



**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2025  
WEDDINGTON TOWN HALL  
MINUTES  
PAGE 1 OF 4**

**1. Call to Order**

Vice Chairman Rusty Setzer called the meeting to order.

Ms. Dewey clarified that the previous meeting was incorrectly recessed without stating a time, place, and location as required by general statutes, requiring a special meeting to be called.

**2. Determination of Quorum**

Quorum was determined with Vice Chairman Rusty Setzer, Board members Amanda Jarrell, Bill Deter, Nancy Anderson, Steve Fellmeth, and Scott Buzzard were present. Chairman Chris Faulk was absent.

Staff Present: Town Planner Greg Gordos, Town Administrator/Clerk Karen Dewey

Visitors: Clayton Jones, Jim Bell, Keith Fenn, Keystone Homes Representatives

**3. Conflict of Interest Statement**

Chairman Setzer asked if there were any conflicts of interest with the items on the agenda. No conflicts were declared by any board members.

**4. Public Comments**

Clayton Jones, 5147 Panhandle Circle: Mr. Jones addressed the Keystone Custom Homes RCD application. He noted that the UDO Appendix 2B is an important document that must be complete, and he advised that the application needs to be reasonably complete before the planning board takes action and sends a recommendation to the town council. He outlined three potential outcomes if the council doesn't find the application complete: they could still take action based on the board's recommendation, they could send it back for additional work, or they could outright deny the application without considering its merits. Mr. Jones expressed that he wanted to see the project succeed for the benefit of the Helms family, who own the property, and urged the board to ensure the application was properly completed.

**5. Discussion and Possible Recommendation of an application by Keystone Custom**

**Homes requesting Conditional Zoning Approval for the development of a 12-lot Conservation subdivision located at 3009 Forest Lawn Drive**

Mr. Gordos provided an update on the application and explained the parliamentary procedure regarding the special meeting. He clarified that this was a special meeting to discuss only the Keystone Custom Homes application that was originally heard on September 22nd. Mr. Gordos reviewed the project details: a 16-acre parcel planned for 12 single-family home lots in a conservation-style development with 50% open space. He noted that the site is topographically challenged with floodplain and creek features on the back of the property, while the front is flat where the 100-foot thoroughfare buffer would be located. He explained that the development would include a cul-de-sac with a stub provided to adjacent undeveloped property, creating a break point that complies with town code regarding cul-de-sac length.

Mr. Gordos reported that at the previous meeting, the planning board had requested additional information from the applicant, which had been provided. This included 30 pages of detailed engineering drawings, grading plans, and other technical documents. He noted that the applicant had addressed questions regarding the stub road connection, which would have an all-weather surface turnaround rather than being fully paved.

Mr. Gordos highlighted that the application is for a conservation-style development, which requires concessions like walking trails, pedestrian connectivity, and a neighborhood green. The applicant had provided documentation showing why their preferred location for a neighborhood green was not suitable due to topography. Mr. Gordos emphasized that the application should be judged on its land use merits rather than on technicalities of completeness with Appendix 2B requirements. He noted that the applicant had done extensive engineering work to meet the town's requirements.

Board Member Bill Deter raised several questions about the application, particularly regarding tree preservation and canopy coverage. He noted that according to the tree removal and mitigation plan, 107 out of 123 heritage trees (87%) would be removed. He questioned whether the applicant had calculated whether they would meet the 30% canopy coverage requirement after development.

Keith Fenn, representing the applicant, explained that there was some confusion in the UDO regarding how buildable area and canopy coverage are defined and calculated. He stated that with the conservation of 50% of the land as forested area, plus the trees that would be preserved on the northern lots, they would exceed the 30% canopy requirement.

Mr. Gordos clarified that the percentage of canopy requirements is a concept best applied to R-40 type developments rather than conservation developments, which already set aside 50% of land with existing tree canopy. He added that the applicant had made efforts to understand and comply with the tree requirements.

Vice Chairman Setzer inquired about the sanitary sewer easement shown on the plans. He

questioned whether the 20-foot limit of disturbance shown was the same as the easement width required by Union County. Mr. Fenn confirmed they were the same and noted that trees within the easement would need to be removed for utility installation.

The Board had extensive discussion about the requirement for a neighborhood green. Board member Deter expressed his view that the UDO clearly states that a neighborhood green is required and that a walking trail, while a good amenity, does not replace this requirement. He suggested that Lot 3, which appeared to be on higher, flatter ground, might be a suitable location for a green space. Board Members Jarrell, Buzzard, and Anderson discussed that requiring a neighborhood green in this case would contradict the goal of minimizing grading and preserving trees.

Mr. Fenn countered that the language in the UDO states the green is required "to the greatest extent feasible," and explained that the topography makes it unfeasible without significant tree removal and grading. He noted that they had designed the project to comply with the intent of conservation development by preserving trees and minimizing grading, and that creating a neighborhood green would contradict those goals.

Mr. Gordos suggested that the board consider a condition requiring a more detailed landscaping plan for the 100-foot thoroughfare buffer at the front of the property, since it would be initially cleared of vegetation.

- Motion:** Board member Fellmeth made a motion to forward the Keystone Custom Homes application for Conditional Zoning Approval to the Town Council with a recommendation for approval, with the condition that a detailed landscaping plan is provided for the 100-foot buffer.
- Second:** Board member Buzzard
- Vote:** The motion passed with a 4-1 vote. Board members Anderson, Jarrell, Buzzard, and Fellmeth voted in favor, Board member Deter opposed.

In closing comments, several board members thanked the applicant for their patience as this was the first application being processed through the new Appendix 2B requirements. Board Member Deter expressed disappointment that a condition requiring 30% tree canopy coverage wasn't included and reiterated his position that a neighborhood green should be required. Other board members reiterated their view that the walking trail was appropriate for this development and that requiring a neighborhood green would contradict the conservation goals of preserving trees and minimizing grading.

## 6. Adjournment

- Motion:** Board member Deter made a motion to adjourn the October 2, 2025 Special Planning Board Meeting at 8:22 p.m.
- Second:** Board member Buzzard

***Vote:*** The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Approved: October 27, 2025