



**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY SEPTEMBER 28TH, 2026 – 7:00 P.M.
WEDDINGTON TOWN HALL
1924 WEDDINGTON ROAD
WEDDINGTON, NC 28104
AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Determination of Quorum
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.*
4. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Approval of Minutes from 06-22-2026 Planning Board Meeting
5. Public Comments: *Individuals are allowed 3 minutes to speak. A maximum of 30 minutes is allocated to the Public Comment Period. The time limit may be extended at the discretion of the Chairman.*
6. Old Business
 - A. Discussion and Possible Recommendation of Text Amendment 2026-4 Section D-917D (A) Agricultural Uses (chicken coops)
7. New Business
 - A. Planning Board Workshop for UDO and plan submittal process.
 - B. Discussion on Upcoming Workshop
8. Update from September Town Council Meeting
9. Board member Comments
10. Adjournment

06-22-2026 Regular Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2026, 7:00 PM

1. Call to Order

Chairman Chris Faulk called the Regular Planning Board Meeting of the Town of Weddington to order on Monday, June 22, 2026, at 7:01 PM.

2. Determination of Quorum

Chairman Faulk noted that a quorum was present. One member, Ms. Scott, was absent.

Present: Chris Faulk (Chairman), Bill Deter (Board Member), Steve Fellmeth (Board Member), Amanda Jarrell (Board Member), Rusty Setzer (Board Member)

Absent: Ms. Scott

3. Conflict of Interest Statement

Chairman Faulk read the Conflict of Interest Statement in accordance with the State Government Ethics Act, advising that it is the duty of every Board member to avoid conflicts of interest and to identify any known conflict with respect to any matters on the agenda. All members present stated no conflict of interest.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. May 26, 2026 Regular Planning Board Meeting

Motion to approve the May 26, 2026 Regular Planning Board Meeting Minutes was made by Board Member Bill Deter and seconded by Board Member Steve Fellmeth. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Public Comments

Chairman Faulk noted that no members of the public were present to offer comment. The Public Comment Period was passed without discussion.

6. Old Business

Chairman Faulk noted that, prior to proceeding with Old Business, the Board considered reordering the agenda items within this section.

Motion to amend the agenda to take up agenda item 6b (Text Amendment 2026-4, Agricultural Uses) before agenda item 6a (Signature Properties Conditional Zoning Application) was made by Board Member Bill Deter and seconded by Chairman Faulk. The motion carried unanimously.

a. Discussion and Possible Recommendation of Text Amendment 2026-4 Section D-917D (A) Agricultural Uses (chicken coops)

Chairman Faulk introduced the item, clarifying that the Board's objective was to reach a general consensus on proposed text language governing small-scale residential chicken keeping, which would then be drafted by staff and brought back for formal action at a subsequent meeting. He stated that his intent was to develop simple, workable parameters suited to smaller residential lots rather than to replicate the existing agricultural livestock standards, which he described as effectively prohibiting chickens on most residential lots given the current 150-foot setback requirement.

Chairman Faulk outlined his initial proposal, which included a maximum of six hens per residential lot of one acre or less, no roosters, placement restricted to the rear yard, a minimum 15-foot setback from side and rear property lines for the coop structure, and a minimum 30-foot separation between the coop and any neighboring dwelling.

Discussion of Lot Size Thresholds

Board Member Deter sought clarification on whether the proposed parameters would function practically on smaller lots, particularly conservation subdivision lots which he noted could be as small as 12,000 square feet. Chairman Faulk acknowledged that on very small lots the setback requirements would significantly constrain placement of a coop, effectively making chickens infeasible on the smallest lots. Board Member Deter observed that on a standard lot of approximately 100 feet in width, a 15-foot side setback combined with the 30-foot neighbor dwelling separation would still provide adequate clearance in most, but not all, cases.

Board Member Fellmeth suggested that the one-acre threshold was appropriate, as lots of two acres or more were generally not the source of complaints and that residents of larger lots typically had more flexibility. Board Member Jarrell agreed, stating that the one-acre or less designation aligned well with the character of smaller residential neighborhoods where the issue was most prevalent. Chairman Faulk acknowledged that some conservation subdivisions had lots as small as 12,000 square feet, and indicated he would research typical lot dimensions in those neighborhoods to confirm whether the proposed setback distances remained workable.

