



CAMDENCOUNTY
new energy. new vision.

PLANNING BOARD

November 14, 2018

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Historic Courtroom

Courthouse Complex

Agenda

**Camden County Planning Board
Regular Meeting
November 14, 2018, 7:00 PM
Historic Courtroom, Courthouse Complex**

ITEM I. Call to Order and Welcome

ITEM II. Consideration of the Agenda

ITEM III. Consideration of the Minutes

1. Minutes from July 18, 2018
2. Planning Board / Bd of Commissioners Minutes - Joint Meeting July 18, 2018
3. Planning Board / Bd of Commissioners Minutes - Joint Meeting July 25, 2018

ITEM IV. New Business

1. UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat
2. UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat

ITEM V. Information from Board and Staff

ITEM VI. Consider Date of Next Meeting - December 19, 2018

ITEM VII. Adjourn



**Camden County Planning Board
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY SHEET**

Minutes

Item Number: 3.1

Meeting Date: November 14, 2018

Submitted By: Amy Barnett, Planning Clerk
Planning & Zoning
Prepared by: Amy Barnett

Item Title Minutes from July 18, 2018

Attachments: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (PDF)

CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Regular Meeting – July 18, 2018

**Camden County Planning Board
Regular Meeting
July 18, 2018 7:00 PM
Historic Courtroom, Courthouse Complex
Camden, North Carolina**

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Camden County Planning Board was held on July 18, 2018 in the Senior Center, Camden, North Carolina. The following members were present:

CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

Planning Board Members Present:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Calvin Leary	Chairman	Present	7:00 PM
Fletcher Harris	Board Member	Present	7:00 PM
Patricia Delano	Vice Chairman	Present	7:00 PM
Rick McCall	Board Member	Present	7:00 PM
Ray Albertson	Board Member	Absent	
Steven Bradshaw	Board Member	Present	7:00 PM
Cathleen M. Saunders	Board Member	Present	7:00 PM

Staff Members Present:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dan Porter	Planning Director	Present	7:00 PM
Amy Barnett	Planning Clerk	Present	7:00 PM

Also Present for purposes of hearing their application for rezoning were Dana and Patrick Smith.

CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA***Motion to Approve the Agenda as Presented***

RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Steven Bradshaw, Board Member
SECONDER:	Fletcher Harris, Board Member
AYES:	Leary, Harris, Delano, McCall, Bradshaw, Saunders
ABSENT:	Albertson

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Regular Meeting – July 18, 2018

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 20, 2018***Motion to Approve Minutes of June 20, 2018 as Written***

RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Patricia Delano, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Steven Bradshaw, Board Member
AYES:	Leary, Harris, Delano, McCall, Bradshaw, Saunders
ABSENT:	Albertson

NEW BUSINESS***A. UDO 2018-06-19 Rezoning Request - Dana and Patrick Smith***

Dan Porter described this rezoning request and read through the staff report attached hereto.

Mrs. Smith spoke very briefly indicating that she and her husband intend to do a parent to child subdivision 1 acre in size after rezoning is approved.

Steve Bradshaw asked if the property was to be divided into 2 lots. Mr. Porter indicated that it was to be divided.

Motion to Approve UDO 2018-06-19 Rezoning Request - Dana and Patrick Smith

RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Fletcher Harris, Board Member
SECONDER:	Steven Bradshaw, Board Member
AYES:	Leary, Harris, Delano, McCall, Bradshaw, Saunders
ABSENT:	Albertson

INFORMATION FROM BOARD AND STAFF

Mr. Porter reminded the board that there would be another joint meeting with the Camden County Board Of Commissioners on July 25, 2018 starting at 5:00 pm.

CONSIDER DATE OF NEXT MEETING - AUGUST 15, 2018

The next meeting will be on August 15, 2018 unless there are no matters to be brought before the Planning Board.

