



**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2025 – 7:00 P.M.
WEDDINGTON TOWN HALL
MINUTES
PAGE 1 OF 4**

1. Call to Order

Chairman Faulk called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Determination of Quorum

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

Staff Present: Town Planer Greg Gordos, Admin Asst. Debbie Coram

Visitors: Bill Caldwell, Wayne Helms, Cathy Weaver, Casey Whiteman, Tracy Stone, Christopher Neve

3. Conflict of Interest Statement: *In accordance with the state government ethics act, it is the duty of every Board member to avoid conflicts of interest. Does any Board member have any known conflict of interest with respect to any matters on the agenda? If so, please identify the conflict and refrain from any participation in the matter involved.*

Chairman Faulk read the Conflict of Interest Statement. No Board members had a conflict of interest.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. July 28, 2025 Planning Board Regular Meeting

Motion: Board member Anderson made a motion to approve the July 28, 2025 Regular Planning Board Meeting minutes.

Second: Chairman Faulk

Vote: The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

5. Public Comments: *Individuals are allowed 3 minutes to speak and must only comment on current agenda items. A maximum of 30 minutes is allocated to the Public Comment Period. The time limit may be extended at the discretion of the Chairman.*

No Public Comments

6. Old Business

A. Discussion and Possible Recommendation of Text Amendment to Section D917A.G. Private Roads and Gatehouses and Section D918.I. Screening and Landscaping-Berm Language.

Mr. Gordos explained this amendment serves as an administrative cleanup for text amendments that had already been recommended for approval by the Planning Board. The ordinance addresses language regarding private roads, stating the town is not responsible for maintaining or inspecting gates, and regarding berms, which were previously prohibited but are now encouraged. The ordinance had gone to Town Council but had not been adopted yet due to concerns about berm language.

Mr. Gordos recommended adding a reference to Section D-917-I in the thoroughfare buffer section for clarity. Board member Deter pointed out several housekeeping items: on page 10, references to "planning board" should replace "town council," and "sketch plan" should replace "preliminary plat." He also noted a typo in the definition of "adjusted tract acreage yield" at the bottom of page 10 that appeared to be carried over from the tree ordinance regarding measuring tree trunks.

Board member Anderson asked for clarification about "playing fields" in Section D-917-B, questioning whether this meant organized sports fields or just open spaces for informal play. Mr. Gordos clarified it was intended as amenable flat space for informal use, not organized athletic fields which have separate regulations.

Board member Fellmeth noted that Town Council had changed the open space requirement from 10% to 20%, referencing Union County's 30% requirement. The board discussed the implications of this change, particularly for smaller subdivisions.

- Motion:** Chairman Faulk made a motion to forward the text amendment to the Council with a recommendation for approval, reaffirming the Planning Board commitment to the ordinance.
- Second:** Board member Deter
- Vote:** The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

B. Discussion regarding Section D-917E. Additional Specific Requirements for Conventional Residential Development

Mr. Gordos explained this ordinance had been recommended for approval by the Planning Board and adopted by Town Council. It was a conceptual overhaul of development regulations for new subdivisions, with Section D-917-A applying to all properties, D-917-B for conservation properties only, and the new D-917-E applying rules to conventional subdivisions. The goal was to differentiate between rules for new development versus existing homeowners' property rights.

Board member Deter expressed concern that the concept wasn't clear enough in the text, particularly regarding "adjusted tract acreage" which excludes primary conservation areas like steep slopes, floodplains, creeks, and ponds - essentially unbuildable land. He explained the intent was that for RCD developments, developers would calculate their yield plan from the adjusted gross acreage after removing these unbuildable areas.

Board member Anderson expressed confusion about how this would work, particularly regarding lots that might have some floodplain but still have buildable area. Mr. Gordos clarified that the compromise was to require new subdivisions to put all steep slopes and floodplains in common open space under HOA management, with flat buildable land reserved for lots.

After extensive discussion about the complexity and implications of these changes, Chairman Faulk suggested this topic warranted a workshop to better explain the concepts with exhibits and real-world examples. The board agreed to direct staff to schedule a workshop on this topic, with Chairman Faulk suggesting they might invite Bob Wilson from LaBella to provide practical perspective. Board member Anderson emphasized the importance of respecting individual property rights in any regulations.

