

Diane Wheatley,  
Chair,  
Cumberland County

Carl Manning,  
Vice-Chair  
Cumberland County

Jami McLaughlin,  
Town of Spring Lake

Jordan Stewart.,  
Town of Stedman

Mark Williams  
Wade, Falcon & Godwin

Thomas Lloyd,  
Town of Linden



**CUMBERLAND**  
★ **COUNTY** ★  
NORTH CAROLINA

*Planning & Inspections Department*

Rawls Howard,  
Director

Vacant,  
Deputy Director

Vikki Andrews,  
Lori Epler,  
Cumberland County

Stan Crumpler,  
Town of Eastover

Patricia Hall,  
Town of Hope Mills

**MINUTES**  
November 19, 2019

**Members Present**

Mrs. Diane Wheatley – Chairman  
Mr. Carl Manning – Vice-Chair  
Mr. Stan Crumpler  
Dr. Vikki Andrews  
Mr. Thomas Lloyd  
Mrs. Jami McLaughlin  
Mrs. Lori Epler  
Ms. Patricia Hall  
Mr. Mark Williams

**Members Absent**

Mr. Jordan Stewart

**Others Present**

Mr. Rawls Howard  
Ms. Annie Melvin  
Mr. Edward Byrne  
Mrs. Laverne Howard  
Mr. Rick Moorefield,  
County Attorney

I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Wheatley delivered the invocation and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF / ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

Mr. Howard advised the Board that Case P19-43 would be moved to Contested Items.

**Ms. Hall made a motion seconded by Mr. Crumpler to approve the agenda with the adjustments. Unanimous approval.**

III. PUBLIC HEARING WITHDRAWAL / DEFERRAL

There were none.

IV. ABSTENTIONS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Mrs. Epler advised the Board and audience that the company that she works for had done a survey on the property and a plan for the applicant to get a water permit for Case P19-42. Her company had nothing to do with the rezoning application and their work was finished months ago. The knowledge she has of this case will not have an influence on the vote for this case and can vote either way based on the evidence that is presented. If anyone has any reservations with her voting on the case, she would abstain from voting on it.

There were no objections.

V. POLICY STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLIC HEARING TIME LIMITS

Mr. Howard welcomed the newest Board member, Mr. Mark Williams the Falcon, Godwin, Wade representative to the Planning Board.

Mr. Howard read the policy statement.

VI. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2019

Mrs. Epler said she wanted to have a discussion about the minutes.

On page 3 of 4 in Case P19-39 the minutes do not reflect the vote or the result of the vote. Also, that case in question the discussion that took place is not reflected in the minutes. Mrs. Epler is requesting that the minutes be amended and come back for approval.

**Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lloyd that the minutes be amended to reflect more consistently what happened in the Planning Board meeting.**

Dr. Andrews asked how one was to know at what point the minutes reflect what you think occurred in this discussion, how would staff know that when they are preparing the minutes.

Mrs. Epler said she doesn't want minutes verbatim, but does think it's important to note the questions that were asked by Planning Board members to the folks that presented that case, and there were several questions that were asked that are not covered in the minutes, and the answers that we got were what led us to the vote that we took and the recommendation that we made.

Dr. Andrews said she understood that, but doesn't know that what Mrs. Epler just said were the instructions of what she asked for, perhaps what you ask for should be that the questions and answers be reflected in the minutes instead of more of what happened, because that is more of a nebulous term.

**Mrs. Epler said she would amend her motion to request that the minutes reflect the questions that were asked by the Board of the applicant and their answers and the vote that was taken, seconded by Mr. Lloyd**

Mr. Lloyd said that it's not just Laverne that does the minutes they are also proofed by other staff, and asked if that was still done, and said that they are proofed by other staff because they may remember something that may not have made it into the minutes.

Mr. Howard said that there was a discussion today and will do whatever the Board decides. We serve as staff for you. What we talked about and there are some cases that don't hit the radar as much but if there is a speaker or a case that goes over five minutes of discussion I've asked that Laverne not go into too much detail but maybe just summarize the tone of what was asked by the Planning Board, who asked it, instead of a paragraph maybe two or three.

Mrs. Epler said that she hopes she speaks for the Board but in cases such as this that go on and there was a lot of discussion that resulted in their recommendation, she thinks it's important.