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARDRegular Meeting – July 18, 2018

ADJOURN*Motion to Adjourn*

RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Fletcher Harris, Board Member
SECONDER:	Rick McCall, Board Member
AYES:	Leary, Harris, Delano, McCall, Bradshaw, Saunders
ABSENT:	Albertson

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM.

*Chairman Calvin Leary
Camden County Planning Board*

ATTEST:

*Amy Barnett
Planning Clerk*

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

STAFF REPORT

**UDO 2018-06-19
Zoning Map Amendment**

PROJECT INFORMATION

<p>File Reference: UDO 2018-06-19 Project Name; N/A PIN: 01-7090-00-16-3805</p> <p>Applicant: Dana & Patrick Smith</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Address: 101 Sharon Church South Mills, NC Phone: (252) 698-0215 Email:</p> <p>Agent for Applicant: Address: Phone: Email:</p> <p>Current Owner of Record: Dana & Patrick Smith</p> <p>Meeting Dates: 7/18/2018</p>	<p>Application Received: 6/14/2018 By: David Parks, Permit Officer</p> <p>Project Address/Location: 101 Sharon Church Road, South Mills</p> <p>Application Fee paid: \$650 Check #3120</p> <p>Completeness of Application: Application is generally complete</p> <p>Documents received upon filing of application or otherwise included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Rezoning Application B. Deed C. GIS Aerial, existing zoning, Comprehensive Plan future land use and CAMA Land Use Plan Suitability Maps
Planning Board	

REQUEST: Rezone approximately 3 acres from Basic Residential (R3-2) to Basic Residential (R3-1)

From: Basic Residential (R3-2)

To: Basic Residential (R3-1)

The R3 Districts are designed to provide for low density residential development in areas that are adjacent to those areas primarily devoted to agriculture. Subdivision in the R3-2 district requires a minimum of two acres per lot.

The R3 Districts are designed to provide for low density residential development in areas that are adjacent to those areas primarily devoted to agriculture. Subdivision in the R3-1 district requires a minimum of one acre per lot.

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

SITE DATA

Lot size: Approximately 2.98 acres

Flood Zone: Zone X

Zoning District(s): Basic Residential (R3-2)

Existing Land Uses: Residential

Adjacent Zoning & Uses:

	North	South	East	West
Zoning	Basic Residential (R3-1)	Basic Residential (R3-2)	Residential (R3-2)	Basic Residential (R3-2)
Use & size	55 acres – Mill Run Open Space Subdivision - Lot size 25,000 sf.	36 acres – Woodland/Wetlands	55 acres – Mill Run Subdivision	Woodland/Open Space Mill Run

Proposed Use(s):

The Uses will remain the same; just the density change is requested from two to one acre.

Description of property:

Property abuts Sharon Church and Keeter Barn roads. Property has house on it and at one time had a Singlewide. A second septic tank is located on the property.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Streams, Creeks, Major Ditches: Mill Run Ditch.

Distance & description of nearest outfall: Less than 1 mile.

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

INFRASTRUCTURE & COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Water	Water lines are located adjacent to property along Sharon Church and Keeter Barn roads.
Sewer	There are 2 septic systems on property.
Fire District	South Mills Fire District. Property located approximately 3 miles from Station on Keeter Barn Road.
Schools	Impact calculated at subdivision.
Traffic	Staffs opinion is traffic will not exceed road capacities.

PLANS CONSISTENCY

CAMA Land Use Plan Policies & Objectives:

Consistent Inconsistent

The proposed zoning change is consistent with the CAMA Land Use Plan which was adopted by the Camden County Board of Commissioners on April 4, 2005 in that the Future Land Use Maps has area as Low Density Residential 1-2 acres or greater.

PLANS CONSISTENCY – cont.

2035 Comprehensive Plan

Consistent Inconsistent

Consistent with Comprehensive Plan (Adopted 2012) as Future Land Use Maps reflect land identified as Rural Residential 1 acre lots.

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

PLANS CONSISTENCY – cont.

Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Consistent Inconsistent

Property abuts Sharon Church and Keeter Barn Roads.

Other Plans officially adopted by the Board of Commissioners

N/A

FINDINGS REGARDING ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

Yes No Will the proposed zoning change enhance the public health, safety or welfare?

Reasoning: The proposed zoning change will neither enhance nor adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare.

Yes No Is the entire range of permitted uses in the requested classification more appropriate than the range of uses in the existing classification?
N/A

Reasoning: The allowable uses in the R3 (Basic Residential) zoning will not change as the request is for higher density from two acres to one acre.

For proposals to re-zone to non-residential districts along major arterial roads:

Yes No Is this an expansion of an adjacent zoning district of the same classification? N/A

Reasoning:

Yes No What extraordinary showing of public need or demand is met by this application? N/A

Reasoning:

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

Yes No

Will the request , as proposed cause serious noise, odors, light, activity, or unusual disturbances?

Reasoning: All uses allowed in the requested zoning classification should not cause any serious noise, odors, light activity, or unusual disturbances.

Yes No

Does the request impact any CAMA Areas of Environmental Concern?

Reasoning: Property is outside any CAMA Areas of Environmental Concern.

Yes No

Does the county need more land in the zoning class requested?

Reasoning: Higher density development in areas identified in the Comprehensive and CAMA plans provides needed roof tops to support commercial development.

Yes No

Is there other land in the county that would be more appropriate for the proposed uses?

N/A

Reasoning: Proposed uses will not change.

Attachment: Planning Board Minutes - July 18, 2018 (2214 : Minutes from July 18, 2018)

Yes No

Will not exceed the county’s ability to provide public facilities:

Schools – The possible additional lot will have minimal impact on the school.

Fire and Rescue – Minimal impact.

Law Enforcement – Minimal impact.

Parks & Recreation – Minimal impact

Traffic Circulation or Parking – N/A

Other County Facilities – No.

Yes No

Is This A Small Scale “Spot” Rezoning Request Requiring Evaluation Of Community Benefits?

If Yes (regarding small scale spot rezoning) – Applicants Reasoning:

	Personal Benefits/Impact	Community Benefits/Impact
With rezoning	Will allow owner to either create a lot for child or create a 1 lot minor subdivision.	Little to no Community Benefits
Without rezoning	Property owner will not be able to create lot for child as parcel is just under 3 acres and current zoning requires residual lot meet current zoning of 2 acres (lot is 2.98 acres).	No Change.

STAFF COMMENTARY:

The owner would like to do either a parent to child exempt subdivision or a one lot minor subdivision. Under the parent to child exempt residual would have to meet 2 acres under current zoning. This is an expansion of an adjacent zoning and is in conformity with adopted plans.

Staff recommends the following:**Consistency Statement:**

The requested Map Amendment is consistent with both the CAMA Land Use Plan and Comprehensive Plan as it allows for densities as low as one acre and is an expansion of an adjacent zoning.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of this rezoning request from Basic Residential (R3-2) to Basic Residential (R3-1).

Maps Show:

Vicinity Map: Corner of Keeter Barn and Sharon Church Roads

CAMA Land Suitability Map: Very High

Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map: Rural Residential One Acre

CAMA Future Land Use Map: Low Density Residential

Zoning Map: R-3-2 with R-3-1 Adjacent beside and behind.