Board Member Deter suggested that rather than restricting the parameters to lots of one acre or less, the same setback and hen count rules could be applied uniformly to all residential subdivision lots, regardless of size. He noted that this approach would simplify the language and cover both smaller and larger lots consistently.

Discussion of Setback Distances

Chairman Faulk stated a preference for a setback greater than 15 feet from the property line, suggesting that 20 feet would serve a similar practical purpose while providing additional separation. Board Member Deter indicated he was amenable to either 15 or 20 feet and noted that in most cases a 15-foot accessory structure setback would still keep the coop from being visible from the street. Board Member Setzer suggested that a 15-foot rear setback would be consistent with existing accessory structure requirements and would help orient coops toward the back of properties.

Board Member Fellmeth referenced proposed text language he had previously shared with the Board, which had suggested a 50-foot separation from neighboring structures and had included provisions for odor control, mandatory enclosures, feed security, and waste disposal. He noted that while a 50-foot coop-to-dwelling separation might be excessive, a figure of 30 to 35 feet appeared more reasonable. He emphasized that enforceable language on maintenance, cleanliness, and feed and waste management would be essential for the ordinance to have any practical effect.

Chairman Faulk stated his agreement that provisions addressing maintenance, waste management, and the confinement of chickens to the rear yard were important components to include. The Board generally agreed that free-ranging chickens onto neighboring properties or public roads was a primary community concern.

Discussion of Enforcement and Permitting

Board Member Setzer raised the question of enforcement mechanisms and penalties, noting that rules without enforcement capacity would have limited effect. Chairman Faulk acknowledged this concern and noted that the town's enforcement capacity was a broader challenge not limited to chickens. He suggested that the Board's immediate role was to establish a clear policy, and that enforcement capacity was a separate matter.

Board Member Fellmeth raised the possibility of a permitting requirement, noting that a permit would create a record of compliance and provide a basis for enforcement. Staff noted that if a permit requirement were

included, the ordinance would need to specify what application documents would be required. Chairman Faulk indicated that the Board would hold off on a permitting requirement at this stage, preferring to keep the initial ordinance straightforward and revisit permit requirements if enforcement issues arose.

Board Member Deter suggested the Board take a measured approach, adopting distance and quantity standards and monitoring outcomes before adding more complex enforcement mechanisms.

Discussion of Code Placement and Structure

Board Member Deter reviewed the relevant section of the Unified Development Ordinance, identifying Section D-917-D(A) as the current agricultural uses supplemental standards section, which presently requires that structures housing poultry or livestock, and waste removed from any such structure, be located no closer than 150 feet from any property line, with a separate provision for horse structures at 60 feet. He noted that the existing language was written for farm-scale agricultural operations and was not suitable for small residential chicken keeping.

The Board discussed restructuring the section to create distinct subsections: one addressing horse and equine uses under the existing language, and a new subsection specifically addressing small-scale residential poultry keeping. Chairman Faulk confirmed that the new chicken coop language should be framed as an urban or residential poultry use, distinct from the livestock and farm animal provisions already in the ordinance. The Board also briefly discussed whether the reference to bovine animals in the corral exemption provision warranted review, though no specific change was directed.

Summary of Consensus

The Board reached general consensus on the following framework to be developed into draft ordinance language by staff:

Residential lots of one acre or less would be permitted to keep a maximum of six hens. No roosters would be permitted. Chickens must be kept in the rear yard. The coop must be set back a minimum of 20 feet from side and rear property lines. The coop must be located a minimum of 30 feet from any neighboring dwelling. Provisions addressing mandatory enclosures, odor and waste management, feed security, and general maintenance should be included in the draft language.

Chairman Faulk indicated he would send a brief communication to Town Council to confirm alignment with their direction on the matter before draft language was finalized, and would share a draft framework with staff and Board members prior to the next meeting. The item was continued to a future meeting for formal action.

b. Discussion and Possible Recommendation of an Application by Signature Properties of the Carolinas LLC Requesting Conditional Zoning Approval for the Development of a 37-Lot Conventional Subdivision Located at the Intersection of Providence Road and Ray Road

Chairman Faulk introduced the item and noted that he had previously communicated questions and concerns to the applicant's representative by email and had received responses. He acknowledged that some of his questions had stemmed from the Board's ongoing efforts to align conventional subdivision standards with the conservation subdivision framework developed through the planning subcommittee, and that portions of that revised language had been approved by the Planning Board in March 2026 but had not yet been codified by Town Council.

