CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

PETITION INFORMATION					
Docket #	W-3397				
Staff	Gary Roberts, Jr. AICP				
Petitioner(s)	Jak Ventures, LLC				
Owner(s)	Same				
Subject Property	PIN 6822-53-6158				
Address	1865 Olivers Crossing Drive				
Type of Request	Site Plan Amendment for property zoned RM8-S (F-1325).				
Proposal	The petitioner is proposing to add multifamily residential buildings to the existing RM8-S site plan. The previously approved uses for this site are: • Residential Building, Townhouse and Residential Building, Multifamily				
Continuance History	This rezoning request was originally submitted for the February 2019 Planning Board meeting and was continued, first to the March 2019 meeting and later to the April 2019 meeting. The request was continued for the third and final time to the May 2019 meeting. Because the Planning Board is required to provide the City Council with a recommendation on each rezoning request it receives within 120 days of the original filing date, the Board must make a recommendation at the May 2019 meeting.				
Neighborhood Contact/Meeting	A summary of the petitioner's neighborhood outreach is attached.				
- ·	GENERAL SITE INFORMATION				
Location	West side of Olivers Crossing Drive, west of Peters Creek Parkway				
Jurisdiction	City of Winston-Salem				
Ward(s)	South				
Site Acreage	± 11.10 acres				
Current Land Use	The site is currently undeveloped.				
	Direction	Zoning District	Use		
Surrounding	North	RS9	Undeveloped property and single family homes		
Property Zoning and Use	East	RM8-S & NSB-S	Townhomes and the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center		
	South	RM12-S	Multifamily residential		
	West	RS9	Single family homes		
Applicable Rezoning Consideration	(R)(2) - Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?				
from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) The approved multifamily residential uses are generally compared the uses permitted on the adjacent RM8-S and NSB-S proper are less compatible with the uses permitted on the adjacent R properties.			and NSB-S properties. They		

				•		C	etation. A stream	
					he site. The topography ranges from			
Physical	National Wetlands inventory shows a Breshwater Horested/North							
Characte	eristics	Wetland in the northern portion of the site, just west of Olivers Crossing Drive. It appears from the site plan that the buildings will be outside of						
D	4 -	the wetland area.						
Proximit Water ar	~	The site has access to public water and sewer service.						
Stormwa	iter/	The site plan shows an underground stormwater control device to be						
Drainage	2	located under the proposed parking lot in the northern portion of the site. A stormwater study will be required.						
Watersho Overlay			The site is not located within a water supply watershed.					
Overlay	Districts	The s	ubject prope	rty is undevelo	ped and he	avily wooded	l, and a small	
Analysis		strear	n traverses t	he site. Buffers	s along this	stream will b	e required. The	
General							on in elevation of	
Informat	tion					the southern	half of the site is	
		Turting		d by its narrow NT ZONING		ES .		
C	D.	4	Decision &				nmendation	
Case	Reque	est	Date	from Site	Acreage	Staff	ССРВ	
F-1343	RM8-S NSB-		Approved 8/13/2001	Directly east	14.99	Approval	Tie	
	225 PSO to PMS C Approved Includes							
F-1325	6 R59 to RM6-5 11/13/2000 Current 57.05 Approval Ap				Approval			
	SITE	CACC	ESS AND T	site RANSPORTA	ATION IN	FORMATIO	N	
					Average			
Street	Name	Classification		Frontage	Daily	_	Capacity at Level of	
Street	, i vaine	Cias	Sincation	Trontage	Trip	Service D		
Olivers	Crossing				Count			
	ive	Local Street		685 feet	N/A	N/A		
	Creek	1	Major	None	20,000	31,600		
Park	wav *	Thoroughfare None 20,000			31,000			
		Tho	roughfare	None	20,000		*	
-	l Access			one access fro	ĺ			
Proposed Point(s)		The s	ite will have	one access fro	ĺ			
-		The s	ite will have ing Zoning:	one access fro	om Olivers (Crossing Driv		
Point(s) Trip Ger	l Access	The s	ite will have ing Zoning: approved site	one access fro	om Olivers (Crossing Driv	ve.	
Point(s) Trip Ger	l Access	The s Exist The a would	ite will have ing Zoning: approved site d presume th	e one access from RM8-S e plan showed to traffic we	om Olivers (Crossing Driv	ve.	
Point(s) Trip Ger	l Access	The s Exist The a would	ite will have ing Zoning: approved sited presume the osed Site Pla	e one access from the second s	om Olivers (the subject pould be gen	Crossing Driversity as uncerted as a re	ndeveloped. Staff sult.	
Point(s) Trip Ger Existing/	l Access neration - Proposed	The s Exist The a would Proper 88 un	ing Zoning: approved site d presume the osed Site Pla aits x 6.65 (A	e one access from RM8-S plan showed to traffic work at no traffic work and Amendment apartment trip in	om Olivers (the subject pould be gen trate) = 585	Crossing Driver Droperty as uncerated as a re	ndeveloped. Staff sult.	
Point(s) Trip Ger	l Access neration - Proposed	The s Exist The a would Prope 88 un Sidev	ite will have ing Zoning: approved site of presume the cosed Site Planits x 6.65 (Avalks will be	e one access from RM8-S plan showed to traffic work at no traffic work and Amendment apartment trip in	om Olivers (The subject pould be gen Tate) = 585 7 The real of the subject pould be gen	Crossing Drivers or operty as ure erated as a record or operty of the control of	ndeveloped. Staff sult. Crossing Drive.	

Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information	The site fronts on Olivers Crossing Drive, a public street with signalized access onto Peters Creek Parkway. Peters Creek Parkway is a four-lane median-divided facility with extra capacity. The current traffic count on this section of Peters Creek Parkway is 20,000 trips per day and the capacity at a Level of Service D is 31,600 vehicles per day. Transit does not extend this far south on Peters Creek Parkway. The request will include a sidewalk on Olivers Crossing Drive which will provide an important link between the adjacent neighborhood and the shopping center. The developer will be required to install an all-way stop at the intersection of Olivers Crossing Drive and Olivers Crossing Circle. PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH UDO REQUIREMENTS		
Building			Placement on Site
Square Footage	43,896		Northern half of the site
Units (by type) and Density	88 multifamily units on 11.1 acres = 7.93 units per acre		
Parking	Required		Proposed
r ai King	160 spaces		160 spaces
Building Height	Maximum		Proposed
Dunuing Height	45 feet		Two and three stories
Impervious	Maximum		Proposed
Coverage	70 percent		25.4 percent
UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request	 Chapter B, Article II, Section 2-1.2 (L) RM8 District Chapter B, Article II, Section 2-5.64 Residential, Building Multifamily Use Conditions 		
Complies with	(A) Legacy 2030 policies: Yes		
Chapter B, Article VII,	(B) Environmental Ord.	N/A	
Section 7-5.3	(C) Subdivision Regulations	N/A	A
Analysis of Site Plan Compliance	The site plan proposes two, three-story apartment buildings and one, two-story building with a total of 88 multifamily units. A clubhouse is also included, along with the required common recreation area at the entrance on Olivers Crossing Drive. As noted, due to the configuration of the site, the improvements are proposed on the northern half of the site with the southern portion utilized primarily as tree save area. In light of the site's topographic challenges, extensive retaining walls are proposed along the western boundary and		
with UDO			
Requirements			
	_	-	
	the 30-foot stream buffer. Because the western and northern property lines abut property zoned RS9, a minimum 15-foot Type II bufferyard is		
	required, which is shown on the site plan.		
CO	ONFORMITY TO PLANS		•
Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area	Growth Management Area 3 – Suburban Neighborhoods		

