



Clifton McNeill, Jr.  
Chair  
Cumberland County

Charles C. Morris, Vice-Chair  
Town of Linden  
David Averette,  
Dr. Marion Gillis-Olson  
Roy Turner,  
Cumberland County

**COUNTY of CUMBERLAND**  
*Planning and Inspections Department*

Nancy Roy, AICP  
Director  
Thomas J. Lloyd,  
Deputy Director

Joe W. Mullinax,  
Town of Spring Lake  
Donovan McLaurin,  
Wade, Falcon & Godwin  
Harvey Cain, Jr.  
Town of Stedman

MINUTES  
April 5, 2005

**Members Present**

Mr. Clifton McNeill, Chair  
Mr. Charles Morris, Vice-Chair  
Mr. David Averette  
Mr. Harvey Cain, Jr.  
Dr. Marion Gillis-Olson  
Mr. Donovan McLaurin  
Mr. Joe W. Mullinax  
Mr. Roy Turner

**Others Present**

Ms. Nancy Roy, Director  
Mr. Tom Lloyd, Deputy Director  
Ms. Donna McFayden  
Ms. Patti Speicher  
Ms. Barbara Swilley  
Mr. Grainger Barrett, Co. Attorney  
Ms. Diane Wheatley, Co. Commissioner

Chair McNeill welcomed Diane Wheatley, County Commissioner liaison.

I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice-Chair Morris delivered the invocation, and Chair McNeill led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF/ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Morris and seconded by Mr. Averette to approve the Agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

III. POLICY STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLIC HEARING TIME LIMITS

Mr. Lloyd explained that speakers would be allowed to speak for the time needed to make their points, and no time limits would be imposed.

IV. CONSENT ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 15, 2005

A motion was made by Mr. Mullinax and seconded by Mr. Averette to approve the Minutes of March 15, 2005 as written. The motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

A. PROPOSED CUMBERLAND COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE

Chair McNeill explained that this was the second public hearing held on the proposed County Zoning Ordinance and asked that the speakers be called.

Mr. Howard Dean appeared before the Board and said that he appreciated the work that has gone into the formulation of the Ordinance. He said that Section 820 (Recreational Vehicle Parks) had some areas that he wanted to discuss. He said that he anticipated opening an RV Park, and the required size of the sites (1,800 square feet) creates a 20-foot by 90-foot site, and that would be large for many RVs. Secondly, he said that the structures being required to be 100 feet from any public street seemed excessive. The last item Mr. Dean addressed was the matrix of uses where RV Parks are allowed as special uses, requiring Board of Adjustment approval. He said after Health Department, Transportation Department and other permits are obtained, it would be logical to allow the parks as permitted uses in the districts. He said that it was obvious that a lot of thought went into the document, and it should now be moved on.

Chair McNeill asked about the special versus permitted use in the districts. Mr. Dean said that if the parks meet all qualifications for permits, they should be allowed. Mr. Lloyd said that the use is currently allowed only in the HS(P), A1 and CD Districts. He said that the requests going before the Board of Adjustment would be similar to the site plan review process and added that the use would now be allowed in many more districts.

Mr. Lloyd asked if Mr. Dean had suggestions for a required lot size. Mr. Dean said that 1,800 square feet is reasonable in camping areas, but tents and smaller vehicles require much less space. Vice-Chair Morris asked what the current space requirement is. Mr. Lloyd said that the original proposal didn't make it out of Committee, so there isn't a space requirement in the current Ordinance. He said that the Board of Adjustment would be provided with boilerplate conditions so that all requests would be treated the same.

Chair McNeill said that only two districts were added to those currently allowing the RV Parks. He asked why the use wouldn't be permitted in the C(P) District since a site plan is required. Mr. Lloyd said that the staff would look at this.

Mr. Dean said that the only other concern he had was that internal drives were required to be 18 feet wide. He said many parks contain roads that are for one-way traffic, and the width requirement could be reduced on these one-way streets. He said that one-way streets make the parks safer.