The applicant was represented by Mel Graham of Signature Properties of the Carolinas LLC and engineer Brent Cowan.

Applicant Overview

Mr. Graham provided an overview of the project's approach to site design, stating that the applicant had voluntarily reduced the number of lots from a technically permissible 44 to 45 lots down to 37 lots in order to preserve existing tree cover and natural features. He noted that the loop road design was specifically selected to avoid a stream crossing through the middle of the site and to minimize site disturbance. Mr. Graham stated that to his knowledge this was an unusual decision for a developer and reflected a deliberate effort to design a project consistent with the town's values around land stewardship.

Secondary Entrance

Mr. Graham addressed the secondary access point to the subdivision, explaining that the original concept of negotiating a road connection through the adjacent Hudson family property had been explored but ultimately set aside because the Hudson family had sought the ability to terminate the arrangement in the future, which the Board had indicated would not be acceptable. He stated that during further site investigation, the applicant discovered an existing approved curb cut on Ray Road, which was installed by the North Carolina Department of Transportation. This curb cut is located on property controlled by the applicant and will be used as a permanent secondary emergency access point. Mr. Graham stated this access would accommodate fire and emergency apparatus and would remain under the applicant's control.

Mr. Graham noted that the stub road extending toward the Hudson property remains in the plan and that in future, if the Hudson farm were to be developed, the expectation is that the road would be extended and eventually connect back to Ray Road, creating a complete circulation loop. He noted that DOT would not permit a full permanent residential entrance at the curb cut location due to its proximity to the Providence Road intersection.

Board Member Fellmeth raised the question of whether the secondary access point truly met the intent of the UDO requirement for two points of ingress and egress, noting that the ordinance language does not restrict the requirement to emergency-only access. He acknowledged that the community's public safety needs were addressed by the emergency access, but expressed concern that the ordinance language anticipated two functional entrances available to all residents. Chairman Faulk noted that if the stub road to the Hudson property was not eventually connected by a future developer, it would serve no purpose beyond a temporary fire apparatus turnaround, and that the town could not compel a future private developer to connect to a private road.

Board Member Deter observed that the gated nature of the proposed subdivision further complicated the stub road's utility, as a future developer of adjacent land would have no reason to connect to a gated private street that their own residents could not use.

Board Member Fellmeth requested that the applicant provide written documentation from NCDOT confirming that a full residential entrance cannot be constructed at the Ray Road curb cut location due to its proximity to the Providence Road intersection. He stated that such documentation would provide justification for the emergency-only access configuration. Mr. Graham confirmed that such documentation could be obtained.

Topsoil Stockpile Areas

Chairman Faulk noted that the grading plans showed two proposed topsoil stockpile berms, one located near the corner of the Providence Road and Ray Road frontage and one in the rear of the property adjacent to the wetland buffer. He expressed concern about the height of both features, observing that based on the contour intervals shown on the plans, the front berm appeared to reach approximately 22 feet in height and the rear berm appeared to be approximately 10 feet in height.

Engineer Brent Cowan clarified that the red areas shown on the slope analysis overlay were intended to identify all areas of 25 percent or greater slope across the entire 76-acre tract, not only disturbed areas. He noted that the vast majority of those areas would remain undisturbed. Regarding the topsoil stockpile areas, he explained that the berms were intended to consolidate topsoil strippings that cannot be used in road construction or stormwater pond embankments, and that retaining this material on site was preferable to trucking it off site given the cost.

Mr. Graham acknowledged Chairman Faulk's concern regarding the rear stockpile berm and agreed to eliminate it, noting that the rear area behind the lots was adjacent to a wetland and an existing tributary and that the intent of the town's sensitive lands philosophy was to leave such areas undisturbed. He reserved the right to retain the front stockpile berm, stating it was located entirely behind the road buffer and tree line, and would be fully landscaped and screened. He noted that a comparable project, High Clair along Ray Road, involved approximately 60,000 cubic yards of material in a berm that had been landscaped to a standard considered one of the better road frontages in the area. He confirmed that the applicant had never left a visible eyesore on any prior project.

