

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 2013 - 7:00 P.M.  
MINUTES**

The Planning Board of the Town of Weddington, North Carolina, met in a Regular Session in the Town Hall Council Chambers, 1924 Weddington Road, Weddington, NC 28104 on August 26, 2013, with Chairman Dorine Sharp presiding.

Present: Chairman Dorine Sharp, Vice-Chairman Rob Dow, Jennifer Romaine, John Giattino, Jeff Perryman, Janice Propst and Jim Vivian and Town Planner Jordan Cook and Town Administrator Amy McCollum

Absent: None

Visitors: Pete D'Adamo, Don Titherington, Kay Porter, Mario Caycedo, Donna DiDonato, Debi Daniels, Lance Daniels, Wes Mangum, Tonya Mangum, Susan Neubarer, Blane Neubarer, Bill Deter, Mike Emanuel, Jeremy Schumacher, Graham Wilson, Chris Duggan, Cory Riback, Rick Yager and Linda Watt

**Item No. 1. Open the Meeting.** Chairman Dorine Sharp called the August 26, 2013 Regular Planning Board Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**Item No. 2. Determination of Quorum/Additions or Deletions to the Agenda.** There was a quorum. There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

**Item No. 3. Old Business.** There was no Old Business.

**Item No. 4. New Business.**

**A. Review and Consideration - Bromley Map 7 Final Plat.** Town Planner Jordan Cook provided the following memo to the Planning Board:

Toll NC 11, LC submitted an application on August 16, 2013 for approval of the Final Plat of Map 7 in the Bromley subdivision located off of Hemby Road.

**Project Information:**

The Bromley subdivision is an approved 120 lot subdivision on 151.60 acres. The subdivision is located on Hemby Road. Bromley is being developed by Toll Brothers as a Conventional subdivision.

Map 7 is comprised of 25 lots on parcel 06-147-007. Map 7 was given Preliminary Plat approval on January 10, 2006.

The original deadline to submit the Final Plat was January 10, 2008. However, the Permit Extension Act of 2009 and 2010 essentially "froze time" from 2007 to 2010 giving Toll Brothers until January 10, 2014 to submit their Final Plat(s). The submitted Final Plat for Map 7 is similar to the approved Map 7 Preliminary Plat. The approved Preliminary Plat has been included in your packet.

**Map 7 Information:**

- Map 7 is 25 lots and 28.639 acres.
- Map 7 is not required open space on its own. The Bromley subdivision has provided 15.84 acres or 10.5% open space in accordance with the *Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.

- Development standards are as follows:
  - Minimum lot size- 40,000 sq. feet
  - Minimum lot width- 120 feet
  - Minimum front yard setback- 50 feet
  - Minimum rear yard setback – 40 feet
  - Minimum side yard setback – 15 feet
  - Minimum corner side yard setback – 25 feet
- Lots 23, 59, 60, 69 and 73 are the smallest lots within Map 7 at 40,000 square feet.
- Water and sewer services are provided by Union County Public Works (approvals on file).
- A copy of the approved Declared Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CCR's) for Bromley are on file at Town Hall.
- US Infrastructure has previously reviewed and approved the Preliminary Plat.
- All roads are built to NCDOT standards (final 1" layer of asphalt to be added after construction). Road names and addresses have been approved by Union County E911.
- All NCDENR, NCDOT and Union County approvals and permits are on file with the Town. These approvals were required during the Preliminary Plat process.

**The Bromley Map 7 Final Plat has been found to be in general compliance with the Town of Weddington Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances with the following conditions:**

1. Performance and Maintenance Bonds to be approved the Town Council (USI and Union County currently reviewing the bond estimates).
2. Each remaining lot to be recorded in the Bromley subdivision shall include on its Deed a statement that Fernhurst Terrace and Pondmeade Lane are private and not the responsibility of the Town of Weddington and shall be maintained by the Bromley Homeowners Association or its Developer;

The Planning Board also received the following:

- Application for Submittal of the Subdivision Final Plat
- A copy of the approved Preliminary Plat
- Bromley, Map 7 – Final Plat (28.639 acres)

---

It was determined that Vice-Chairman Rob Dow did not need to excuse himself from this discussion since he is not an adjacent property owner to this portion of the plat.

Planning Board members questioned how this phase fits in with the project as a whole and what were the changes that were made from the preliminary plat to the final plat.

Town Planner Cook advised that the changes made were minor tweaking of interior lot lines.

Mr. Jeff Perryman moved to send a favorable recommendation to the Town Council for the Bromley Subdivision Final Plat - Map 7 including the two conditions noted in Town Planner Cook's memo. Ms. Janice Propst seconded the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES:	Giattino, Vivian, Propst, Romaine, Perryman and Vice-Chairman Dow
NAYS:	None

**B. Review and Consideration - Union County Elevated Water Storage Tank Conditional Zoning Permit.** Town Planner Cook provided the following memo to the Planning Board:

Union County requests a Conditional Zoning Permit (CZ) for a 179 foot tall, 1.5 million gallon elevated water storage tank located along Hemby Road.

**Application Information:**

Date of Application: July 19, 2013

Applicant Name: Cynthia Coto (Union County-County Manager)

Owner Name: Lelia L. Morris

Parcel ID#: A portion of 06-120-004 and 06-120-004B in its entirety

Property Location: South side of Hemby Road between Providence Volunteer Fire Department and Hunter Lane (Weddington Woods subdivision)

Existing Zoning: R-40 and RCD

Proposed Zoning: R-40(CZ) and RCD(CZ)

Existing Land Use: Traditional Residential and Residential Conservation (no change proposed)

Existing Use: Vacant

Proposed Use: Elevated Water Storage Tank, Class II Essential Service

Parcel Size: 3.92 Acres (comprised of two tracts that will be recombined)

**General Information:**

- A Conditional Zoning Permit is required for a Class II Essential Service in the R-40 and RCD zoning districts. Water Storage is included as a Class II Essential Service in the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- The applicant is proposing a 179 foot tall, 1.5 million gallon elevated water storage tank within a fenced in area along Hemby Road.
- The proposed water tank style will be a composite tank with a 48 foot concrete diameter base and approximately 74 foot diameter bowl.
- The proposed facility will be accessed by a 20 foot wide gravel access road from Hemby Road. A decorative entrance gate will be placed 47 feet from the property line while an access gate at the facility entrance will be placed approximately 290 feet from the property line to reduce visibility of the facility from Hemby Road. The actual water tower will be located over 500 feet from Hemby Road.
- In addition to the water storage tank, the site will include a tank drainage/overflow vault, stormwater pond and a parking area comprised of four parking spaces.