Mr. Howard said no problem, we can do that. Mr. Howard asked if the minutes could be updated and sent out via email.

Chair Wheatley said yes.

Mrs. Epler asked Mr. Moorefield if that was legal.

Mr. Moorefield said they would have to come to you as a draft. It would be okay to send out in an email and get everyone's okay and submit as a draft.

Mrs. Epler said that what Mr. Moorefield was saying is that we can approve the minutes through email, and they can go to the Commissioner's as a draft and vote on them at the next meeting.

Mr. Crumpler said there have been several times when we have been overturned when something in the minutes didn't fully reflect what happened in here, he thinks that's what led to our recommendations being overturned.

Mr. Lloyd said back to what Dr. Andrews said it isn't up to one person, in this case Laverne, the staff has, the professional staff, to point out things that should be in there, it isn't her responsibility to necessarily know that. That's why the staff members review it.

**Chair Wheatley said that there was still a vote on the floor and asked if there was anymore discussion. There wasn't. It was unanimous to approve the motion on the floor.**

VII. JOINT PLANNING BOARD 2020 DEADLINE / MEETING SCHEDULE

**Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Chair Wheatley to approve the Joint Planning Board 2020 Deadline / Meeting schedule. Unanimous approval.**

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING CONSENT ITEMS

- A. **P19-41.** REZONING OF 1.81+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO R40 RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 2380 WADE STEDMAN ROAD, SUBMITTED BY MICHAEL & MICHELLE BROWNE (OWNERS).

In Case P19-41, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40 Residential and find this request consistent with the adopted 2030 Growth Vision Plan (2009) which calls for "Rural Areas" at this location. Staff further finds that approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses.

**In Case P19-41, Mrs. McLaughlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40 Residential and find this request consistent with the adopted 2030 Growth Vision Plan (2009) which calls for "Rural Areas" at this location. Staff further finds that approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning and existing land uses. Unanimous approval.**

- B. **P19-44.** REZONING OF 0.37+/- ACRES FROM R6A RESIDENTIAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 4854 & 4860 CUMBERLAND ROAD, SUBMITTED BY ROSCOE & DELL STRICKLAND (OWNER). (HOPE MILLS)

In Case P19-44, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning from R6A Residential to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this request consistent with the adopted Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2014) which calls for "Heavy Commercial" at this location. Staff further finds that approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the subject property is served by public water and sewer and the requested district is in harmony with the surrounding C(P) zoning and existing land uses at a heavily trafficked intersection.

**In Case P19-44, Mrs. McLaughlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the rezoning from R6A Residential to C(P) Planned Commercial and find this request consistent with the adopted Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2014) which calls for "Heavy Commercial" at this location. Staff further finds that approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the subject property is served by public water and sewer and the requested district is in harmony with the surrounding C(P) zoning and existing land uses at a heavily trafficked intersection. Unanimous approval.**

- C. **P19-45.** REZONING OF 2.94+/- ACRES FROM C3 HEAVY COMMERCIAL & A1 AGRICULTURAL TO A1 AGRICULTURAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 6660 GOLDSBORO ROAD, SUBMITTED BY NETTIE M. CURRIE (OWNER) & TYLER ENGLAND (AGENT).

In Case P19-45, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning from C3 Heavy Commercial & A1 Agricultural to A1 Agricultural and find this request consistent with the adopted 2030 Growth Vision Plan (2009) which calls for "Rural Areas" at this location. Staff further finds that approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because approval will remove the nonconformity from an existing residential structure now that the previous commercial use has ceased, and the district requested is in harmony with the surrounding existing zoning.

**In Case P19-45, Mrs. McLaughlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to recommend approval of the rezoning from C3 Heavy Commercial & A1 Agricultural to A1 Agricultural and find this request consistent with the adopted 2030 Growth Vision Plan (2009) which calls for “Rural Areas” at this location. Staff further finds that approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because approval will remove the nonconformity from an existing residential structure now that the previous commercial use has ceased, and the district requested is in harmony with the surrounding existing zoning. Unanimous approval.**

## IX. PUBLIC HEARING CONTESTED ITEMS

### REZONING CASE

- D. **P19-43.** REZONING OF 2.25+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO R40A RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 2130 MONTANA ROAD, SUBMITTED BY VANCE U. TYSON JR. (OWNER) & ANNIE MAE EFIRD (AGENT).