Steep Slopes Analysis

Board Member Deter requested clarification on the steep slopes data presented in the plans. Engineer Cowan explained that the total area of land with slopes of 25 percent or greater was 2.57 acres across the entire tract. Of that, 0.04 acres fell within the proposed right-of-way and 0.10 acres fell within the stormwater best management practice areas. An additional 0.31 acres of steep slopes were located within the proposed lots. He calculated that the total area of steep slopes subject to disturbance was approximately 0.45 acres, representing approximately 17 percent of the total steep slope area, with the remaining steep slope areas located in common open space that would not be disturbed.

Board Member Fellmeth and Board Member Deter acknowledged this as a relatively low level of disturbance to sensitive land relative to the overall tract size and noted the applicant's efforts to minimize grading and lot count.

Open Space Compliance

Board Member Deter referenced the pending text amendment language approved by the Planning Board on March 23, 2026, which would require a minimum of 20 percent common open space for conventional subdivisions and establish definitions for primary and secondary open space, including the provision that no more than 25 percent of the required open space could consist of primary open space features such as floodplains, wetlands, and steep slopes. He noted this language was awaiting Town Council codification and was therefore not yet in effect, but indicated it reflected the Board's philosophy and direction. Chairman Faulk noted that the Board had consistently communicated this direction to applicants even prior to codification.

Cul-de-Sac and Close Design

Board Member Deter raised the UDO provision that private road cul-de-sacs should be designed as a close, defined as a road with a 35-foot open space or green area in the center, forming a loop rather than a traditional dead-end cul-de-sac. He acknowledged that the town engineer had reviewed the plans and found them to meet applicable UDO requirements and had recommended approval, and stated he would not press the issue further for this application. Board Member Setzer noted the application had been submitted in January 2026 under the then-current version of the ordinance.

Chairman Faulk acknowledged the recurring challenge of applicants proceeding in good faith under existing standards while the Board and Council were actively refining those standards through the amendment process. He indicated that consistency in applying these evolving standards going forward would be important.

Motion

Board Member Setzer made a motion, stating that the revised submission presented to Town Council should reflect only the modifications discussed at this meeting and that no further design development changes should be incorporated into the submission forwarded to Council.

Motion to recommend approval of the application by Signature Properties of the Carolinas LLC for Conditional Zoning Approval for the development of a 37-lot conventional subdivision located at the intersection of Providence Road and Ray Road, subject to the following two conditions: (1) submission of written documentation from NCDOT confirming that a full residential entrance cannot be constructed at the Ray Road curb cut location, thereby justifying the emergency-only access configuration; and (2) elimination of the rear topsoil stockpile berm in the sensitive area adjacent to the wetland buffer, was made by Board Member Rusty Setzer and seconded by Board Member Bill Deter. The motion carried unanimously.

7. New Business

There was no new business to come before the Board.

8. Update from May Town Council Meeting

Staff provided an update on the most recent Town Council meeting. The most relevant item noted was a discussion regarding the procurement of an environmental survey of the town's sensitive areas through a consultant. Staff reported that the Council decided to defer action on the scope of work for that survey until a new town planner was in place, so that the planner could help define the appropriate level of detail and purpose for the study.

Board Member Deter commented that clarifying the purpose of the environmental survey would be important, noting that the current UDO provisions already addressed protection of sensitive lands and that the scope of the survey should be clearly defined in relation to those existing standards.

9. Board Member Comments

Board Member Deter stated he was pleased to move the Signature Properties application forward and expressed anticipation of having a new town planner in place to assist applicants through the planning process and to provide staff support for ongoing UDO clarifications.

Board Member Fellmeth expressed appreciation for staff support during a period of reduced staffing and acknowledged the difficulty of the current transitional period for the department.

Board Member Jarrell echoed appreciation for staff efforts and offered a brief comment in relation to the chicken coop discussion, clarifying that her interest in the matter was practical rather than personal and that the broader question of what property owners are permitted to maintain on their land was the relevant concern for her.