**Minimum Standards for a Class II Essential Service in R-40 and RCD Zoning Districts:**

Minimum Lot Area- 40,000 square feet—combined lots are 3.92 acres or 170,755 square feet

Minimum Front Yard Setback- 75 feet—proposed setback is greater than 500 feet

Minimum Lot Width- 120 feet as measured at the front yard setback—proposed width is 176 feet

Minimum Side Yard Setbacks- 15 feet—proposed left and right side yard setbacks are 113 feet and 34 feet respectively

Minimum Rear Yard Setback- 40 feet—proposed setback is greater than 200 feet

- The proposed water storage tank complies with all minimum yard regulations and front, side and rear yard setbacks for a Class II Essential Service in the R-40 and RCD zoning districts as set forth in the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- The applicant will be required to submit a lot line revision plat. The lot line revision plat will include parcels 06-120-004 and 06-120-004B. All 1.278 acres of parcel 06-120-004B and 2.638 acres of parcel 06-120-004 will be included on the water tank site.

**Additional Information:**

- Screening and landscaping will be provided using new and existing (mature) vegetation.
- A 26 foot landscape buffer is required around the proposed water tank. Landscaping will be added to the front and northern perimeters of the property to meet these buffer requirements. A natural/existing tree buffer will surround the rear and southern perimeters of the property.
- Clearing will only occur where the access road will be installed and within the tank construction limits. All proposed landscaping complies with the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- Outdoor lighting will be minimal. Lighting on top of the tank will comply with Federal Aviation Administration requirements.
- The water tank does not have any pumps or other moving parts, therefore noise should not be a factor.
- The applicant has provided a map and pictures of the proposed water tank from various locations surrounding the water tank.
- The proposed water tank is exempt from the Town's maximum height restrictions per *Section 58-15* of the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- The property owner has provided written and notarized authorization to Union County to apply for the Conditional Zoning Permit.
- Two Public Involvement Meetings (PIM) were held in accordance with *Section 58-271* of the *Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
  - The first PIM was held on-site at parcel 06-120-004B on August 22, 2013 from 10:00am-12:00pm. There were approximately 35 attendees at that meeting.
  - The second PIM was held at Weddington Town Hall on August 26, 2013 from 4:30-6:30pm. There were approximately 35-40 attendees at this meeting.
  - Most attendees were not in support of the proposed water tank. Included in the packet is a list of questions that were asked by the public during the August 22<sup>nd</sup> PIM and the PIM tonight.

**Staff has reviewed the application and submitted documents and finds the Conditional Zoning Application is in compliance with the Town of Weddington Zoning Ordinance with the following conditions:**

1. All engineers (USI-Bonnie Fisher) comments must be addressed and completed prior to any construction;
2. Applicant must apply for NCDOT Driveway Permit for proposed driveway along Hemby Road;
3. Lot line revision plat must be approved and recorded by the Union County Register of Deeds prior to any construction.

The Planning Board also received the following:

- Conditional Zoning Application dated July 19, 2013
- A list of questions from the August 22, 2013 and August 26, 2013 On-Site Public Involvement Meetings
- Aerial Map
- Booklet Prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc. of the Carolinas regarding the Conditional Zoning Permit Application for the Elevated Water Storage Tank
- Drawings for the Weddington Elevated Storage Tank

Vice-Chairman Dow - For the future we are supposed to get the application 15 days prior to our meeting.

Town Planner Cook – We have never done that before. We have always gotten the Planning Board the packets the Wednesday or Thursday before the meeting.

Vice-Chairman Dow – Just a point of order. I read that from the application. I am a little confused of what we are doing here. We are to discuss this application for this site as to how it fits with our Zoning Ordinances and the Land Use Plan and to advise the Council as to whether this fits with those goals. However the Town Council has already voted for this site so what exactly are we doing here?

Chairman Sharp – We are reviewing the project. We did not choose the site. We are reviewing the project that they want to put on the site. We are not approving the site.

Vice-Chairman Dow – We are not reviewing the site whether it is applicable with the Land Use Plan?

Chairman Sharp – Yes we have to do that.

Vice-Chairman Dow – That has already been done.

Town Planner Cook – The Town Council endorsed a site. There was no plan or application. You have that information before you tonight. Conditional Zoning District rezonings are site specific plans. They did not endorse an actual plan or application.

Vice-Chairman Dow – That is why I am questioning why we would vote on anything site related.

Chairman Sharp – They have not seen the tower. Is the tower compatible if we put it on that site? Just for point of order for what Vice-Chairman Dow brought up, the sentence says that the Planning Board by majority vote may shorten or waive the time provided for receipt of the completed application. Can I get a motion to do that?

Vice-Chairman Dow moved to waive the 15-day time requirement. Mr. Perryman seconded the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES:	Giattino, Vivian, Propst, Romaine, Perryman and Vice-Chairman Dow
NAYS:	None

Chairman Sharp advised that Town Planner Cook and herself need to review the ordinance to look at those time periods to see what needs to change to meet that 15-day requirement.

Ms. Janice Propst – I would like to ask the Planning Board to consider sending this issue directly to the Town Council. This was discussed with the Town Attorney. As a group, there are two people on the Town Planning Board that are on public record regarding the location of where this water tower should go. One Planning Board member spoke publicly at a County Commissioners' Meeting and one spoke publicly at a Mayor's meeting. We have three members of the Planning Board that live in a neighborhood less than ½ of a mile where a lot of people are very upset. I am asking do we need to hear this? That leaves two people on this board that do not live within a ½ mile, have not been on public record stating their opinion of where the water tower should go and do not have a dog in the fight. Why don't we consider sending it to the Town Council for them to make the decision?

Chairman Sharp – We can choose not to make a decision. I do think one of the things that we do is look at potential conditions that we would like to see attached.

Town Administrator Amy McCollum – I did speak with Attorney Fox about this today. He said that this was legislative and not quasi-judicial. I did see an email that stated that two people had already made a statement. He did not feel uncomfortable with still hearing it and the Planning Board making a decision.

Chairman Sharp – I believe that all the people on this Board have the integrity to make the decision. I don't see that making a recommendation is going to hurt the integrity.

Mr. Perryman – I agree. I have worked with all of you. Even if you have an opinion I believe that we can hear this information, discuss it as a board and each express what we think about it and take a vote.