Mr. Byrne presented the case information and photos.

In Case P19-43, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40A Residential and find:

- a. The approval is an amendment to the adopted current South Central Land Use Plan (2015) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request;
- b. The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the parcel does not meet the minimum criteria for “low density residential” defined in the Land Use Policies Plan (2009): *public or community water and public sewer required, must have direct access to a public street;*
- c. And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning, existing land uses, and the maximum number of dwelling units allowed per lot on a Class “C” private street.

Mr. Lloyd asked what the two conditional uses were near the site.

Mr. Byrne said the case history only goes back ten years, so it doesn’t show what the conditional uses were. He assumes it was commercial use because that’s when they had overlay districts. This would have been back in the nineties.

Dr. Andrews asked to see the slides that showed the structures on the property and asked where the second mobile home was on the property because it wasn’t visible in the photo.

Mr. Byrne said it was on the other side of the visible structure.

There were people present to speak in favor and in opposition.

Public hearing opened.

Ms. Annie Efird spoke in favor and stated that she purchased the land in order to have two mobile homes for her and her daughter and her two adopted children and her daughter’s children.

Ms. Crystal Mason spoke in favor and stated that the whole family lives on the street, her mom helps take care of her grandfather. The applicant already has a mobile home, they are just trying to get the approval.

Mr. Robert Downey spoke in opposition and stated that he was a resident for thirty years and has owned his property for twenty years, he is the only person on the road who owns their property. Mr. Downey is concerned that the land can't sustain a traditional septic system they have to have a pump system and the only place for that is adjacent to his property. Mr. Downey said that he was the only one to maintain the road, no one has helped. The applicants have applied for rezoning before and every time it has been denied.

Mr. Lloyd asked which lot Mr. Downey lived on.

Mr. Byrne pointed it out.

Mrs. Epler asked the daughter of the applicant if a new septic tank would need to be installed if they get approval for another structure.

Ms. Mason said she wasn't sure. She knows they can run off the same well, but not sure about the septic tank. They've been told they could run off of them both but won't know until we get approved.

Ms. Hall asked Mr. Downey if Montana Road was a private road.

Mr. Downey said yes, private road maintained by the residents, and he's the only one who maintains it and he maintains it all the way up to the applicant's driveway then he stops.

Mr. Lloyd asked Mr. Downey if he was here before for the same lot.

Mr. Downey said yes, and the applicants didn't show up the last time.

Mr. Lloyd said the last time it was heard it was denied by the Planning Board.

Mr. Downey said yes.

Mrs. Epler said to Mr. Downey that that was a class "c" private street, by today's standard if you tried to put one in today there would have to be a maintenance agreement for that class "c" private street. Is there a recorded maintenance agreement?

Mr. Byrne said only class "b" and class "a" have to have a maintenance agreement.

Mrs. Epler said so there is no maintenance agreement on that street. Mrs. Epler clarified that Mr. Downey was responsible for the portion of the street that lies on your property and you have been neighborly in taking care of theirs.

Mr. Crumpler asked if there was a maximum number of dwellings with that being a class "c" street.

Mr. Byrne said it's two per lot.

Public hearing closed

Mr. Manning asked if this was denied before why is staff recommending approval now.

Mr. Byrne said staff recommended approval the first time because it meets the plan, but in the public hearing the applicant didn't show up, the opposition showed up and the Planning Board recommended denial and the same thing happened at the Commissioner's meeting.

Mr. Lloyd asked Mr. Byrne to explain the private street regulation with the number of units per lot.

Mr. Byrne explained the class "c" regulations for Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Crumpler said he didn't see any restrictions, if this is approved would they have to go through public health.

Mr. Howard said they would have to go through a group development, and they would have to have approval from the health department for a septic tank.

Mrs. Epler said that she was inclined to say that this case has opposition and from what she hears from the opposition the maintenance of the road is one issue, but from what we hear there won't be any more people travelling on that road than what you have today, secondly, she doesn't like the idea that the applicant has come before the board before to recommend approval of this and the opposition is mostly opposed to another septic tank being installed.