Board Member Setzer also thanked staff for stepping up during the transition period.

Chairman Faulk thanked all Board members for their patience and participation and expressed optimism about the direction of ongoing planning work. He extended belated Father's Day wishes to the fathers present and wished everyone a happy Independence Day.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

significant pedestrian activity. Where the first floor of a nonresidential building has expanses of blank wall, each such expanse of blank wall may not exceed 20 feet in length. The term "blank wall", for the purposes of this section, means a wall that does not contain transparent windows or doors or significant ornamentation, decoration, or articulation.

6. *Pedestrian Friendly.* Nonresidential portions of a development (including, but not limited to, the landscaping, parking, and lighting of those portions) shall be designed so that they encourage and facilitate pedestrian use of those portions. In addition to other design elements that encourage and facilitate pedestrian use, in nonresidential portions of a development, sidewalks shall be placed in front of all principal buildings, and small pocket parks shall be created whenever feasible.
 7. *Off-Street Parking Areas.* Large expansive off-street parking lots are not allowed. Accordingly, each off-street parking area shall contain no more than 150 off-street parking spaces and shall meet or exceed the standards in section.
 8. *Internal Streets; Private Ownership; Parking.* Streets within the development may be privately owned and maintained. On-street parking is allowed and may be counted towards meeting the off-street parking requirements. For both on-street and off-street parking, a parking space shall be not less than nine feet in width or less than 20 feet in length, and all parking spaces shall be clearly marked and maintained so that the boundaries of each space may be easily seen. In off-street parking lots with more than 20 standard spaces, one compact parking space may be permitted for every five standard spaces. Each compact space shall be at least seven feet wide and at least 17 feet long, and shall be clearly marked, "compact cars only".
 9. *No Outdoor Storage.* Any outdoor storage of retail goods is prohibited. Notwithstanding this provision, garden materials such as flowers, plants, shrubs, fertilizer, and pine needles, etc., may be stored outdoors, but only if appropriately located, screened, and secured. Such outside storage shall be allowed only at the sole discretion of the Town Council and shall be included in calculating the floor area ratio for the site.
 10. *Open Space.* At a minimum, ten percent of the gross acreage of the project (minus any required setbacks and buffers, utility easements, stormwater detention areas, and marginal lands including, but not limited to, wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, and bodies of water) shall consist of prominently located and pedestrian-accessible village green open spaces so as to encourage walking and pedestrian activity within the development. No development may occur within any such open space except for the creation of sidewalks, other walking paths, and any type of development commonly found in small public parks, such as statues or other art.
 11. *Stormwater Management.* The post development rate of stormwater runoff from any lot shall not exceed the predevelopment rate of runoff for a 100-year storm. The applicant shall provide, at a minimum, the following information to the Administrator as part of his application to obtain a zoning permit:
 - a. An engineering report made and certified as true and correct by a registered engineer licensed to do business in the state. Such report shall include the following:
 1. The routing of stormwater for the predevelopment and post-development conditions of the proposed building lot.
 2. Calculations showing the peak estimated rates of runoff using a ten-year return period for predevelopment and post-development conditions for the lot, including each stream leaving the proposed building lot.
 3. Calculations, plans, and specifications for stormwater retention/detention facilities or other means to effect peak rate attenuation.
 4. A statement indicating the rate of post-development stormwater runoff for the proposed building lot will not be greater than the predevelopment rate for a 100-year storm.
 - b. A statement from the owner acknowledging responsibility for the operation and maintenance of required retention/detention facilities, and to disclose such obligation to future owners.
- B. Additional Requirements.** For clarity, these supplemental requirements are in addition to other requirements of this UDO. Whenever a conflict arises between an otherwise applicable standard imposed by another provision of this UDO and this section for the non-residential development, the stricter standard shall apply. For example, development occurring within the downtown overlay district must also meet the requirements outlined in the Section D-703.

Section D-917D. Supplemental Requirements for Certain Uses.