Vice-Chairman Dow – There are two forms of hearings: one is quasi-judicial and one is legislative. When it is a quasi-judicial you should not speak to anyone about it and you should not form any prior opinion and you certainly should not state it. If anyone does approach you, you should bring the entire discussion to the entire board so they have the ability to have all of those facts. That is quasi-judicial. Legislative is not at all encumbered by that. While there are two, me being one that may have stated for a site preference different than this there are probably three that have not spoke that have a preference like this. That is why Attorney Fox has said he is fine with it. It is totally legal for us to make an opinion on a legislative matter. At this point we are not actually looking at the site. We are doing the job we are supposed to do which is not policy and opinion. Our job is to look at an application, see how it fits with the Land Use Plan and our Zoning Ordinances and recommend to the Town Council favorable or unfavorable.

Mr. Pete D'Adamo – I am with HDR Engineers. This application shows a composite tank. We are going to show some other styles as well. This is a breakdown of the various water service areas that Union County has. This area is currently served by the 853 West Zone. Water systems are divided into zones in great part by topography in trying to maintain certain pressures and fire flows within those zones. The County has a pump station which operates this zone and it also pumps into the Indian Trail tank and the 853 Stallings Tank. There are a couple of issues that are trying to be addressed with this tank. There are current storage issues in the Weddington-Marvin service area. There is an insufficient amount of storage volume within the existing tanks for normal and emergency conditions. There are also pressure issues within this service area. The County is trying to establish a level of service – a minimum pressure in their water mains under static conditions. NCDENR has minimum requirements with respect to that. There are several residents that are on the public water system that do experience pressures that are less than 30 psi under normal conditions. This is below the level of service that is needed to properly operate the water system. There is a Waxhaw-Marvin Pump Station which pumps up into this service area so those residents on the water system that are near that pump station or in low lying areas when that pump station comes on actually experience high pressures. There is a problem both ways. The County through their master plan process completed in 2011 developed a hydraulic model for the entire County. We are focused right now on the 853 West Zone which is the current zone. They try to categorize it as areas that have less than 30 psi when the pump station is off and areas that are 30 to 40, 40 to 50 and greater than 50. One of the levels of service goals established in the master plan was to provide at least 40 psi static pressure to residents with 20 psi under fire flow conditions. When the pumps are off the red dots show areas along ridge lines and other areas where they experience low pressures below this level of service. As part of the master planning process the County has gone through several iterations of the master plan. Since 2005, there has always been a recommendation for a water tank in the Weddington Service Area. What was recommended was to create a new pressure zone partially out of the 853 zone. You can see on the map this is the Town corporate limits but this new 880 zone covers more than just the Town of Weddington. This zone would be created to address storage and low pressure issues, improve water service in terms of pressure and fire flows to residents. Right now as that pressure zone is defined on that plan the current number of accounts is approximately 6,200. From the master plan the projected 2030 average day demand for the 880 zone is about three million gallons per day. The recommendation is to site a new elevated storage tank in the Town of Weddington that will create this 880 zone. That means the max water level in the tank would be 880 feet above mean sea level and it would fluctuate about 20 feet or so up and down from there. As part of that master plan process, they plugged in the improvements

of the Weddington tank and this new zone creation and they went back in and remodeled what would happen with the pressures and again trying to provide a level of service of 40 psi. You can see a lot of those areas previously were red dots are up in the 40 to 50 psi. Some of the areas that had high pressures would experience low pressures as well. When you look at water storage tanks – some people look at them and think they are just to serve the domestic demand. There are several components that actually go into this – the demand and flow equalization, there is also a component for fire flow or emergency reserve. That goes into the sizing of the tank as well as the domestic demands. There is a component called equalization storage which is the peak hour demand minus the maximum day demand for six hours. The goal was to provide enough storage to be able to deliver 3,500 gallons per minute under fire flow conditions for three hours. There is an emergency reserve equal to half of the average day demand. The way this calculation was set up was whichever was greater the fire flow requirements or the emergency reserve was the overriding factor added onto the equalization storage. What was come up with was the size of this tank with the equalization and fire flow emergency storage was approximately 1.44 million gallons rounded up to 1.5 gallons. This is conditional zoning and is allowable under Class 2 essential services. This is the proposed site. You have the fire station here – it is approximately 500 feet from this corner to the center of the tank. From the road it is approximately 560 feet to the center of the tank. We have a gravel access road. There will be a gate here to make sure that folks do not access this and park in here. We did not want to put the fence too close to the road for aesthetic reasons. We also have a gate and fence surrounding the site here. We have two potable water lines. As part of this project, we are going to install a 20-inch water line up to the Weddington-Matthews Road intersection and tie into an existing 16-inch water line. Coming off of this new 20-inch water line will be two lines which one line will feed the tank and one line takes water from the tank. The reason why you have two lines is you want to be able to turn the tank over because of water quality considerations. There is a stormwater overflow structure and there is a stormwater basin which is designed to meet the Town's ordinance requirements.

Mr. Perryman – You said the tank was 1.5 million gallons. What is that overflow area designed to hold?

Mr. D'Adamo – The maximum capacity of that basin at the top of the berm is about 500,000 gallons – at the spillway it is 300,000 gallons. The primary reason for that is to deal with the impervious areas created on this site and it has a secondary benefit as it relates to the maintenance of the tank. There are a few parking spaces for County employees. There will be two doors. You can go into the pedestal. There will be a light over the top of the doors. We will comply with FAA requirements as it relates to other lighting based on those considerations. What we were told from FAA in a verbal conversation that for this location and where it is in relation to airports that the trigger to require a beacon or a light is 200 feet and right now we are under 180. There is no light planned for the tower. Regarding the landscaping plan, we mentioned about providing an evergreen buffer along those two sides of the tank and then maintaining the natural tree buffer down here in the back of the property. The landscaping and screening will be in compliance with your ordinance. The basic dimensions of the tank – the storage capacity is 1.5 million gallons, the tank is approximately 179 feet tall and bowl diameter of 74 feet and tank base is 48 feet and where the water sits in the top of the bowl is approximately 50 feet. The max water level would be 880 and the floor elevation as shown on the plans is 721 feet. We have looked at a couple different styles of tanks. This is called a composite tank. The stem is concrete and the top part is steel. We had a meeting previously and we showed different types. General consensus from those that were interested in rendering an opinion was that a tall bowl composite was the most preferable of the types of designs.

Mr. Vivian questioned whether this tower was similar in size to the one on Highway 218.

Union County advised that tower on Highway 218 was 235 feet tall and was 1 million gallons.

Mr. Perryman – Is one design more robust?