Mr. Morgan Johnson appeared before the Board and said that he had experienced many RV Parks, and 1,200 to 1,800 square feet would be a reasonable site size. Mr. Johnson said that he is the Chair of the Eastover Sanitary District, and the Eastover community is concerned about two or three main issues in the proposal. The first is allowing two units per acre in the A1 District. He said that this would rezone most of the County that would typically require public hearings and notification of surrounding landowners. He said that the A1 should be changed to R87 to keep the two-acre requirement. He said that the Eastover community does not support rezoning their area to allow one unit per acre.

Mr. Johnson's second concern was the Density Development requiring 40 percent to be open space and all of the 40 percent consisting of undevelopable land. He said that this would allow density at R10 rather than R40. He said that Eastover is not suitable for the Density Development because they have so much land that is wet and not developable. He said that the proposal might be good for some areas of the County, but not Eastover.

Another concern expressed by Mr. Johnson was the 20-foot buffer requirement in the Density Development proposal. He said that 50 feet would be a better figure with varying sizes of vegetation.

Mr. Johnson said that the purpose of a Zoning Ordinance is to guide and control development of the County and protect the public. He asked if the job of zoning is to allow developers to make as much money as they can or to protect the public and give them their wishes.

Chair McNeill asked if the Eastover community was opposed to utilizing undevelopable areas as part of the green space in the Density Development proposal because of the concept or because it rewards developers. He asked if the community would support the concept if the 40 percent were limited to a certain percentage of undevelopable land. Mr. Johnson said the concern was not the developers, but there is so much undevelopable land in Eastover that it would have an adverse impact on the environment if the rest of the land was developed at the allowed density. He said that the 40 percent should consist of useable land.

Chair McNeill said that there seemed to be a misconception that the Density Development will automatically create small lots. Mr. Johnson said that a 100-acre tract would allow 100 houses, and with the Density Development, the homes would be allowed on 60 percent of the land, so the lots would be smaller and meet the R10, R15 and R20 density requirements. Chair McNeill said that the use of Zero Lot Line allows individuals to get credit for the number of lots allowed on a tract and place them closer together and leave large undeveloped areas also. Chair McNeill said the Board decided that all of the open space could be undevelopable land, and it may be that only a percentage of the designated open space should be undevelopable land. He asked Mr. Johnson if the Eastover community would be more agreeable to this. Mr. Johnson said there was bound to be a compromise and agreement. Chair McNeill said he wasn't sure what percentage would be best, it would probably depend on individual tracts. Mr. Johnson said that Eastover has an impact on the environment of the entire County. He said that Zero Lot Line is also a serious concern. He said when it was created in the 1970s, it was said that Zero Lot Line "may be allowed" – not that it would always be approved. He said that the Eastover community also opposes Zero Lot Line.

Mr. McLaurin said that he agreed with Mr. Johnson on the buffer. He asked the median income of the Eastover group Mr. Johnson said that a grant received in the 1990s indicated that the average income was between \$32,000 and \$34,000 per household. Mr. McLaurin said he was talking about the group that Mr. Johnson works with on planning issues. Mr. Johnson said that they earn between \$15,000 and \$100,000 per year. Mr. McLaurin said if the requirements are two- and three-acre lots, many of the low-wealth people could not afford to buy homes.

Ms. Liz Reeser appeared before the Board and said that she is the Vice-Chair of the Eastover Sanitary District. She said when the Eastover Land Use Plan was created; it was based on the A1 District allowing only one unit on two acres. She said that she owns 2.3 acres on a street with 11 other landowners, and they all use septic tanks. She said that she feared adding more residences to the swampy area. Ms. Reeser also expressed

concern about protection of the agricultural community and watershed issues. In addition, she said that she didn't want her property rezoned without her permission. She said that the Density Development option is worthwhile in some areas, but she had concerns about its use in Eastover. She asked that the A1 requirements not be changed to one acre and added that housing needs are being met in the County.

Dr. Olion asked if Ms. Reeser would rezone her property to R87 if the A1 proposal were adopted. Ms. Reeser said that she would be forced to rezone it to R87. Mr. McLaurin asked if Ms. Reeser's area would soon have water and sewer. Ms. Reeser said that it would not have sewer for a long time. Mr. McLaurin asked if she thought that another septic tank would be allowed, and Ms. Reeser said that she doubted that the Health Department would approve another septic tank on her property.