**In Case P19-43, Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to defer this case to the December 17, 2019 Planning Board meeting to allow the applicant to find out from the Health Department whether they can use the existing septic tank for both units or if they're going to have to have another septic tank installed.**

Dr. Andrews asked Mr. Downey if his opposition was characterized correctly.

Mr. Downey said no, his opposition is the lines to the septic system is not a traditional system, it's a pump system it takes an electric motor and a reservoir and pumps it uphill to his property line and leads it out.

Dr. Andrews asked if this is approved how will it be different than it is now?

Mr. Downey said her septic waste will be running on his property.

Ms. Hall asked if the land is lower than the adjoining property it's got to lead somewhere, will the health department analyze that?

Mr. Howard said they can ask them, and they will give their assessment.

Mrs. Epler asked that before this come back to the Planning Board staff do some research and educate the Board on how the pump system works.

Mr. Manning asked if the Health Department approved the septic system for the applicant

Mr. Howard said if there's a permit he's pretty sure they would have had to inspect it. He doesn't think they would have approved something that would leech onto someone else's property.

Mrs. Epler said she thought they needed to hear it from the Health Department.

Chair Wheatley said they would get answers at the next meeting and wanted to take a vote on the motion.

Dr. Andrews asked Mr. Howard if the Health Department could send someone to talk to them at the meeting.

Mr. Howard said he would make the request.

**Chair Wheatley asked for a vote on the motion. Unanimous approval.**

## CONDITIONAL ZONING CASE

- E. **P19-42.** REZONING OF 7.50+/- ACRES FROM M2 HEAVY INDUSTRIAL, C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL & R6A RESIDENTIAL TO M(P) PLANNED INDUSTRIAL/CZ CONDITIONAL ZONING FOR ALL ALLOWED USES WITHIN M(P) PLANNED INDUSTRIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 159 ROCK HILL ROAD, SUBMITTED BY INKFISH, LLC (OWNER) & CHARLES MORRIS (AGENT).

Mr. Byrne presented the case information and photos.

In Case P19-42, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends denial of the rezoning from M2 Heavy Industrial, C(P) Planned Commercial and R6A Residential to M(P) Planned Industrial/CZ Conditional Zoning for all permitted uses and instead recommend approval of rezoning to M1(P) Planned Light Industrial/CZ Conditional Zoning for all permitted uses in the M1(P) district or M(P) Planned Industrial/CZ Conditional Zoning with limited uses harmonious with the area and find:

- a. The approval is an amendment to the adopted current Vander Land Use Plan (2017) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request;
- b. The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the parcel is currently zoned a dormant district that is in line with industrial zoning, has access to public water & sewer, and is located along a major thoroughfare;
- c. And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested will allow the property owner to utilize an existing vacant building developed for manufacturing with appropriate uses.

Mr. Howard said that M(P) was a very heavy industrial district, but taking it down a little to a light industrial is why we were going in that route and came up with some options, the building reuse is sensible it's just trying to get this to fit in with our plans. The reason it's on contested is by the time we talked to the applicant about taking it down a bit, the packets had already gone out.

Mrs. Epler said it was advertised as M(P)/CZ, and M1(P)/ CZ is more restrictive so we can approve that here tonight.

Mr. Howard said correct.

Mrs. Epler said this is site specific and the only reason for a variance is because the existing building does not meet the setback requirements. They're not making an improvement that makes them nonconforming it's the existing building.

Mr. Lloyd asked what the use was prior to this.

Mr. Byrne said it was a cabinet making business.

Mr. Lloyd said even though the plan didn't call for industrial use industrial use was there.

Mr. Byrne said correct, it was already zoned industrial when they did the Vander Plan and they called for it to be light commercial.

Mrs. Epler said it wasn't being used for light industrial when that plan was approved.

Dr. Andrews asked what Mrs. Epler about site specific.

Mrs. Epler explained what she meant by that.

There were people present to speak in favor.

Public hearing opened.

Mr. Charles Morris spoke in favor and said that he was present with his client and just wanted to give some history and explain what they're asking for and how it relates to everything. Mr. Morris also said that they were fine with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Russ Mason spoke in favor and said that they purchased the building to consolidate operations that they currently have going on in Fayetteville. They also wanted extra square footage for room to grow.