Mr. D'Adamo – The single pedestal tank is the most robust. You learn from history one of the problems associated with failure of tanks in a natural disaster is flying debris. If you see tanks with multiple skinny legs those are less robust because they may be subject to flying debris hitting one of those legs.

Mr. Giattino – What color is the tank going to be?

Mr. D'Adamo – I have a rendering of one of the colors. The public wanted the tower to be understated. The color is called Heavenly Blue.

Chairman Sharp - A color rendering is in our book. Before they start construction, they will have to bring construction documents to us and we will look at the color at that time.

Town Planner Cook – We will have architectural standards on this and that will be determined at a later time.

Chairman Sharp – Are you committed to one of the other two styles or is that up to Town Council?

Mr. D'Adamo – What is shown on the plan is the composite tank. Water tanks are designed as critical structures to withstand major weather events. There have been discussions about tanks and how durable they are and concerns about disasters of that nature. They are built very structurally sound. That does not say there is not a failure. Sometimes they are the last thing standing. We did some photo renderings for this presentation. The tank site is shown there. These are along Hemby Road and we have renderings from Providence Woods South. What we did was take a fire truck back there and raise it up 30 to 40 feet above the tops of the houses. This is across the street from the site, the fire station is right here, this is the composite style and that is the spheroid style. Site 2 is looking at the fire station up closer to the intersection. Some of these pictures were taken before leaf growth and some after. This is a birdseye view of the tank heading west looking towards the south along Hemby Road. This is further down Hemby Road looking down that same direction. We took one shot from Greenbrook Parkway. We brought the fire truck there and raised the ladder up above the roof line and took some pictures from different views in that community.

There was a discussion that a cell tower is in the same vicinity that is approximately 185 feet.

Mr. Ed Goscicki – If the community residents cannot see the cell tower they probably will not be able to see the water tower.

Mr. D'Adamo – We also did some renderings for landscaping plans. Union County is in discussion with the property owner to see if they would be willing to provide an easement to do some additional landscaping. Those discussions are ongoing. There is no actual agreement on that.

Vice-Chairman Dow – The Master Water Plan is good through 2030. Does that take into consideration Weddington's growth now until 2030 or is that simply your projected building plan for 2030?

Mr. Goscicki – The 2030 Master Plan looks at the projected growth in Union County and our service area for the next 20 years.

Vice-Chairman Dow – This would satisfy us to 2030 with the growth that you are anticipating?

Mr. Goscicki – Correct. The tank is specific for this zone and we looked at the potential growth in this area.

Mr. Perryman – In one of your publications the statement was made that in the future there would be other towers and other storage towers required in this end of the County. Based on your projections have you even looked at where the next one is going to be?

Mr. Goscicki – This is the only water tank in this pressure zone in the master plan. This is for the next 20 years. There are three more tanks in Union County for the next 20 years.

Ms. Propst – This is for 20 years to cover Weddington and Marvin. In the future would Marvin actually be considered for the next water tank?

Mr. Goscicki – You tell me what the growth is going to be the next 30 years from now.

Ms. Propst – In the past we have asked why Weddington has to have it. There were reasons why Marvin was not suitable but Weddington had to have the water tank.

Mr. Goscicki – Weddington has the high ground. We are creating a smaller zone served by this one new tank. Right now there are two tanks in the Indian Trail area. One is very small (150,000 gallon tank). Those tanks will still exist and serve the balance of what is left of the 853 pressure zone. The new tank will only serve this 880 pressure zone. They are all connected. Water can flow from one zone to the next. If we need to pull water from the lower pressure zone you can get water here but you are going to be operating at a lower pressure until you can correct the situation.

Chairman Sharp – We talked about the height of the tower and because it is under 200 feet it is not going to need a light. In previous discussions I have asked the question about co-locating cell towers and you never indicated that you have any intentions of doing that.

Mr. Goscicki – We have had no conversations or contact with any of the cell companies. It is not in our plan.

Chairman Sharp – Would you have an objection to a condition that nothing could be placed on the tank that would make it any higher?

Mr. Goscicki – I would not have any problem with that.

Mr. Perryman – I know that at the two Public Involvement Meetings that I sat in on a question was asked regarding if this water tower would affect local wells. I believe that your group said that there are no tanks currently in Union County that feed from an aquifer under the tank. Have you heard of that being done before?

Mr. Goscicki – There are no plans to use ground water at all as a primary water source. Our primary water source right now is the Catawba River. The ground water supplies here are not productive enough for municipal water supply. This is purely storage.

Mr. Perryman – It is a 1.5 million gallon tank. In the unlikely event that tank would get a hole in it, fall down and that 1.5 million gallons goes out I believe you stated earlier that the current retention pond is 500,000 gallons. Is there enough land or real estate that you have that you can up that to one million gallons so that you could be reducing the amount of water that would be spilling out in the areas around that tank?

Mr. Goscicki – The challenge is that the only way that 1.5 million gallons would fall out of that tank would be under a catastrophic failure. If it is a catastrophic failure I do not know how we would design a storage area on site for that type of failure.

Mr. Perryman – Could the berms be raised?

Mr. Goscicki – I don't think we could design it for an anticipation of a catastrophic failure because of the definition you do not know the nature of that failure.

Mr. Giattino – You could do a scenario if it did fall over how long it would take for the water to dissipate and how many feet to safe distance. Have you done any of that type of analysis?

Mr. Goscicki – This is proven technology that has been around for a lot of years.

Chairman Sharp – There has been discussion that some homeowners within a certain distance would have to get flood insurance in case of a failure. Are you going to have some type of liability insurance?

Mr. Goscicki – The County cannot indemnify. We are a County government. The Town of Weddington cannot indemnify private residents. It is against the law.

Mr. Perryman – I called my insurance agent – Farm Bureau. I have had insurance with them for over 30 years. I asked my agent several questions because I am trying to get educated on insurance. Water damage in the house – what are people insured for and not. The scenarios that I gave him were you go on a week vacation and the pipe burst you come home and there is water everywhere. Your homeowners insurance covers that. What about if there is a storm and a thunderstorm comes through and a tree falls over and knocks a hole in my roof and it rains and soaks the upstairs. He said we are covered because that is an act of God. I said about the water tower issue and it bursts and 1.5 million gallons comes down. He told me that in the State of North Carolina the industry standard is if a house is damaged by surface water whether it is from the water tower or it is from another hurricane that comes through if you are in a low lying area and there is enough rain that water is running down in your house that is considered surface water. If one of their 24 inch pipe breaks and you are in a low lying area and before you can get the water shut off that water goes down and floods your basement, that's surface water. What requires flood insurance - anything designated as a flood area by FEMA. FEMA is the one that says this is the potential of a flood occurring and they give it a rating and then that rating is what the insurance companies use. What I got from it is that they consider water from a water tower just like they would if the river got out or if their main supply burst and that surface water got in your house.