7. New Business

A. 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 presented the application from Keystone Custom Builders for a 12-lot conservation subdivision on approximately 16 acres on Forest Lawn Drive. The property currently has a single-family home, and the proposal would create 12 RCD homes with 50% or more of the land preserved as conservation. Lot sizes would range from approximately 19,018 to 23,000 square feet. The project had gone through the public participation process since April, including an on-site charrette walk and two community meetings.

The site includes a stream and floodplain in the rear, is heavily wooded in back with open area in front and would connect to existing sewer. The plan includes two roads, with the second serving as a stub to undeveloped property to the south and meets cul-de-sac length requirements. Mr. Gordos noted this was the first application subject to the new Appendix 2B requirements and recommended the project include a neighborhood green as an amenity.

The applicant's engineer, Casey Whiteman from Colliers, presented the project. He showed the yield plan demonstrating 12 lots outside the floodplain, the conservation of 50% of the property, aerial views showing the wooded areas, and heritage tree locations. He clarified they would save 3 of 5 heritage trees in the front, not 3 of 4 as stated in the report. The applicant confirmed all required trees per lot would be provided.

The applicant explained the only viable area for a neighborhood green would be behind the rear lots at the highest topography, requiring more tree removal. They felt the walking trail and 50% conservation met the intent for only 12 homes.

Chairman Faulk raised numerous technical concerns about the submitted plans, including questions about the accuracy of the tree survey, grading plans showing slopes that didn't appear to meet 3:1 requirements, stormwater management concerns for water flowing toward Forest Lawn Drive, and lack of detail about the walking trail construction. He emphasized this was the first project subject to the new Appendix 2B requirements and needed to set the right precedent.

Board members debated whether the level of detail being requested was appropriate. Board member Anderson expressed concern that they were being unrealistic in asking developers for essentially final plans at this stage. Board members Deter and Buzzard supported getting more information to avoid problems later, with Board member Buzzard noting that under 2B, the Planning Board was taking on more responsibility that previously fell to Town Council.

After extensive discussion about the appropriate level of detail required, the Board decided to recess this portion of the meeting to allow the applicant to provide additional information.

- Motion:** Board member Anderson made a motion to table recommendation to a recessed meeting for up to 10 days to allow the applicant to provide additional information requested by the Board.
- Second:** Board member Buzzard
- Vote:** The motion passed with a 3-1 vote in favor: Board members Anderson, Buzzard, and Fellmeth voted in favor. Board member Deter opposed.

8. Discussion of removal of 11 "sketch plan" references from UDO and replace with "schematic plan"

Mr. Gordos explained that when Appendix 2B was adopted, the term "sketch plan" was replaced with "schematic plan" to reflect the higher level of detail required. However, there were still 11 references to "sketch plan" in the UDO. He recommended allowing staff to administratively update these references where appropriate and include them in the amendment.

Board members directed staff to administratively update these references where appropriate and include them in the text amendment.

9. Update from Town Planner

Mr. Gordos reported that at the last Town Council meeting, there was discussion about the downtown overlay and its location on the zoning map. The Town Council decided not to direct staff to amend the overlay or add a specific property at this time. No map amendments would be made at this time, though applicants could still apply for zoning changes to their properties.

10. Board Member Comments

Board members commented on the challenges of implementing Appendix 2B and the learning process for both the Board and applicants. Chairman Faulk expressed disappointment with suggestions that board members weren't qualified to review technical plans, emphasizing that maintaining high standards was important for Weddington.

11. Adjournment

- Motion:** Board member Deter made a motion to recess the September 22, 2025 Regular Planning Board Meeting to a date and time to be determined within 10 days
- Second:** Board member Fellmeth
- Vote:** The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Note: According to North Carolina General Statutes, a motion to recess a regular meeting must include the time and place at which the meeting will be continued. The motion to recess the September 22, 2025 Regular Planning Board meeting did not include the time and place and therefore notice requirements for a recessed meeting were not met.

Approved: October 27, 2025