Mrs. Epler asked Mr. Mason how many employees he had.

Mr. Mason said he had twenty-seven employees.

Public hearing closed.

**In Case P19-42, Mr. Lloyd made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crumpler to recommend denial of the rezoning from M2 Heavy Industrial, C(P) Planned Commercial and R6A Residential to M(P) Planned Industrial/CZ Conditional Zoning for all permitted uses and instead recommend approval of rezoning to M1(P) Planned Light Industrial/CZ Conditional Zoning for all permitted uses in the M1(P) district and find: a. The approval is an amendment to the adopted current Vander Land Use Plan (2017) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b. The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the parcel is currently zoned a dormant district that is in line with industrial zoning, has access to public water & sewer, and is located along a major thoroughfare; c. And, this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested will allow the property owner to utilize an existing vacant building developed for manufacturing with appropriate uses. Unanimous approval.**

#### REZONING CASE

- F. **P19-46.** REZONING OF 30.10+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO R20 RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 2647 & 2673 WADE STEDMAN ROAD, SUBMITTED BY JAMES S. & BEVERLY L. FISHER (OWNERS) AND JASSON ROBBINS, TIMOTHY PEPPERS JR. & SANJAY KHAZANCHI (AGENTS).

Mr. Byrne presented the case information and photos.

In Case P19-46, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends denial of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R20 Residential. However, staff does recommend approval of rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40 Residential and find that this recommendation is consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan which calls for "Rural Areas" and the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) which calls for "Rural Density Residential" at this location. Staff further finds approval of this recommendation of R40 Residential is reasonable and in the public interest because R40 is more in harmony with existing lot sizes, land uses and surrounding zoning.

There was one person present to speak in favor and seven people to speak in opposition.

Public hearing opened.

Mrs. Epler asked when the report came in from Eastover Sanitary district that they would go along with the recommendation of R40 instead of R20 was the applicant notified.



Mr. Byrne said the we got the notification after they submitted the subdivision plan; we got a different reaction from Eastover. They didn't want R20 but didn't say anything about the pressure or anything else. We had already gone through the whole review process with staff. Then we got the subdivision review and that's when we got Eastover's reaction. That's when they said there was low pressure and didn't want to have all those lots.

Mrs. Epler asked Mr. Byrne if what he was saying was, they didn't get that detailed remark from Eastover until after this had already gone out and been reviewed by staff and advertised.

Mr. Byrne said we got it just before our staff meeting last week.

Mr. Lloyd asked what the applicant requested also follows the Eastover Plan, to the west, is correct.

Mr. Byrne said to the west, yes.

Mr. Timothy Peppers spoke in favor and said he was present on behalf of Faithwell Homes and acting as their consultant on getting this project started. Looking to see how many lots would be allowed according to what they anticipated would be the continued growth in that area and expansion from I-295. Looking at this an opportunity to expand in this area and invest in it.

Mrs. Epler asked who owns Faithwell Homes because she wanted to make sure she hasn't done business with them.

Someone from the audience said Sanjay Khazanchi.

Mr. Lloyd asked Mr. Peppers if anyone from the developer's side spoke with Eastover Sanitary District.

Mr. Peppers said no.

Mr. Crumpler asked if there were any hydric soils on the subject property.

Mr. Byrne said just a little on the western side of the property.

Mr. Crumpler asked to see the surrounding zoning and said that nowhere in site of the subject property is R20. R40 and A1 is all there is.

Mr. Byrne said that's correct.

Mrs. Epler asked if the Board finds that R40 is a better fit for this property would he be prepared to accept that.

Mr. Peppers said at this point he would have to accept that.

Mrs. Epler said no, you could take this to the Commissioner's and ask for R20, but she's asking if this Board sees fit after hearing your comments and the opposition we can tonight recommend R40 and forward it to the Commissioner's as such, and we need to know if you're going to be okay with that.

Mr. Peppers said no.

