing and moving of vehicles. Nicholas Tripp asked if it Staff's recommendation to make the denial. Nathan Rhue responded that it is Staff's recommendation is that the subdivision ordinance of 8-36.6 is adjusted to have full build out in that versus final plat. Toni Hardin stated that full build out would need to be defined more.

Nathan Rhue suggested that they could chose a percentage. Dave Mosey stated that a percentage would work. Toni Hardin stated that it could still be problematic. Nathan Rhue stated right now as it stands, they only have one year from final plat approval to turn the roads over. Nathan Rhue stated that it all goes back to the Town not being required to accept roads.

Dave Mosey mentioned that as an example, a lot of HOA's state that after 75% of the development is sold out to the builder, then an HOA must be created, and roads construction and dedications start, but in the context of Preserves at Morris Landing, that was started in 2012 and didn't reach that percentage until 2019, that is a long time in regard to the roads etc. Toni Hardin mentioned those are filler provisions, and those provisions, if no agreement is already in place allows you to draft your own agreement. Dave Mosey stated that the Preserves in Morris Landing was in limbo for many years. Toni Hardin asked if anyone had a percentage. There were none.

Nicholas Tripp asked what the original amendment was that came before the Planning Board. Nicholas Tripp read off his phone that the original one was that prior to any final plat being approved an alternate construction access no less than 20 feet wide must be provided and readily identified – in sketch plan and preliminary plat. Nicholas Tripp mentioned that was originally before us back and forth, back and forth, and this is the change now before us, that the original was better. Nicholas Tripp asked if construction companies are already doing this. Nathan Rhue responded that some are. Nicholas Tripp stated that he noticed it by Holland's.

Nathan Rhue responded that the construction access they has is already their property and that eventually it will be the access to the RV Park.

Charles Riggs stated that in order for them to clear that property for the RV park, they had to get a state erosion control plan and that plan requires a construction entrance. Nicholas Tripp stated that we keep circling back to the Preserves at Morris Landing, but it is intended for other areas. Nathan Rhue responded that is the intention of ordinances. Toni Hardin stated that the Preserves at Morris Landing is what put this on the radar, but this is legislating for everywhere. Nicholas Tripp stated take Hwy 50, you have a construction entrance, and does this also takes effect for anything already in place. Nathan Rhue responded for any future development.

Nicholas Tripp asked if they would need a construction entrance for the next phase of Camp Davis Industrial Park. Nathan Rhue responded potentially. The previously proposed text amendment it was the fact of the Town would be requiring ones to purchase additional property for an easement for a construction entrance. Should the neighbor deny that we would essentially be saying that they could not develop their property. Toni Hardin mentioned that another issue that they had with that even if they put it own their own property, it would have to be on the final plat which could not be removed easily after that.

Charles Riggs stated that the reason he brought up the state requiring an erosion control plan was because that keeps the dirt on the entrance, it does not go on the main highway – that is already erosion control measures in place. Charles Riggs that his client would have a construction entrance that is 20 feet wide and 40 feet long so it would keep the debris off the streets in the Preserve at Morris Landing, but that would be part of his erosion control plan/construction entrance per the state requirement which keeps the sediments on-site. They are worried about erosion and debris, which is something that is already required by the state – anytime you disturb over an acre of land, you are required to have an erosion control plan.

Nicholas Tripp stated to Chairman John McIver that we need to recommend a motion. Chairman John McIver asked if there was a motion. Dave Mosey stated that before we do that Nathan Rhue has crossed out approval of the final plat and changed it to full build, do we want to add a percentage to that? Toni Hardin stated to do either that or provide a definition. Nicholas Tripp stated what if you are building 100 homes and it takes 9 years? Nathan Rhue stated with that in mind there would likely not petition the Town to take the roads over after 9 years. Nicholas Tripp asked if the Chairman was accepting motions at this time.

A motion was made by *Nicholas Tripp* to table this text amendment. Dave Mosey asked what purpose would that serve to table it again. Nicholas Tripp stated that he believed it needs more in depth investigating of this, we keep going back and forth. Toni Hardin stated that they were talking about verbiage, not more information; that there are already things in motion to help protect. Nicholas Tripp stated that there has to be more out there, other places must of done this, what other agencies have done this, that will have some better information for us – it will allow us some time to think about the staffs recommendation. Chairman John McIver asked how much more time do we need.

Nathan Rhue mentioned to the Chairman that there is a motion on the floor that needs a second.

Chairman John McIver asked if there was a second for the motion made. There was none. ***Motion dies with no second.*** Chairman John McIver asked if there was another motion to send to Town Council to approve or disapprove.

A motion was made by ***Dave Mosey*** and seconded by ***Toni Hardin*** to recommend approval based on changes made by Staff to Section 8-36.6 from approval of final plat to full build. ***Nicholas Tripp opposed.***

Persons wishing to address the Board

There were none.

Board Member Questions or Concerns

There were none.

Staff Updates

Nathan Rhue mentioned that Circle K connected water yesterday to the Onwasa lines and should be opening by next week. Camp Davis Industrial Park – there is a groundbreaking for Phase II on Friday at 12 noon. Topsail Steamer will be coming into Camp Davis Industrial Park. Sail Into Nutrition on Hwy 50 sold the property, and a micro-brewery are looking to renovate the building.

Adjourn

A motion was made by ***Dave Mosey*** and seconded by ***Toni Hardin*** to adjourn the meeting at 7:18 PM. ***All Agreed.***



John McIver
Chairman



Marsha-Gray Kircher
Community Development Department