Town of Indian Trail

P.O. Box 2430
Indian Trail, North Carolina 28079
Telephone 704-821-5401
Fax 704-821-9045

PLANNING AND NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
July 19, 2016
06:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER - Meeting was called to order by Acting Chair, Jan Brown.

ROLL CALL

The following members of the governing body were present:

Board Members:	Jan Brown, Sidney Sandy, Samantha Towns, Jorge Aponte, Dennis Gay, and John Killman.
Members Present but not Voting:	Joe Lytch, and Jason Derosier.
Absent:	Arthur Spurr, and Michael Head.
Staff Members:	Rox Burhans-Planning Director, Gretchen Coperine- Senior Planner, and Pam Good- Board Secretary

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

John Killman-	seat #1	term 7/1/16-6/30/19
Dennis Gay	seat #6	term 7/1/16-6/30/19
Jorge Aponte-	seat #7	term 7/1/16-6/30/19
Jayson Derosier-	alternate #1	term 7/1/14-6/30/17
Joseph Lytch-	alternate #2	term 7/1/14-6/30/17

Election of Officers-

Motion to elect Jan Brown as Chair by Member Aponte, seconded by Member Towns. Vote to approve was unanimous.

Motion to elect Dennis Gay as Vice-Chair by Member Towns, seconded by Member Brown. Vote to approve was unanimous.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES- June 21, 2016

Motion to approve as written by Member Sandy, seconded by Member Gay. Vote to approve was unanimous.

PUBLIC ITEMS-none

OTHER BUSINESS

Indian Trail Planning Director Rox Burhans presented training information to the board beginning with

Divisions of the Planning Department

Planning Division
Code Enforcement
Permit Center/ Customer Service
Environmental Services

Plan Dept who we are and what we do

- **First Part**: Long Term Planning (Comp Plan)
    - Help community grow and develop holistically
- **Second Part**: Current Planning (UDO)
    - Recommendations to Planning Board, Town Council and others on development projects
    - Review development projects for compliance

Plan Board structure (appointed by Town Council)

7 regular members
3 alternates
Chair and Vice Chair

Purpose

Think tank- advise mayor, town council, and plan director

Rules of Procedures

Adopted by IT Town Council

- Duties
- Appointment and terms
- Rules and Conduct
- Not lobbied by applicants (as a policy)
- Meetings – 3rd Tuesday of the month at 6:30pm
- Quorum and Voting – 4 members
- Secretary (Pamela Good)

Duties include: UDO, Comp Plan, Other Town wide plans, parks master plan, greenway pedestrian plan, downtown master plan (rule book for development/ standards)
Showed power point of village and corridor plans

Visionary document-Comprehensive Plan (big vision)
Regulatory document- Unified Development Ordinance (must haves)

Text Amendments training was presented by Senior Planner Gretchen Coperine. She began her portion of training with an overview of what a text amendment is.

A text amendment

- Modifies the UDO (i.e. "rule book).
- Can be proposed by: Citizens, Planning Board, Staff, Town Council, or developer.
- The Planning Board serves as the recommending body for the Town Council.
- Town is most frequent applicant

The duty of the Board is to make two consistency findings:

- One for consistency with Town adopted plans
- One for the benefit of the public

Staff Coperine spoke about the boards' choices after deliberation of the case but reminded the board that The Town Council is not bound by recommendations by the Planning Board. Text Amendment- is macro/ applies to town-wide decision. A Variance would be for a particular property.

Director Burhans then provided information about conditional rezonings.

Overview of the Rezoning Process

Two Types:

1. Zoning Map Amendments
2. Conditional Rezoning

1. Zoning Map Amendment

- Most Common Rezoning Process
- By-Right Rezoning
  - SF-4
  - GBD
  - LI
- Entitled By-Right to develop in accordance with UDO
- No Conditions Permitted (by law)

2. Conditional Rezoning Overview

- Used Less Frequently
- More of a Rezoning Package:
  - Attaches "Conditions" to the New District
    - Limit Uses
    - Memorialize design
    - Hours of operation
    - Infrastructure
  - Master Plan and TIA (for large sites)
  - Community Meeting Process

Pros:

1. Greater Certainty
2. More Public Involvement
3. Has mechanisms for flexibility (setbacks, etc)
4. Helpful in managing specific issues (use restrictions, etc.)
5. Helpful in visualizing future development and identifying impacts

Cons:

1. Can be a lengthy process
2. Expensive
3. 2-Year Approval Timeline
4. Review/Approval can get bogged down in details

Discussion and questions by the board followed.
Member Derosier asked who determines whether they apply for map amendment or conditional rezoning. Director Burhans answered that the applicant or property owner decides. Member Derosier also asked for clarification on the two year approval time frame. Planning Director Burhans answered that the development team has two years to take some significant action on that project to bring it to fruition.
A question arose about annexation of a property and Staff Burhans explained the annexation process in more detail as well as the zoning process.
Staff Coperine gave a brief overview of several upcoming potential cases and was asking for Planning Board feedback and first reaction. The first case was regarding a property on the south side of Chestnut Ln in the Old Monroe Village that is presently two parcels. The applicant is interested in potentially establishing green houses, retail space, farm stand, as well as a shipping and storage area on the properties.
Current zoning is single family 1 (SF1). The necessary rezoning would be for rural single family. The future land use of that area would be mixed use. Staff Coperine reminded the board this was only an initial discussion, there was no application at this time.

Member Gay asked if there is a state regulation that must to allow green houses in agricultural zoning. Staff Coperine was unaware of that regulation. Member Towns asked if there were presently residences there. Staff Coperine answered that there were. Member Towns affirmed the idea but was concerned with impact on area residents as well as potential traffic issues. Member Gay spoke about shipping and the hours involved with the vehicles that would be involved. Member Sandy asked if there were any public hearings yet? Staff Coperine replied that the process was not that far along yet. Discussion ensued about the access to the property and Staff Coperine answered that it would be accessed from Chestnut Ln. A question was asked if it would be retail and wholesale. Staff Coperine was unsure but would check. Member Derosier stated that he felt it was a bit out of place because of the surrounding residential area. Director Burhans stated that if the project went forward, the applicant would need to show compatibility with the surrounding area. Member Towns asked where the plants will originate from. Staff Coperine answered that most will be grown on site.

Case #2 is an actual application that has been submitted to the Town. The project is residential and is located partly in Indian Trail and partly in the village of Wesley Chapel. The entire project is approximately 430 lots, mostly in Indian Trail. A large portion is intended to be age restricted with some designated as conventional lots. Current zoning of a portion of the lots is SF4 and portion is presently zoned rural single family. The entire project area is being requested to be zoned SF4. Land use is that the parcels are split between Sun Valley Village and the Moore Farm Village.

Discussion ensued regarding access roads. Concerns were mentioned about traffic. Member Sandy asked about connectivity to Taylor Glen and Sheridan. Staff Coperine answered that it would connect to both but no direct connection to Brandon Oaks although it would back up to it. Member Towns mentioned that there will be issues with restricted residences and the federal guidelines that they will have to adhere to. Staff Coperine agreed. She gave a brief overview of the difference between age restricted and age targeted, stating that with age targeted communities there are no covenants/ no restrictions from a federal requirement. Anyone of any age can purchase a home. Age restricted communities must have at least 80% occupation with one member of each household at least 55 years old.

Member Towns asked if age restricted communities have ever been built in Indian Trail. Staff Coperine answered that it has not been done but have been in contact with the Town Attorney for advice and perimeters. A question was raised about the property in Wesley Chapel, if they are waiting to see what Indian Trail will do first. Staff Coperine explained that the Planners in Wesley Chapel are writing their decision with the contingency that it would conform with Indian Trail's decision.

Staff Coperine also explained that traffic flow would be dispersed and a traffic analysis has been performed. Member Sandy asked if the county portion of the project has already been approved and construction started. Staff Coperine answered that the project has been approved at the re-zoning level but was unsure if construction has begun.

Member Derosier asked how concerned should the Board be when they see flood plains in a project.

Staff Coperine replied that the flood plain is being preserved in this project as no structures can be built on flood plains in Indian Trail.

Director Burhans ended with how different and more thorough the process is from the past.

PLANNING REPORT – none

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm.

Chairman: Jan W. Brown

e: 8-16-16

Secretary: Pamela J Sood