Mr. Tom Grubb appeared before the Board and said that when he serves on boards or committees, he tries to get all the data possible before making decisions. He said data is missing from Eastover, and changing the A1 District to one acre needs information. He said that canals were dug throughout the area to alleviate water drainage. He said that the canals now flood and back up, and the water doesn't leave the area. He said that rezoning to require only one acre in the A1 will increase the density without knowing if the water will drain. He said if the Board is going to make a broad sweeping change, they should consider the special situations that exist. He suggested that engineers be hired to see if runoff will be possible with added development.

Mr. Turner asked who is responsible for keeping the canals clean. Mr. Grubb said that the Commissioners said they were created through a federal document. Mr. Barrett said that the canals were set up as drainage districts that are now defunct. He said that the City and County Stormwater Utility is limited in what they can afford to do. Mr. Turner said health hazards could result if the lots back up and ditches are not cleaned up. Mr. Grubb said the situation deserves a study, and adding to the problem will not allow correction. Mr. Barrett said that the City on behalf of the City and County administers the Stormwater Utility. Mr. Turner said that the County needs more attention. Chair McNeill said that the Stormwater Utility was set up for water quality purposes—not flood control. He said that the Flea Hill functioned well when it was created, and it should be cleaned out. He added if someone builds a home in a hole, it's going to get wet.

Mr. Richard Walker appeared before the Board and said that his address is in Wade, but he lives in the Eastover Fire District. He said that he was in favor of the A1 being one-acre lots because he knew of several instances where parents or grandparents were forced to deed off two-acre lots to their children and grandchildren when one acre would have been better for the parents/grandparents. He asked for whom farmland is being preserved. He said that the family farm is a dying entity with a 40 percent reduction in farmland and 48 percent reduction in farms over the past few years. He said farmers are being penalized when they have to sell two-acre lots. He said that the drainage canals were cleaned out in the early 70s, and each family was assessed drainage taxes. After they were cleaned, the Committee in charge asked the Commissioners to assess the property owners to cover future cleanup, and the Commissioners didn't do it. He said that a lot of land in the Eastover community cannot be developed, so there shouldn't be a problem with one-acre lots.

Mr. McLaurin said that farmers who are no longer able to farm could sell the one-acre lots for as much as they receive for two acres. He said that this would tend to raise property values for the farmers and the surrounding landowners, and this would in turn increase the tax value for the County. Mr. Walker agreed.

Mr. Franklin Johnson appeared before the Board and said that he supported the new document. He said that he was in favor of the one-acre lots in A1 because the two-acre requirement is now is a waste for the farmers. He said that he spoke with a number of landowners who agree with the A1 District allowing one unit per acre.

Commissioner Wheatley asked Mr. Johnson's opinion on the density issue. He said with Zero Lot Line, not much changes. He added that property owners are being hurt because they lose density due to wetlands. Chair McNeill asked how the development community felt about limiting the percentage of the required open space that could consist of wetlands. Mr. Johnson said that it shouldn't affect people because they will still be allowed to use Zero Lot Line. He said it would be a rare piece of property that would have 40 percent undevelopable land. Chair McNeill asked about the large acreage that Mr. Johnson rezoned from A1 to R40 last year, and Mr. Johnson said that it would have been a perfect tract for the A1/CUD concept.

Mr. Johnson said when he grew up, everyone owned 100 plus acres, and now they own only a few. He said that he favors the A1 at one acre. Mr. McLaurin asked him if he would use the Density Development under certain criteria, and Mr. Johnson said he definitely favored the Density Development, and there are certain properties that are perfect for it.

Mr. John Gillis appeared before the Board and thanked the staff and Board for their hard work on the Ordinance. He said that the focus has been on a couple of issues that are key changes, and the meat of the Ordinance has been overlooked. He said that land use and zoning are tools of government under the control of elected officials and appointed boards, and the objective of governance must be kept in the forefront with the focus not being on minutia. He said to focus on the Land Use Plan objectives. He added that governing can be through carrots or sticks, and carrots have a much better chance to improve a community and the environment now and over the next 100 years.