**Camden County Planning Board
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY SHEET**

Minutes

Item Number: 3.2

Meeting Date: November 14, 2018

Submitted By: Amy Barnett, Planning Clerk
Planning & Zoning
Prepared by: Amy Barnett

Item Title Planning Board / Bd of Commissioners Minutes - Joint
Meeting July 18, 2018 (Please Note: Already Considered and
Approved by BOC)

Attachments: Planning Bd / Bd of Commissioners Minutes July 18,
2018 (PDF)

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

Camden County Planning Board**Joint Meeting****July 18, 2018 4:30 PM****Senior Center, Courthouse Complex****Camden, North Carolina****MINUTES**

A Joint Meeting of the Camden County Board of Commissioners & Camden County Planning Board was held on July 18, 2018 in the Senior Center, Camden, North Carolina. The following members were present:

CALL TO ORDER

Board of Commissioners & Planning Board Members Present:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Tom White	Vice Chairman, Camden Board of Commissioners	Present	4:30 PM
Randy Krainiak	Commissioner, Camden Board of Commissioners	Present	4:30 PM
Garry Meiggs	Commissioner, Camden Board of Commissioners	Present	4:48 PM
Clayton Riggs	Chairman, Camden Board of Commissioners	Absent	
Ross Munro	Commissioner, Camden Board of Commissioners	Absent	
Calvin Leary	Chairman, Planning Board	Present	4:30 PM
Patricia Delano	Vice Chairman, Planning Board	Present	4:30 PM
Fletcher Harris	Planning Board Member	Present	4:30 PM
Ray Albertson	Planning Board Member	Absent	
Cathleen M. Saunders	Planning Board Member	Present	4:30 PM
Rick McCall	Planning Board Member	Present	4:30 PM
Steven Bradshaw	Planning Board Member	Present	4:30 PM

Staff Members Present:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dan Porter	Planning Director	Present	4:30 PM
Amy Barnett	Planning Clerk	Present	4:30 PM
Ken Bowman	County Manager	Present	4:30 PM

Others Present:

Attendee Name	Company	Purpose
Chad Meadows	Code Wright Planners	Present Proposed Revised UDO
Roger Ambrose	Ambrose Signs	Voice Concerns w/ Sign Regulations
Lois Brown	RO Givens Signs	Voice Concerns w/ Sign Regulations
Scott Givens	RO Givens Signs	Voice Concerns w/ Sign Regulations

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

17 CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA - PLANNING BOARD18 *Motion: Approve Agenda as Presented*

19	RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
20	MOVER:	Steven Bradshaw, Board Member
21	SECONDER:	Patricia Delano, Vice Chairman
22	AYES:	Leary, Delano, Harris, Saunders, McCall, Bradshaw
23	ABSENT:	Albertson

24 OLD BUSINESS:

25
 26 In the absence of and expected late arrival of Commissioner Garry Meiggs in order to form a
 27 quorum for the Camden County Commissioners, it was suggested that the Planning Board call
 28 their board to order and proceed with the Old Business Item which was the Continuation of
 29 presentation by Chad Meadows on the Proposed Revised Unified Development Ordinance.

30 CONTINUATION OF PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED REVISED UDO - CHAD MEADOWS,
31 PART 1

32
 33 Dan Porter, Planning Director described this agenda item and gave a brief background regarding
 34 the Proposed Revised UDO, after which he introduced Mr. Chad Meadows of Code Wright
 35 Planners, who began his presentation.

37 Chad Meadows, Code Wright Planners

- 38 • Reminded both boards that there are 11 issues of policy for presentation and discussion
- 39 • Will go over issues that guidance has been given on
 - 40 ○ Major Subdivisions - New Process
 - 41 ▪ Change: Allow administrative review of certain elements prior to any
 - 42 board meetings so developer doesn't have to incur expenses without the
 - 43 certainty that a project will be approved.
 - 44 ○ Increase residential density in the R-1 district to 4.35 dwelling units per acre
 - 45 where there is adequate availability of both water and sewer
 - 46 ○ Alter the permissiveness of manufactured housing such that it is dispersed out into
 - 47 the county rather than concentrated in village centers.
- 48 • Will cover items that Planning Board has already heard but Commissioners have not,
- 49 hope to get through to end of the 11 issues. May require additional meeting(s).

50
 51 At this time, 4:48 PM, Commissioner Garry Meiggs arrived and a quorum was now present for
 52 the Camden County Board of Commissioners.