Ms. Romaine – Is it required?

Mr. Perryman – No. That is up to you as a homeowner to decide what you think the potential of that happening. They did not require it but it is not covered.

Ms. Romaine – I see that the driveway is pushed over to one side of the lot – the fire department is on the other. Are there any future plans for the fire department to use that unused land?

Mr. Goscicki – We have had discussions with the fire department. They have expressed interest in possibly leasing property from us or getting an easement for some of that property to be used for a septic field for their expansion. We told them we would be happy to work with them on that.

Ms. Romaine – Is that alarming to anyone that a septic field is going to be going in on the same property as water lines coming in and out of a water tower that supplies water?

Mr. D'Adamo - The State requires certain separation distances between potable water lines and septic fields. They would have to comply with that.

Mr. Goscicki – The water line is under pressure. So if there is any leakage water it is going out of the pipeline and you are not getting leech from a septic field into the water pipeline. If anything you would have water going out because it is under pressure. The water going in and out of the pipe is pressurized all the time.

Mr. Vivian- Is there a minimum acreage requirement for these?

Mr. D'Adamo – No basically where it will fit making sure you have enough room to construct it to work around the tank as it is built.

Town Planner Cook – We require 40,000 square feet.

Vice-Chairman Dow – How is the maintenance and turnover of the water handled?

Mr. Goscicki – You actually drain it out into the system. The water is going in and out continuously. Every five to 10 years you need to go in and do an inspection or some major maintenance every 10 years in terms of repainting. You just drain the tank then.

Mr. D'Adamo – The tank also has an overflow which is required. The operation of the pump will be monitored and levels of the tank will be monitored to ensure that overflow does not happen. When you drain the tank to do this maintenance there may be a small amount of the total volume that may have to be discharged through the drainage structure into the basin.

Mr. Giattino – Where are the pumps?

Mr. D'Adamo – We are anticipating them being at New Town Road and Providence Road. We are actually building a new pump station as part of this project. We are in negotiations with the property owner on that right now on the northeast corner.

Vice-Chairman Dow – I am going to nail you down on that. You have to blow out the lines and clear it all out. Are you talking about 200,000 gallons?

Mr. D'Adamo – You are talking about 100,000 gallons. That would be controlled. When they get ready to do maintenance they will make sure that is controlled.

Chairman Sharp – How often does maintenance have to be done?

Mr. D'Adamo – These days utilities will hire a diver and once every five years they will go into a full tank and inspect and look at corrosion issues. Every 10 to 15 years is when you would take the tank down and have to recoat and address any corrosion issues.

Vice-Chairman Dow – What is the difference between that water and when someone is turning their sprinkler on in their yard if they are on city water?

Mr. Goscicki – Nothing. That is the water. It is the same water that is coming out of the faucet.

Vice-Chairman Dow – The concern about a huge amount of chlorine hitting a creek immediately at the same time.

Mr. D'Adamo – That drainage structure is equipped with a de-chlorination system. We have incorporated that in the design. That is not standard.

Ms. Romaine – Where is the water chlorinated?

Mr. D'Adamo – At the water treatment plant.

Mr. Perryman – I think I heard you say that you are still in negotiations with the property owner to get the right-of-way on Hemby Road for that additional screening. Can you give us any idea if that is looking positive?

Mr. Goscicki – We have only had preliminary discussions. It is the same property that we have been dealing with.

Vice-Chairman Dow – Have you gotten specifics about the trees along the berm and borders that you are planting? Are you open to suggestions and amounts?

Mr. D'Adamo – We will follow your ordinance and yes.

Vice-Chairman Dow – Do we have any say in our ordinance on that?

Town Planner Cook – We have a list. It is a minimum of when it is planted. All trees shall have a minimum caliper of two inches measured six inches above the ground at the time of planting. From a previous meeting, our Town landscaper said that was a 12 to 14 foot tree when planted.

Mr. Perryman – Didn't at the last meeting the Council ask specifically that bigger trees be planted for the church? There is a precedent for the Town asking for bigger trees to be planted initially.

Town Planner Cook – That is true. It does not even have to be a precedent. It is a conditional zoning rezoning. You can ask the applicant to add that as a condition.

Chairman Sharp – Probably the only place they cannot add that is along Hemby Road because that is not required in our ordinance and not part of this site.

Mr. Perryman – We could make a request.

Chairman Sharp – We could certainly ask that they consider planting bigger trees. We can only control the landscaping on this parcel because there is no requirement for landscaping on an easement along Hemby Road.

Mr. Perryman – When you have a project like this and you are building a tower, how long is it from the start to when you turn on?

Mr. D'Adamo – About a year.

Vice-Chairman Dow – Am I assuming that the darker lines are the new grading lines and the lighter lines are current topo lines?

Mr. D'Adamo – Correct.

Vice-Chairman Dow – Since there is no wetlands or water, DENR does not need to look at this at all?

Mr. D'Adamo – They approve a tank. They are not looking at it from the standpoint of any releases of any kind. There is no discharge permit associated with a water tank.

Chairman Sharp – How did you determine the size of the pond?

Mr. D'Adamo – To meet your ordinance requirements.

Mr. Perryman – If the berm is designed for a ½ million based on the topography why can't you extend that berm to 750,000 or 1 million.

Mr. D'Adamo – It would have to be looked at in the context of trying to build the tank and where equipment has to go.

Vice-Chairman Dow – The new line along the back - is that the new line that you are carving property out of?

Mr. D'Adamo – Correct.

Vice-Chairman Dow – My big problem is that you have a 179-foot tower 34 feet from a property line and that is a property line which you have put in through a purchase. What would go 36 feet from them? What would you do with that? Is this just the case of not wanting to spend enough money to give it a real buffer?

Chairman Sharp – It is a case of what is in our ordinance and what we require. We have front, rear and side setbacks and they are not required to have more property because they more than met the setbacks.

Vice-Chairman Dow – For an antenna in someone's back yard we have a fall zone.

Town Planner Cook – Yes we have a fall zone for a cell tower so the fall zone is 1 ½ times the height of that cell tower.

Vice-Chairman Dow – I am not really concerned with the thing falling down. I guess there is a possibility. I am concerned about the aesthetics of it that close to the property line and what happens to the other property.