Mr. Gillis said that density has decreased in the core around the City of Fayetteville, and the City is trying to recover the growth. He said that the County has the same dilemma, and one opportunity that the County has is to make land use plans and zoning fit with long-term objectives. He said that the number of people requiring housing continues to increase because this area is appealing for many reasons. He said that there is a struggle in the State with sprawl, which causes the cost of government to go up. Land use and zoning are used to create an environment that meets the needs of the individuals and allows the government to continue to operate effectively and efficiently. As density increases, cost of government generally decreases.

Mr. Gillis said that he likes the ideas behind the Density Development; however, some practical issues need to be addressed. He said that it needs to be determined who owns and maintains the 40 percent open space. He noted that the City and County merged their recreation departments. He said that his experience with homeowners' associations has been that left to their own devices, they tend to deteriorate over time in as far as

property maintenance is concerned. He said that he would support a mechanism for a County Open Space Plan that creates larger tracts to be used by the Recreation Department for parks, walking trails, etc. He said that they would be used and enjoyed and not a patch work of every property owner and developer in each little development.

Mr. Gillis said another good planning tool is to encourage density where it can support it, and develop open spaces for the enjoyment of the County.

Mr. Gillis said in Section 703.F, open space can be used by the farmer for up to 10 years. He said that the time may not be enough. Mr. Barrett said that the purpose was to allow farmers to recognize revenue from the sale of the land and transition from farming. He said that the figure can be changed.

Mr. Gillis said that the last issue was property owners versus developers. He said that property owners usually inherit and live on the land. A family farm is no longer an economically viable means of income, and income is necessary, so farmers enter into the unique situation of selling land. They don't want to limit their income potential through too many regulations. He said that the Density Development has a good overall basic objective, but the Board and staff should look deeper and not use just the Density Development to create open space.

Commissioner Wheatley said that she agreed with the park suggestion because homeowners' associations tend to fade out, and the green space isn't maintained. She said if the City or County government maintained parks, it would require more taxes. Mr. Gillis agreed and said it is a dilemma because so many people are already having a difficult time with taxes, and that's why they are fighting annexation. He said that there is currently an income tool in place that charges a fee when property is developed in lieu of dedicating land for open space. He said that developers would probably support an increased fee if a plan was in place for a park project or some type of open space project. He added that in this market, not all costs get passed on to buyers.

Mr. Barrett said that he was aware of a number of counties who included an open space plan as part of the land use plan, and there are sectors of the public in favor of greenways and others who resist if it's in their backyard. He said it can be a complex issue. He said in the Density Development proposal, cost is allocated to a homeowners' association unless the developer finds a nature conservancy or some such organization that is willing to maintain it.

Chair McNeill asked if the Density Development would have an impact on annexation. Mr. Gillis said that it wouldn't make a difference to the City's philosophy on annexation.

Mr. McLaurin said he preferred the Density Development over cookie cutter developments with parks and recreation fees where children must be driven to parks. He asked if there was a way that the Density Development could require open space to promote on-site play areas in neighborhoods. Mr. Gillis said it may not be realistic to believe the set aside space will create an environment like Mr. McLaurin grew up in because there are safety issues and a greater number of people involved.

Vice-Chair Morris asked Mr. Gillis if he was representing the Homebuilders' Association or himself. Mr. Gillis said he was speaking for himself. Vice-Chair Morris said that the public hearing was continued in order to give surveyors, engineers and developers an opportunity to give their input, but none had attended the meeting.

Mr. Lloyd said from both meetings, there appeared to be two main issues—Density Development and one acre for the A1 District. He cautioned the Board not to lose track of the reason that the Density Development was created: 1) too many A1 to R40 rezoning cases; 2) to get a better handle on sprawl; and 3) to promote preservation. He said that the A1 to R40 density also addresses sprawl. He concluded that an Open Space Plan would take a lot of time to write, and he'd hate for it to hinder approval of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Barrett said that homeowners' associations are pervasive across the State, and a common requirement of land use plans and ordinances. He told the Board to remember, "The perfect is the enemy of good."

Mr. Averette said that Mr. Jeff Reitzel said that he didn't attend the meeting because he felt that the proper way to formulate the Ordinance was through workshops where each item could be addressed. Mr. Averette said that the public hearings haven't really covered much of the Ordinance, just the Density Development and A1 density, and his concern was whether everything else in the Ordinance is okay. He said another concern is that the public needs to understand that one unit per acre does not involve the size of a lot, but density. He said it only becomes a lot size issue when it is cut out of a larger tract. He added that infrastructure has to support the additional unit.