53

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

54 **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS CALL TO ORDER - 4:50 PM**55 CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA - BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS56 *Motion: Approve Agenda as Presented*57 (Agenda consists of Hazard Mitigation Reconstruction [Grant and Associated Budget
58 Amendments] and Presentation of Revised UDO)

59	RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
60	MOVER:	Garry Meiggs, Board Member
61	AYES:	White, Krainiak, Meiggs
62	ABSENT:	Riggs, Munro

63

64 HAZARD MITIGATION RECONSTRUCTION, 2018 HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT
65 AGREEMENT (FEMA DR-4285-010-R), & BUDGET AMENDMENTS 2018-19-BA001 AND
66 2018-19-BA002

67

68 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White called for consideration of the Hazard
69 Mitigation Reconstruction Grant Agreement (FEMA DR-4285-010-R) and associated
70 Budget Amendments 2018-19-BA001 & 2018-19-BA002. The aforementioned grant
71 agreement and associated budget amendments are for the purpose of assistance to be
72 granted to 2 homeowners (one on Bingham Road, the other on NC 343 N) for making
73 much needed repairs due to hurricane flooding.74 *Motion: Approve Hazard Mitigation Reconstruction, 2018 Hazard Mitigation Grant*
75 *Agreement (FEMA DR-4285-010-R), & Budget Amendments 2018-19-BA001 and 2018-*
76 *19-BA002*

77	RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
78	MOVER:	Garry Meiggs, Board Member
79	AYES:	White, Krainiak, Meiggs
80	ABSENT:	Riggs, Munro

81

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

82 CONTINUATION OF PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED REVISED UDO - CHAD MEADOWS,
83 PART 2

84

85 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White opened the floor for Public Comments so that Roger
86 Ambrose, Lois Brown, and Scott Givens could comment regarding the proposed new sign
87 regulations that are a part of the Revised UDO.

88

89 Roger Ambrose, Ambrose Signs90 • Believes the "No new billboards in Camden County" clause of the proposed revised UDO
91 to be restrictive and also believes it would hurt his business as well as any other sign
92 business

93 • State of NC regulates signage and defines fairly well what can and can not be done

94 • Billboards that are already in place are said to be grandfathered

95 ○ Wants to be able to repair billboards if needed and not be required to take them
96 down if cost of repair exceeds 50% of billboards worth

97 ○ Wants to be able to tear down and re-build billboards if needed

98 ○ Wants section that speaks of the "50% of value" to be removed so that is not a
99 consideration

100 • Businesses rely on signage for advertising, both on and off premise signs

101 • Sign companies rely on the businesses who buy signage

102 • Signs need to be able to be seen in order to be effective advertising

103 • Wants county to look at how signs (billboards) are regulated instead of saying no new
104 ones105 • There are at least 15 businesses in Camden County that currently rely on billboards for a
106 portion of their advertising

107 • Opposed to "No New Billboards"

108 • Believes there should be a balance between the rural character of the county and the
109 needs of the business community.

110

111 Lois Brown, RO Givens112 • Has land, wants to be able to put signs on her land if she wants to. Doesn't want someone
113 telling her she can't put it on her own piece of property

114 • Most of the RO Givens billboards in Camden are rented, there are a few that are not

115 rented, and if a business wants to advertise, they should be able to do so with a billboard.

116

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

117 At this time, Dan Porter, Planning Director, made the following comments:

- 118 • With regards to prohibition of signs, that is a policy decision
- 119 • Regarding repair of billboards, such repairs can get very expensive very quick.
 - 120 ○ Agrees 50% rule is restrictive
- 121 • Recommends that if there are to be no new billboards, that no limits be placed on ways to
 - 122 repair and / or replace existing billboards with the following exceptions:
 - 123 ○ Size cannot be changed
 - 124 ○ Height cannot be changed
- 125 • Thinks type of billboard changes should be allowed (ex: Paper billboard to Electronic)
 - 126 also types of pole / foundation changes should be allowed.