Ms. Romaine – It affects the property owners because lenders will not lend on homes that are within a fall zone of a water tower.

Chairman Sharp – How do you define the fall zone?

Ms. Romaine – The height.

Mr. Perryman – Is that any water tower?

Ms. Romaine – Yes – FHA at last check.

Mr. Giattino – Is the adjacent property owner you are talking about the same property owner that is selling that land? So they are making the conscious decision to sell that piece of land and have this 34 feet from their property line.

Chairman Sharp – We have added one condition that nothing be added to the tower that would take it over the constructed height. We need to talk about consistency with the Land Use Plan. Any decision or vote that we make we have to state that it is or is not consistent with the Land Use Plan.

Ms. Romaine – In reviewing the Land Use Plan in accordance with this project there are definitely arguments for both. Is the Land Use Plan required to discuss public utilities?

Town Planner Cook – Nothing is a requirement.

Ms. Romaine - Our Land Use Plan makes a case for both sides. Our Land Use Plan mentions that a significant aspect of Weddington's planning process has been the high level of citizen involvement. I received a lot of emails. There has been a lot of chatter at the meetings. We have had probably the largest audience that we have had since I have been a member of the Planning Board. I think you need to take that into consideration. We do have a lot of voices coming to the table.

Chairman Sharp – We do not take public opinion into account.

Ms. Romaine – Correct but we take the Land Use Plan and that is mentioned in the Land Use Plan the fact that a significant aspect of Weddington's planning process is the high level of citizen involvement.

Chairman Sharp – We have had citizens speak which is wonderful. That statement is just saying that we have a high level of involvement and they are certainly encouraged to stay in contact with the Town Council.

Ms. Romaine – On Page 10 under Community Vision it states that new growth must occur (which can or cannot apply to the water tower) within the framework which is in keeping with the existing rural community character which avoids negative social, economic and environmental effects on the Town. This is going to be an environmental effect on many of the residents surrounding this water tower.

Chairman Sharp – Do you have any data on the effect on property values surrounding a water tower when it is constructed?

Mr. D'Adamo – I do not have any. I am sure it has been looked at.

Ms. Romaine – As a realtor there are many homes that have higher days on the market and they have to sell at a lower price that are surrounding a water tower.

Chairman Sharp – That could be difficult to look at because there would be other things with that particular house.

Ms. Romaine – Page 14, Goal 1 – to ensure all new development takes place in a manner that conserves open space and scenic views. This is going to affect the scenic views. Goal 3 – minimize the visual effect of development from surrounding properties and roadways. This will affect surrounding properties.

Chairman Sharp – I think that is why they are talking about the landscaping and their goal is to minimize the effect by adding additional trees.

Ms. Romaine – Which would be hard to do with a 179-foot tower. Policy 5 – ensure that new development is consistent with the Town's quality and aesthetic values thereby protecting property values. This tower does not do that. Page 16, Policy 11 - ensure that land uses abutting residential developments are compatible with the scale, intensity and overall character in existing and planning neighborhoods. A water tower does not do that. Page 20, Goal 1 – to maintain and enhance the Town's aesthetic qualities and visual character. The water tower does not do that. These are just a few. People move to the Town because of the quality of life and the rural character. The water tower is the exact opposite of that.

Chairman Sharp – On Page 19, Goal 2 - to ensure that all existing and future developments in Weddington are served by adequate water and sewage disposal facilities. If you look at Page 34, in order to maintain a high quality of life for residents of residential areas the Town needs to ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are available to serve them in a convenient and functional manner. Infrastructure includes adequate needs for access and mobility, water and sewer service and stormwater systems.

Mr. Giattino – I probably have five to six others items. We as the Town need to work to supply adequate water and essential services and work with Public Works. It is an essential service. We have a crisis about to happen. Water is a public safety issue. I get the fact that no one wants this in their back yard.

Chairman Sharp – Basically what you are saying is you can make a case being consistent with the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Perryman – I asked specifically at one of the meetings what were the primary concerns with this site. I tried to do my homework. I have four areas: safety, aesthetics, impact on residential home values and the potential for future commercial development. On the safety issue, the tower could collapse. Yes that is a possibility. Obviously anything could collapse but based on the information we have been given about the standards it is probably very unlikely. I was given examples of two municipal type towers that have collapsed. One was in Indiana in 2011. It was unexplained. It was one of the towers with multiple legs. The other municipal tank was in Delaware. This occurred in 2010 and that was a tank that was used to augment the pressure in fire hydrant lines. It did not say it was for public consumption. As far as safety goes in my opinion the likelihood of a spontaneous collapse is very unlikely. We have already covered the water damage insurance question. Aesthetics - I have heard that it is not in harmony with the rural area, don't want to see it, eyesore, we would be losing open space by putting it there. Is the size large? Yes it is but there is also a 185-foot cell tower which is 1,000 feet from where this tower is supposed to be. This tower in 1996 was raised from 150 feet to 185 feet. As far as aesthetics is concerned that tower has been there since before 1996 and there are no recorded complaints.

Chairman Sharp – I have had people say to me "What cell tower?".

Mr. Perryman – I will also say it is not a fair comparison to make between the cell tower and water tower. The Land Use Plan talks about ensuring public safety. Property values will automatically go down and commercial development will definitely follow. I have been told that in person. I have read it in the emails that we have received that when the tower goes up this is what is going to happen and my property, values are going to drop. One gentleman claimed that he had data to show that they will drop 25 to 35% for adjoining property owners. I have some friends that are in the appraisal business. I talked with a gentleman that is local. His name is Stout. He works locally and regionally. He has been doing appraisals for residential properties for 38 years. He has specifically done work in doing analysis with power lines, substations, cell towers and water towers. What he has told me there is no guarantee either way. They could go up or down. Nobody can predict what will happen to the property values in the future. He also said that the County probably would not devalue that property automatically when the