Mr. Lloyd said if only one or two issues were covered, it would be possible to meet with specialists from the individual industries, but when writing an entire Ordinance, it becomes too expansive to cover item by item. He reminded the Board that the Committee met with representatives from the Homebuilders' Association, engineers, surveyors, developers and the general public and addressed all concerns that were expressed. He said that the staff is comfortable with the document.

Mr. McLaurin said that homeowners' associations shouldn't be branded because they can work. He said that the Density Development proposal encourages community living by creating common areas for the children in the open space.

Vice-Chair Morris said that the Board realizes that things change, and things may come up that weren't anticipated; however, the review process is in place to correct these things. He said the staff will observe how the Ordinance works for a year or two and then make needed changes when it is reviewed. He said out of 119 pages, the concerns address only about three pages. He said that the staff has done an excellent job, and it's time to move on.

Mr. Morgan Johnson said that the Planning staff did a commendable job, and his group has only one or two issues. He said that the Ordinance is a good document, and the concern expressed doesn't require workshops to address each item. He said not many people attended the public hearings because they don't recognize the importance of the document. He agreed that it is time to move on.

Mr. Johnson invited everyone to Eastover Heritage Day on May 14. He said it will be an enlightening event with bands, paratroopers, a bake sale and dinner.

Ms. Roy said when she came on board in January of 2003, revising the Ordinance was the Board's priority. She said that staff began in the summer of 2003. She said that they could have hired someone to rewrite the Ordinance, but the elected to have the staff do the job because: 1) They knew the administrative difficulties with the current Ordinance and had knowledge of the problems; 2) the Ordinance was written in the early 70s, and staff knew what needed to be updated and reorganized; and 3) new techniques were available that required staff to research and learn. She said that this is a great document, and staff will monitor it daily and keep track of problems for the review process. Ms. Roy said that she believed in the end they would all be happy that the rewrite was done in this way.

Chair McNeill commended staff and thanked them for their hard work.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair McNeill said that the Board had several options because he didn't want the document to go to the Commissioners until the Board approves a final version. He said that a few items came up in the public hearings, and Board members expressed a few concerns. He then asked each Board member to state his specific concerns so that a list could be formulated for the staff to work on.

Mr. Averette—Section 820, Recreational Vehicle Parks/Campgrounds, the matrix on page 35 (change from special to permitted uses) and Section 102 M, Lighting, the concerns expressed by Mr. Reitzel.

Dr. Olion—Mr. Barrett's rewrite on open space in Density Developments, Section 703 F. She questioned the definition of "zoning" where "police power" is mentioned. Mr. Barrett explained that this is the power of the government to provide for public health, safety and welfare.

Mr. Mullinax—Mr. Barrett's amendment.

Mr. McLaurin—Mr. Barrett's amendment, allowing only a percentage of designated open space in the Density Development to be undevelopable land; Page 49 F.

Mr. Cain—No concerns expressed.

Mr. Turner—Same as Mr. Averette and also the 20-foot buffer in the Density Development.

Vice-Chair Morris—Density in A1 from two acres to one.

Chair McNeill—Density Development and R87 District.

Chair McNeill then asked staff if they had additional comments. Ms. Speicher said that Mr. Johnson had mentioned changing permit allowance from six months to one year in the earlier public hearing.

Section 820 (page 62). Mr. Lloyd said that 1,200 square feet was suggested, and this would allow 36 sites per acre. Vice-Chair Morris suggested limiting the number of sites to 20 per acre. He said that it should read “a minimum of 1,200 square feet per site with a maximum of 20 sites per acre.” Mr. Averette said that he didn’t think that the restriction is needed. Mr. Lloyd said that minimum standards should be included to maintain consistency and assist the inspectors.

**A motion was made by Vice-Chair Morris and seconded by Mr. McLaurin to change the Ordinance to read “a minimum of 1,200 square feet per site with a maximum of 20 sites per acre.”**

Dr. Olion asked if it was necessary to state that tents and recreational vehicles should be kept a certain distance apart for safety reasons. Vice-Chair Morris said it wouldn’t be necessary, and park owners should be given enough flexibility for what they need. Mr. Lloyd added that the regulations are to keep parks from being unsightly.