	Encourage a mixture of residential densities and housing types		
Relevant	through land use recommendations.		
Legacy 2030	Promote quality design so that infill does not negatively impact		
Recommendations	surrounding development.		
Delevent Avec	• Increase infill development in the serviceable land area.		
Relevant Area Plan(s)	South Suburban Area Plan Update (2018)		
Tian(s)	Area plan recommends low-density attached residential.		
	 The highest intensity, mixed-use development should be located in 		
Area Plan	proposed activity centers.		
Recommendations	 Goods and services should be available near where people live and 		
	work.		
Site Located			
Along Growth	The site is not located along a growth corridor.		
Corridor?			
Site Located			
within Activity	The site is located within the Olivers Crossing Activity Center.		
Center?	Olivers Crossing Circle will be extended across Olivers Crossing Drive		
Addressing	into the subject property.		
Applicable	(R)(3) - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in		
Rezoning	the petition?		
Consideration	No		
from Chapter B,	$(\mathbf{R})(4)$ - Is the requested action in conformance with L_{eggc} 2030?		
Article VI,	(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with <i>Legacy 2030</i> ?		
	Yes		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development.		
Article VI,	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district.		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district. The request is also consistent with the density recommended in the <i>South</i>		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district.		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district. The request is also consistent with the density recommended in the South Suburban Area Plan Update. This plan further unifies the site with the		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district. The request is also consistent with the density recommended in the South Suburban Area Plan Update. This plan further unifies the site with the Olivers Crossing Activity Center. Activity centers are typically suitable locations for multifamily development because compact design, residential density, and a mixture of uses can result in shorter and less		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district. The request is also consistent with the density recommended in the South Suburban Area Plan Update. This plan further unifies the site with the Olivers Crossing Activity Center. Activity centers are typically suitable locations for multifamily development because compact design,		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district. The request is also consistent with the density recommended in the South Suburban Area Plan Update. This plan further unifies the site with the Olivers Crossing Activity Center. Activity centers are typically suitable locations for multifamily development because compact design, residential density, and a mixture of uses can result in shorter and less frequent motor vehicle trips.		
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	Yes This Site Plan Amendment would allow 88 multifamily residential units on RM8-S zoned property. The subject property is part of a larger 37-acre development that was rezoned to RM8-S in 2000. Approximately 15 of the 37 acres were later rezoned to NSB-S to accommodate the Olivers Crossing Shopping Center. The remainder includes the subject property and The Towns at Olivers Crossing, a townhome development. The approved RM8-S site plan included the proposed uses but did not specify how this particular site would be developed. The proposed residential density (7.93 dwelling units per acre) is consistent with the maximum allowed in the district. The request is also consistent with the density recommended in the South Suburban Area Plan Update. This plan further unifies the site with the Olivers Crossing Activity Center. Activity centers are typically suitable locations for multifamily development because compact design, residential density, and a mixture of uses can result in shorter and less		

foot opaque wood fence along this section. Due to topography, much of the three story apartment buildings will have a finished first floor elevation considerably lower than the elevation of the adjacent RS9 property. Also, due to the depth of the single family properties along Old Salisbury Road, it appears the shortest distance between the existing homes and the proposed apartments will be over 370 feet.

CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION				
Positive Aspects of Proposal	Negative Aspects of Proposal			
The site is a good location for multifamily residential as it is located within an activity center and within walking distance of a shopping center. The request is consistent with the approved land uses and density of the initial zoning case (F-1325). The proposed residential density of 7.93	The western side of the site abuts single-family homes.			
units per acre is compatible with the				
density of the adjacent townhomes located				
across Oliver's Crossing Drive.				

SITE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The following proposed conditions are from interdepartmental review comments and are proposed in order to meet codes or established standards, or to reduce negative off-site impacts.

• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:

- a. Developer shall have a stormwater management study submitted for review by the Public Works Department of the City of Winston-Salem. If required, an engineered stormwater management plan shall be submitted and approved by the Public Works Department. Relocation or installation of any stormwater treatment device into any buffer areas, vegetation designated to remain, or close proximity to adjacent residentially zoned land shall require a Staff Change approval at minimum, and may require a Site Plan Amendment.
- b. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from the City of Winston-Salem; additional improvements may be required prior to issuance of the driveway permit. Required improvements include:
 - Installation of an All-Way Stop Condition (AWSC) at the intersection of Olivers Crossing Drive and Olivers Crossing Circle, with the appropriate advanced signage per MUTCD specifications.
 - Installation of sidewalk along Olivers Crossing Drive.

• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:

a. The proposed building plans shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted elevations as verified by Planning staff.

• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMITS:

- a. Buildings shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the approved building elevations as verified by Planning staff.
- b. Developer shall complete all requirements of the driveway permit.

c. As volunteered by the petitioner, the six (6) foot tall wooden opaque fence along the Western property line shall be extended to the Northern property line and continue to the East, along the Northern property line, terminating at the Western edge of the street buffer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

NOTE: These are staff comments only; <u>final recommendations</u> on projects are made by the City-County Planning Board, with <u>final decisions</u> being made by the appropriate Elected Body, who may approve, deny, table or request modification for any project. THE APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS WHERE THE CASE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AND THE ELECTED BODY.

CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES FOR W-3397 MAY 23, 2019

Gary Roberts presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR:

Dustin Mills, 2217 Stantonsburg Road, Greenville, NC 27834

- I am the property owner and our firm is seeking the Site Plan Amendment.
- The plan meets all municipal requirements and is consistent with *Legacy 2030* and with the *South Suburban Area Plan*.
- It is an ideal location for multifamily. The development is close to an activity center and within walking distance to shopping and restaurants.
- We have worked closely with the neighbors to address their concerns. We met with some of the neighbors in their homes that were not able to come to the meetings.
- We met with Council Member Larson and staff to come up with a four-way stop and lighting along Oliver's Crossing Drive to slow down the velocity of traffic.
- Studies show that 30 percent of households pay 50% of their income in rent. This is a systemic problem across our country that needs to be addressed. Our plan addresses a significant need for workforce housing in Winston-Salem.
- There is a creek that runs through the property but there are no wetlands onsite. As far as the creek is concerned, our designs are within the required limits.
- Stormwater was a legitimate concern for the neighbors. We are doing an intensive underground system to maintain tree save area. We are also pushing our development towards the most developable area. There is no net increase in storm runoff, as is required by the approved site plan. We have a sizeable buffer of approximately 400 feet from any of our buildings to the closest residential building.
- We are only disturbing 45 percent of the site. That means less trees have to come down.
- Residents wanted fencing along the rear of Old Salisbury Road, which we agreed to, and have in writing. In addition, fencing is volunteered along a portion of the northern property line.
- This is a privately-owned development for working class individuals. The typical person in this area makes \$39,000 a year. About 63 percent of Winston-Salem's workforce mean and median salary is under this income community range.

- We did a voluntary Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) and submitted that to staff for review. The takeaways from that were nominal impacts to Oliver's Crossing. One vehicle every two minutes, one and a half minutes in the peak hour. Walkability will help decrease the amount of cars.
- Our attorney and engineers are available if there are any questions.

AGAINST:

Clementine Barr, 1820 Oliver's Crossing Circle, Winston-Salem, NC 27127

- I live in the circle at Oliver's Crossing. The construction we are referring to today, the entrance and exit will be directly in front of our entrance and exit.
- I did oppose this and still do because of my concern for the traffic. Oliver's Crossing Circle is a terrible circle. The street bares to the right all the way down to Haversham, and we take a chance every time we come out of the circle. They said their traffic people came out to do a count, but their timing had to be wrong. I stand out there with small children in the neighborhood just to keep them safe in the mornings.
- I have the names of nine other people that oppose this that couldn't be here today that wish you all would take this into consideration.
- My concern is everyone getting in and out safely. I love the idea that they are going to have a four-way stop and a crosswalk and added lights, but I don't know if it will pay off. It's a bad area and is not suitable.

Jeff Albertson, 1682 Haversham Park Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27127

• I am here to make sure, after reading the agenda, some things that I thought needed to be brought to people's attention that I didn't feel like were represented well. Townhouses and apartments are not equivalent. People own townhouses individually, so there is a difference between apartments and homes. They are putting apartments in the middle of a residential area, and they are claiming it is not something that would cause an impact. I don't see how I could agree with that. I don't have any proof except for my suppositions on that point.

WORK SESSION

The Planning Board shared their appreciation of how clear and straightforward Mr. Mills' plan was for this development.

Mr. Lambe inquired as to the length of income on how the credits will work.

Mr. Mills responded that credits were a 15-year minimum but they were extending compliance to 30 years.

Ms. Dunigan inquired as to whether the undeveloped part of the property will ever be developed or whether it is intended to be undisturbed as part of the tree save.

Mr. Mills responded by addressing the fact that the density that is allowed has been maxed out. Due to the stream and topographically it will be almost impossible to do anything in that area.

Aaron King encouraged the Planning Board to focus their discussion on things like land use, compatibility with the surrounding uses and zoning, transportation impacts, and environmental impacts. Aaron commented that while workforce housing is a worthy cause, zoning is not the mechanism that can tie somebody to promises made about rent levels.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended approval of the zoning petition with the volunteered fencing conditions.

SECOND: Jason Grubbs

VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Clarence Lambe,

Chris Leak, Johnny Sigers, Brenda Smith

AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

Aaron King

Director of Planning and Development Services