tower goes up. I made a call to the County Tax Office to ask if that ever happened in Union County. The lady that I talked to said not to her knowledge but she was not the appraiser. I did put in a message for him to call me and he has not returned my phone call. As an example of what happens around a water tower once it is built. The example that he gave me was at 7<sup>th</sup> and Pecan in Charlotte. That is the Elizabeth neighborhood. I drove down there and walked around the neighborhood. It sits on a block between 7<sup>th</sup> Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street. It has been there a long time. If the tower goes up there is going to be nothing but low commercial property there. Property values are going to go south. On the street side there are some restaurants and boutiques that face on 7<sup>th</sup> Street. The question was what kind of residential will wind up around one. This is what I found. There is one slide that shows there is a house that the back yard is adjacent to the fence. That is another picture of that house with the water tower backing up to it. There was also a "for sale" sign on the house. I am standing in the front yard with the house that has the "for sale" sign so I called the number and asked what they were asking for the house. It is a little bungalow. It is 1,500 square feet with three bedrooms and two baths. They are asking \$399,900. I am sure it does not sit on an acre of land. Just in the interest of saying that there is no guarantee that our property values are going to go down and what is going to wind up here is going to be something that is totally unacceptable in the future. I wanted to show that as an example. Speaking of the commercial, I asked Jordan how many pieces of residential property had been converted to commercial in his four years of being with the Town and he said it was one property – Polivka. You said the one before that was the bank. I know the time I have been on this board how difficult it is to convert property from one to the other and the process that is involved and I personally think the Land Use Plan accompanied with our current ordinances provide an extreme amount of protection for any commercial conversion to that property over there. I know this is hard on everybody. This is our third time around on this. My personal opinion is that wherever a tower goes in our Town somebody is not going to be happy about it. The only thing that has changed with the comments has been the people making them. Same thing is being said that it is going to ruin my property values and you are going to put commercial across the street. I wish there was a way that we could absolutely guarantee that is not going to happen and we can't. We have to make a decision because we have people without water. We have 94 fire hydrants in Town and 84 of them are below pressure and two of them have zero pressure and that was from the survey that was done in 2011. We need a water tower. I wish there was a way to take care of all of these concerns. The question is does it meet the code and the Land Use Plan and I believe that it does. I will be glad to share any of this information with any one that wants to see it.

Vice-Chairman Dow – I am surprised especially from the PIM tonight how many people are mistaken about the last two processes for the site. In my mind I don't think anyone questions that the Town has a water problem. The past sites were not turned down because they didn't think we needed it. There was some confusion from the public about that earlier. I go through the Land Use Plan. It requires us to come up with water as we grow. It is a basic service. We have to have to water. It is safety. You go through the Land Use Plan and there are 15 reasons why we need to take care of this. None of those are specific to this application. I am not saying we do not need a water tower. I appreciate what Jeff is showing here - a 50-year old water tower in a beautiful area that has been redone in downtown Charlotte. I don't think that is the same for a field in Weddington surrounded by 170 acres of undeveloped land. I am concerned about it being that close to adjoining property.

Mr. Giattino – I would like to make a condition to have substantially larger vegetation.

Town Planner Cook noted that the previous condition placed by the Council for the church was the following: Trees and scrubs to exceed the Town's minimum landscaping requirements. He stated, "We require that 25% of the trees planted are evergreens."

Ms. Propst – It was discussed at the PIM to have a smaller size of a tower.

Chairman Sharp - That is not part of this application. The Town Council can discuss that. That is nothing that we can be a part of.

Mr. Perryman – The strip that they are trying to get the right-of-way we can't make that a requirement we can make that a request. I would like to put that in as well.

Ms. Romaine – Could we make a condition that the Town Council approach Union County regarding a ground level storage tank?

Chairman Sharp – No, but you as a citizen of Weddington can certainly contact the Town Council.

Ms. Romaine – It is not really the Town; it is the County.

Ms. Propst – You can also come and speak as a citizen and ask the County and Town to consider a lower tower.

Chairman Sharp – We cannot make that a condition attached to this.

Ms. Romaine – I wanted to clear that up that it is not the Town's decision to have a ground level tank – it is the County and Union County Public Work's decision.

Chairman Sharp – The Town and County would have to work together to decide that. I believe that former Mayor Anderson talked about ground level tanks before and it was the excessive cost and Union County said something about the Town paying the difference in costs.

Mr. Perryman – What they said at that time is that the costs would be more than double for the tank and the Town would be responsible for that difference and for the annual maintenance costs to maintain it.

Vice-Chairman Dow – I appreciate the bend in the driveway. When you are driving by there and for years to come it is just an open field and you are going to look at the 48 foot base and those trees along the road are going to be fine but something along the driveway with a bend in it would completely block the view of the base from the road.

Mr. Perryman – I would still like to ask if that berm could be enlarged for a larger water capacity.

It was advised that they do not have the space to enlarge that area.

Mr. Perryman moved to send a favorable recommendation to the Town Council for the Union County Elevated Water Storage Tank with the following conditions:

- All engineers (USI-Bonnie Fisher) comments must be addressed and completed prior to any construction
- Applicant must apply for NCDOT Driveway Permit for proposed driveway along Hemby Road
- Lot line revision plat must be approved and recorded by the Union County Register of Deeds prior to any construction.
- Nothing can be added to the tower to extend the height
- Trees and scrubs to exceed Town's minimum landscaping requirements
- Recommendation – Landscaping of possible easement if obtained by Union County

Ms. Propst seconded the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Perryman, Propst, Giattino  
NAYS: Vivian, Romaine and Vice-Chairman Dow

Chairman Sharp voted in the affirmative; therefore, breaking the tie. She stated, “I really do lean on the side of safety. The fact that the fire hydrants do not have adequate pressure and I do not think the Town can keep waiting and going through the process over and over again.”

**C. Review and Consideration - Lake Forest Preserve Phase 3B Final Plat.** Town Planner Cook provided the following memo to the Planning Board:

Orleans Homebuilders submitted an application on June 21, 2013 for approval of the Final Plat of Phase 3B in the Lake Forest Preserve subdivision located on Weddington Road.

**Project Information:**

The Lake Forest Preserve Subdivision is an approved 211 lot subdivision on 260.61 acres. The subdivision is located at the intersection of Weddington Road (NC 84) and Cox Road. Lake Forest Preserve is being developed by Orleans Homebuilders as an R-CD conservation subdivision.

Phase 3B is comprised of 13 lots (tax parcel 06-099-009) and was given Preliminary Plat approval on May 9, 2005. The original deadline to submit the Final Plat was May 9, 2007. However, the Permit Extension Act of 2009 and 2010 essentially “froze time” from 2007 to 2010 giving Orleans Homebuilders until May 9, 2013 to submit their Final Plat(s). The submitted Final Plat for Phase 3B is identical to the approved Preliminary Plat showing Phase 3B.