127

128 Commissioner Randy Krainiak questioned why there would be a prohibition on billboards.

129 Commissioner Krainiak voiced concerns relating to the effect of prohibition on employees of
130 such businesses.

131

132 Dan Porter stated that prohibition is only a recommendation. Mr. Porter added that if they are
133 not prohibited that the county would need to rely on the current ordinance to regulate billboards.

134 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White suggested that a committee consisting of County
135 Manager, representatives of the sign companies, and any other necessary person(s) get together
136 to work on this issue and bring their suggestions back to the Board of Commissioners at a later
137 date. Planning Board Chairman Calvin Leary expressed agreement with what Mr. Porter had
138 stated earlier regarding not limiting the repairs to 50% as a means to determine permissiveness.

139

140 Chad Meadows commented:

- 141 • Agrees with Mr. Porter that the 50% damage threshold may not be suitable for billboards
- 142 • Regarding the prohibition:
 - 143 ○ Hwy 17 is an interstate, it is designated as US Interstate 85
 - 144 ○ Within 660 feet of the right of way of any interstate, local government cannot
145 prohibit a billboard.
 - 146 ▪ Federal Government made this rule.
 - 147 ○ There are between 15-20 billboards in the county, and no billboards on Hwy 17.
 - 148 ○ Proposal to prohibit is because of the landmark Supreme Court case which has
149 modified how local governments are allowed to regulate signage.
 - 150 ▪ Outdoor, off premise advertising is an issue which is still 'cloudy' as far as
151 the Supreme Court ruling goes
 - 152 ▪ Question of whether or not the Supreme Court intended local government
153 to be able to regulate off premise signs is not known, not clear. Suggest a
154 more conservative position because it is not known. It will become more
155 clear in the future
 - 156 ▪ If Board of Commissioners wants to continue with the existing ordinances
157 / regulations for billboards, fine.
 - 158 ▪ Agree that some adjustments with regard to repair of billboards is in order
- 159 • Would be helpful to know where BOC stands with regard to policy standpoint on whether
160 to allow new billboards or not outside the Hwy 17 corridor.

161

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

162 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White repeated his earlier suggestion to let the committee
 163 meet on this and bring their suggestions back to the Board of Commissioners at a later date.
 164

165 Steve Bradshaw asked if by prohibiting billboards, is a problem being fixed. Is there such an
 166 abundance of billboards that a prohibition is warranted. If not, why does government need to be
 167 involved? Mr. Bradshaw went on to describe other areas where he feels additional regulation is
 168 in his opinion excessive. One particular area of concern was parking regulations. Mr. Bradshaw
 169 was concerned that the way the code was written that it would require parking facilities for farm
 170 buildings. Mr. Porter stated that farms and agricultural facilities / uses are exempt from the
 171 zoning regulations.
 172

173 Mr. Meadows stated that the rationale behind the sign regulations is to protect the county from
 174 law suits. Mr. Bradshaw asked how would the county be protected. Mr. Meadows responded
 175 saying that at this point, it is unknown whether or not there will be any legal challenges to county
 176 regulations as they relate to the Supreme Court ruling on signage. As such, the recommendation
 177 is to limit signage.
 178

179 County Manager Ken Bowman stated that even after the UDO revision is approved, it can be
 180 amended if and when necessary. With regard to signage regulations, Manager Bowman
 181 suggested a review of current regulations to see if alterations are in order or not.
 182

183 Dan Porter commented on the billboard issue saying it is pretty much straight forward, and
 184 suggested that rather than prohibiting them, that they be allowed to be replaced or repaired
 185 without placing a value on the work performed to that effect, and simply go by what the current
 186 rules are for placement of new billboards.
 187

188 Mr. Roger Ambrose of Ambrose signs commented that in order to place a billboard in Camden
 189 County, that the property where upon the sign is to be placed has to be zoned to allow such use.
 190 He added that before he can get a state permit, he has to secure a county permit first. He further
 191 commented that the Supreme Court ruling may change some of that, but that at this time, this is
 192 how it is done.
 193