Ms. Robin Bridges spoke in opposition and presented emails from Eastover Sanitary District and also presented some maps. Ms. Bridges said that she and her husband are retired disabled veterans and moved to the area to enjoy a quieter lifestyle, wildlife, and the benefit of local farms. Ms. Bridges is concerned that without a detailed land use plan uncontrolled and unplanned growth will destroy Bethany, their way of life, and their agriculture base. The harmony of Bethany will be destroyed by people who don't live there and don't have any interest in Bethany except for financial. R20 is inconsistent with the area and R40 will be disruptive for the area. Existing infrastructure does not

support this request, sewer is not available, traffic and schools will be impacted as well as security. Ms. Bridges asked everyone in the audience who was opposed to this request to stand.

Jerry Collier spoke in opposition and is concerned about the effects that septic tanks will have on his property and supports A1 designation.

Chair Wheatley extended the time limit to four minutes per speaker for new information.

Mr. Wayne Tew spoke in opposition and said that the subject property used to be a mobile home park and the owner at the time tried to have it rezoned to R40. Mr. Tew said it needs to remain A1.

Mr. James Baker said his points were already made.

Mr. Roy Robinson spoke in opposition and said he owned the adjacent property to the subject property and said his property was flooded with Hurricane Matthew and doesn't want that to happen again.

Mr. Dana Jumper said he didn't have anything new to add.

Mr. Claude Jordan spoke in opposition and said that he would like to keep A1.

Mr. Lloyd asked how many of the people present live in the subdivision with the Winnie the Pooh names or Ruth Bunce Lane.

The audience said no one.

Public hearing closed.

Chair Wheatley said that the applicant was not interested in R40.

Mrs. Epler said with that in mind she would like to make a motion to follow the staff recommendation to deny, seconded by Mr. Manning.

Mr. Lloyd said that staff didn't deny the entire application. There is a plan, it's not a detailed land use plan, but the 2030 plan does address the area and recommendations are based on that outside of the Eastover Area Plan. On Ruth Bunce Lane there are houses and in the subdivision with the Winnie the Pooh names there are houses that front Wade Stedman Road. The staff recommendation was as well as Eastover Sanitary District that west of Wade Stedman Road the Eastover Plan called for R40 and that's what staff is recommending. There's R40 in the area and the Eastover Plan was just done, and this is traditionally the way it works. At the meetings for the Eastover plan there were maybe ten people there, maybe. Rural is what the Plan called for and Eastover called for Rural west of Wade Stedman Road.

Mrs. Epler said that the applicant said he doesn't want R40.

Mr. Lloyd said to Mrs. Epler that he was making his points. Mr. Lloyd went on to say that it does go with the Eastover Plan. Mr. Lloyd said he would have gone with R40, but the developer should have done his due diligence with the sanitary district before he asked for a rezoning to begin with.

**In case P19-46, Mrs. Epler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams to recommend denial of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R20 Residential although the request is consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan which calls for "Rural Areas" and the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) which calls for "Rural Density Residential" at this location and further find that denial of this request is reasonable and in the public interest due to potential issues with water service and the request is not in harmony with surrounding existing zoning. Unanimous approval.**

## X. DISCUSSION

- Stedman Land Use Plan will be on December agenda.
- Schedule of Small-Town Area Plan Updates – next plan will be Bethany area. Provided Board with schedule of when plans will be worked on.
- 160D State Statute update workshop- major overhaul in statutes that will go in to effect next year. Separate statutes for city's and counties, staff will be attending workshops.
- Airport Overlay Amendment – Proposing a review of amendment. Proposal for protecting land around the airport.
- Status Interlocal Agreements – Mr. Howard is working with the County Attorney to get it settled.
- Future meeting times and format – Mr. Howard advised the Board that the Board of Adjustment is moving meeting time to 6 pm and asked if Planning Board would be interested in the same.  
**There was unanimous approval to change the Planning Board meeting to 6 pm. starting with the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

The Board also decided to eliminate the first Tuesday Planning Board meeting and work through committees.

**Mr. Lloyd made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Epler to discontinue the first Tuesday Planning Board meeting. Unanimous approval.**

- Mr. Howard suggested getting a timer for speakers. The board agreed to that.
- Mr. Howard told the Board that there have been some tweaks to the format of the meeting. The Chairman will now read the greeting and rules of the meeting.
- Mr. Crumpler made a request for clarification on how cabins and rv's are handled in the ordinance. That is something that staff would work on.

## XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:09 pm.