**Phase 3B Information:**

- Phase 3B is 13 lots and 7.533 acres.
- Phase 3B is not required open space on its own. The Lake Forest Subdivision has provided 138.81 acres of conservation land in accordance with *Section 58-58 (4) of the Weddington Zoning Ordinance*.
- Development standards are as follows:
  - Minimum lot size- 12,000 sq. feet
  - Minimum lot width- 80 feet
  - Minimum front yard setback- 20 feet
  - Minimum rear yard setback – 30 feet
  - Minimum side yard setback – 15 foot separation of structures
- Lots 54 and 58 are the smallest lot within Phase 3B at 17,903 square feet.
- All adjacent parcels either owned or maintained by Lake Forest Preserve Homeowners Association.
- Water and sewer services are to be provided by Union County Public Works (approvals on file).
- A copy of the approved Declared Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CCR's) for Lake Forest Preserve are on file at Town Hall. Those CCR's address ownership and maintenance of all conservation lands and have been approved by the Town Attorney.
- US Infrastructure has previously reviewed and approved the Preliminary Plat.
- All roads are built to NCDOT standards (final layer of asphalt to be added after construction). Road names and addresses have been approved by Union County E911.
- All NCDENR, NCDOT and Union County approvals and permits are on file with the Town. These approvals were required during the Preliminary Plat process.

**The Lake Forest Preserve Phase 3B Final Plat has been found to be in general compliance with the Town of Weddington Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances with the following exceptions:**

1. Performance and Maintenance Bonds to be approved the Town Council (USI and Union County currently reviewing the bond estimates).

The Planning Board also received the following:

- Application for Submittal of the Subdivision Final Plat
- A copy of the approved Preliminary Plat
- Lake Forest Preserve – Phase 3B Map 1

Vice-Chairman Dow moved to send a favorable recommendation to the Town Council for the Final Plat for Lake Forest Preserve Phase 3B. Mr. Giattino seconded the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES:	Giattino, Vivian, Propst, Romaine, Perryman and Vice-Chairman Dow
NAYS:	None

**D. Discussion of Conservation Subdivisions – Permitted Versus Conditional.** Chairman Sharp - When conservation subdivisions were first put in the ordinance they were a permitted use. They were made a conditional use after Mayor Anderson was elected. The question is what vision do we want for the Town? It is extra work, time and money to build a conservation subdivision as far as the public hearing.

Town Planner Cook – We have four to five subdivisions going on right now and pretty much every developer I have talked to wants to do a conservation subdivision because there are less infrastructure costs. They advise that the open space looks great in Weddington but there is not a guarantee because it is conditional zoning. These developers are telling me that they would rather do conservation subdivisions but cannot risk doing full engineering for the preliminary plat with no guarantee.

Vice-Chairman Dow - On top of which if they have a \$10 million piece of property they are paying \$100,000 a month. The conditional zoning process takes at a minimum one more month.

Chairman Sharp - The question is should we ask Jordan to present text to us next month moving conservation subdivisions from conditional zoning back to permitted uses?

Mr. Perryman - Has there ever been an applicant for a conservation subdivision that we have turned down?

Chairman Sharp – Yes, it was on Antioch Church Road. There was a very large parcel on the west side and a very small parcel across the street. What people complained about the most was because the stream went through the center of the property that would be your conservation land and the parcel on the east side of Antioch Church Road would end up with houses ranging from 12,000 to 14,000 square foot lots.

Vice-Chairman Dow – We had a meeting at the high school and had four experts talking about how great this plan was. There was such uproar and I think some of it was misunderstood. I sense a shift and people are starting to realize that if Weddington continues along with its traditional subdivisions mostly that you have going to have a house on every acre and that this may not be a good idea after all.

Chairman Sharp - We review the sketch plans for conservation subdivisions but not conventional subdivisions. The fact that they have to do a yield plan would not change. The only thing that would

change is the fact that they know if they meet all the conditions of the ordinance when they go to the Town Council it is a permitted right.

Ms. Romaine – It is basically dropping the public hearing.

Vice-Chairman Dow – It would also be removing the Town Council’s ability to turn them down. There is a large parcel that may be coming in on Cox Road and it is a large open tract. We have had property values go up and down over the past few years and that will determine the price of the houses that are built. You are beginning to see tract builders coming to Weddington.

Ms. Propst - That is because the value of the property went down.

Vice-Chairman Dow – You are going to have a different style of home because the lots have come down in price.

Town Planner Cook - Are you prepared to approve only conservation subdivisions? I do not know of a developer that is going to come in and choose the conventional route. That is something to think about.

Ms. Propst - There are still several people in Weddington that are adamant about R-40.

The Planning Board asked that Town Planner Cook discuss this idea with the Town Council at their next meeting to see if they are receptive before preparing text to be reviewed.

**Item No. 5. Update from Town Planner.** Town Planner Cook provided the following update memo to the Planning Board:

- Construction on the roundabout located at NC 84 and Weddington-Matthews Road is expected to be completed by August 25, 2013.
- The Highclere Conservation Subdivision submitted their Preliminary Plat and this item will be on the September 23<sup>rd</sup> Planning Board agenda.
- At their August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Town Council approved only Phase I of the St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church. Phase I includes only the 15,433 square foot multi-function building. Phases II, III and IV were not approved.
- At their August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Town Council approved the Atherton Estates Subdivision Modification Request and Preliminary Plat. As part of their approval, they did not require the applicant to connect to the adjacent property.
- At their August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Town Council approved the wedding/banquet facility text amendment. This text change added the wedding/banquet facility to all residential zoning districts as a conditional use and left conference centers in the MX zoning district. On Friday, I received a conditional zoning application from the Alexanders off of New Town Road.
- At their August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Town Council approved the All Nations Church CUP for three mobile classrooms.
- The following items will be on the September 9<sup>th</sup> Town Council agenda:
  - Lake Forest Preserve Phase 3B Final Plat
  - Bromley Map 7 Final Plat
  - Anderson Agritourism CZ Permit
- The following items may be on the September Planning Board agenda for discussion:
  - Bard Property Preliminary Plat
  - Highclere Preliminary Plat
  - Height Exemption Text Amendment

- TUP Text Amendment
- CUP Text Amendment regarding PRD's

**Item No. 6. Other Business.**

**A. Report from the August Town Council Meeting.** The Planning Board received a copy of the August Town Council agenda as information.

**Item No. 7. Adjournment.** Ms. Propst moved to adjourn the August 26, 2013 Regular Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Giattino seconded the motion, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES:	Giattino, Vivian, Propst, Romaine, Perryman and Vice-Chairman Dow
NAYS:	None

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

---

Chairman Dorine Sharp

Attest:

---

Amy S. McCollum, Town Clerk