A. Agricultural Uses.

1. Structures housing poultry or livestock and waste removed from any structure shall be located no closer than 150 feet from any property line except that structures housing horses shall be located no closer than 60 feet from any property line. Corrals for bovine and equine animals are exempt from these setbacks.
2. Agricultural uses shall have a minimum lot size of 80,000 (R-80), 60,000 (R-60), or 40,000 (R-40, R-CD) square feet; provided, however, that a minimum of five acres shall be required for any agricultural use containing one or more livestock animals having a mature adult weight of 250 pounds or greater. Notwithstanding this requirement, lots whose agricultural use consists exclusively of one horse shall be required to have a minimum of 40,000 square feet of contiguous fenced land area designed to accommodate the horse. Such lots containing two horses shall be required to have a minimum of 80,000 square feet of contiguous fenced land area designed to accommodate the two horses.

(Ord. No. 2023-04, 2023-06-12)

B. Horse Farm or Academy. Structures housing horses shall be located no closer than 60 feet from any property line. Waste removed from any such structure shall be located no closer than 150 feet from any property line.**C. Family Care Home.** Consistent with the authority provided in 160D-907 family care homes are prohibited from being located within a one-half mile radius of an existing family care home.**D. Private Airstrips.**

1. The airstrips may be used only by the owners of the land on which the same is located; provided, however, if the airstrip is located on a bona fide farm, any airplanes engaged in crop dusting may use such airstrip in connection therewith;
2. No flying lessons shall be conducted in airplanes flying from or to the airstrip;
3. No commercial sales of airplanes, parts, or fuel shall be conducted at the airstrip;
4. The airstrip shall have been approved by the appropriate state and federal agencies.

E. Amateur Radio Towers. An amateur radio tower may also be located on a lot that contains another principal use or structure. In no instance, however, shall the amateur radio tower be located in the front yard of a lot containing another principal structure.**F. Customary Home Occupations.** Customary home occupations may be established in any dwelling unit. The following requirements shall apply in addition to all other applicable requirements of this UDO for the district in which such uses are located:

1. The home occupation shall be clearly incidental and subordinate to the residential use of the dwelling and shall not change the residential use of the dwelling.
2. No accessory buildings or outside storage shall be used in connection with the home occupation.
3. Use of the dwelling for the home occupation shall be limited to 25 percent of the area of the principal building.
4. Only residents of the dwelling may be engaged in the home occupation.
5. No display of products shall be visible from any adjoining streets or properties. Sales of products are limited to those made on the premises and those which are accessory to the service being provided.
6. No alterations to the exterior appearance of the residence or premises shall be made which changes the residential characteristics.
7. Only vehicles used primarily as passenger vehicles (e.g., automobiles, vans, and pick-up trucks) shall be permitted in connection with the conduct of the customary home occupation.
8. Chemical, mechanical, or electrical equipment that creates odor, light emission, noise, or interference with radio or television reception detectable outside of the dwelling shall be prohibited.

Engineering	Schematic Plan	Final Plat	Reference Number
A written recommendation by the Town Engineer confirming they have reviewed the application and, on a preliminary basis , that the plans meet the intent of the UDO regarding stormwater flow and SCM facilities.	X		B58 → B75A

Section D-917D.

A: Agricultural Uses

1. Structures housing ~~poultry~~ or livestock and waste removed from any structure shall be located no closer than 150 feet from any property line except that structures housing horses ~~or poultry~~ ("chicken coops") shall be located no closer than 60 feet from any property line. Corrals for bovine and equine animals are exempt from these setbacks.

MAY 6 changes no copies

Section D-917A.

Q: Tree Requirements.

2. Tree Save and Tree Replenish Requirements.

In order to maintain or replenish the Town tree canopy in any new major residential development the following shall apply:

- a. The tree removal is not permitted within areas that have naturally occurring trees located outside the ~~buildable area~~ buildable envelope of a lot or development. For the purpose of these provisions "buildable ~~area~~ envelope" means all areas located outside of:

- i. Required zoning district setbacks;
- ii. Existing and proposed street rights-of-way and easements;
- iii. Utility and drainage easements
- iv. Existing ponds, lakes, streams and their buffers

v. Septic drain fields

with inclusion of graphic by Jaclyn of buldy envelope

BD 12 T6 74

Staff offers the modification above for the Town Council's consideration and approval, as recommended by the Planning Board. Staff had recommended no text amendment to the Board. For ease of reference, new text is referenced in red/underlined font, while deletions are referenced in ~~strike through~~ font.