Mr. Mullinax asked about the “permanent address” mentioned in the Section. Mr. Lloyd said that staff would make it more specific.

**Upon a vote on the motion, it passed seven to one with Mr. Averette voting in opposition.**

Mr. Lloyd suggested that recreational vehicle parks be allowed as a permitted use in the C(P) District.

Regarding the term “permanent address,” Mr. Lloyd said that a specific amount of time should be stated as the maximum a person would be allowed to stay at a campsite.

**A motion was made by Mr. McLaurin and seconded by Mr. Mullinax to state that permanent occupancy is defined as one year or less provided the time limit doesn’t conflict with State guidelines.**

Ms. Roy said that she would check with the building inspectors to make sure that the state allows one year.

Commissioner Wheatley expressed concern that people could live in a campground for a year, educate their children and not pay any taxes.

**Upon a vote on the motion, it passed seven to one with Mr. Turner voting in opposition.**

The members then addressed the required 100-foot distance for structures from the road. Mr. Averette said that the RR District allows structures to be 30 feet from the roadway.

A motion was made by Mr. Averette and seconded by Chair McNeill that structures be allowed to be no closer than the number of feet the individual zoning districts allow.

Mr. Lloyd said that some uses should be farther from the road, e.g. public showers, storage, etc. He said where they’re allowed, they are required to be farther back.

Upon a vote on the motion, it failed one to seven with Mr. Averette voting in favor.

The requirement that roads inside the parks be 18 feet wide was then discussed. Mr. Lloyd said that 18 feet is too wide for one-way streets.

**A motion was made by Vice-Chair Morris and seconded by Mr. McLaurin to require an 18-foot width on two-way streets and 12 feet on one-way streets. The motion passed seven to one with Mr. Averette voting in opposition.**

Mr. Averette expressed concern about the requirements of Section H being too rigid.

The members then discussed allowing the use as a permitted or special use.

**A motion was made by Mr. McLaurin and seconded by Vice-Chair Morris to allow recreational vehicle parks and/or campgrounds as permitted uses in the CP) District.**

Mr. Roy said that leaving the use as a special use in the other districts, requiring Board of Adjustment approval, protects the neighborhoods and allows public input from residents when a recreational vehicle park is planned for their community.

**Upon a vote on the motion, it passed seven to one with Mr. Averette voting in opposition.**

Regarding outdoor lighting, Ms. Speicher said that she worked with Mr. Reitzel on the specifics of the Section. She said that he wanted specific measurements on the lighting that would have required the inspectors to work at night and the purchase of light meters. She said that she was able to include some of the particulars that Mr. Reitzel requested. She reviewed the changes with the Board members.

Mr. Averette said that Ms. Speicher had addressed most of the concerns that Mr. Reitzel had discussed with him.

**The members agreed by consensus with the recommendations presented by Ms. Speicher.**

Chair McNeill said due to the lateness of the hour, the rest of the concerns would be addressed at the next Planning Board meeting or the following meeting if the schedule doesn't permit the discussion at the next meeting (April 19 or May 2, 2005).

## VI. FOR YOUR INFORMATION

### A. DIRECTOR'S UPDATE—2030 PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Roy handed out a data sheet on the progress of the 2030 Executive Committee. The Committee has met seven times and received information from various community factions—PWC, schools, municipalities, etc.

Ms. Roy also presented the Growth Vision Plan for the 2030 Land Use Plan that was written by Mr. Glenn Harbeck, the consultant who is working on the project.

She said that the next step in the process is public input, and a group of administrative staff has met and reviewed the consultant's recommendations on how to effectively conduct public meetings. The group will receive a detailed presentation on April 12. The cost will be approximately \$173,500 for the 17-month process.

Ms. Roy said that the consultant recommends a five-step process for creation of the 2030 Land Use Plan:

- Build a Consensus for Planning
- Create the Vision
- Identify Policies, Actions, Growth Strategies
- Evaluate the Plan Positively
- Reach a Consensus for Adoption

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.