194 Mr. Porter stated he would look at setting a date to meet with both Ambrose and Givens to
 195 discuss these issues as they relate to the proposed UDO.
 196

197 At this time, Mr. Chad Meadows began his presentation of the Proposed Revised UDO,
 198 Commercial Design Standards.
 199

Chad Meadows, Code Wright Planners

- 201 • Section 5.1.2 of the Proposed Revised UDO
- 202 • Covered with Planning Board, who felt there were too many design standards
 - 203 ○ Spoke of a flexibility option to relax some of the regulations through the use of
 - 204 the Administrative Adjustment process
- 205 • Applied to new non-residential development in VR, VC, CC, MC, and HC districts
 - 206 ○ Not applied to utility, public safety, industrial, or agricultural uses

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

- 207
- 208
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213
- 214
- 215
- 216
- 217
- 218
- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223
- 224
- 225
- 226
- 227
- 228
- 229
- 230
- 231
- 232
- 233
- 234
- 235
- Overlay for Commercial Corridor has different standards (US Hwy 158 within 1000 feet of the right of way)
 - Standards include but are not limited to:
 - Basic building orientation provisions
 - Building materials
 - Colors
 - The above is not designed to tell someone how to design their building or that a particular architectural style should be followed, but rather to specify the range of materials that are allowed, limitations, and prohibited materials.
 - Suggested prohibited exterior materials for non-residential development:
 - Unadorned / unfaced concrete masonry units
 - Corrugated or sheet metal
 - Smooth vinyl siding
 - Basic provisions for massing & articulation (varying building facades such that they not be one long façade of identical look)
 - Provisions for windows
 - Provisions for roof mounted equipment
 - Idea is to support increased development quality and a better overall appearance of the commercial corridors.
 - Concepts come from the Comprehensive Plan approved by the Board of Commissioners
 - Inside the Commercial Corridor Overlay district (1000 feet from the right of way along US Hwy 158) there is a provision whereby buildings which are screened from view of the street may be exempted from design standards
 - Question is do these standards go too far? Are they OK as drafted or should they be pulled back a bit?

Discussion

236

237

238 Steve Bradshaw stated his opinion is that the proposed standards do go too far. He keyed on

239 parking standards as an example of an area that goes too far. Mr. Bradshaw asked where these

240 standards come from. Mr. Meadows responded that they come from the Comprehensive Plan

241 and added that the plan calls for higher quality development, protection of community character,

242 more intense development in certain locations properly configured so that it is compatible with

243 the rural places that are not going to be higher density.

244

245 Mr. Bradshaw stated his opinion that buildings built with fewer windows and use some of the

246 materials which are on the suggested prohibition list would not affect the rural character of the

247 county. He then spoke about the different rules for parking based on the type of business and

248 asked what the rules were based on. Mr. Meadows stated that the rules for parking are based on

249 the uses which are adjacent to the parking area (example: parking requirements for a strip mall

250 are based on the uses in the strip-mall).

251

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

252 Mr. Meadows mentioned Currituck County's use type "Shopping Center" which has its own set
 253 of standards and added that something similar could be drafted for Camden.

254
 255 Commissioner Garry Meiggs observed that what the driving force behind Currituck's Shopping
 256 Center use is the amount of traffic they get from people going to and from the Outer Banks of
 257 NC. Mr. Meadows added that Camden doesn't have any where near that amount of traffic.

258
 259 Mr. Bradshaw stated that the standards can be addressed once stores begin to show adequate
 260 interest in locating to Camden.

261
 262 Mr. Dan Porter stated that public opinion from the public meetings held on this had the
 263 consensus from the public that brick block / metal buildings like those in Currituck County along
 264 US 158 were not desirable for Camden County. The intent is not to keep commercial away, but
 265 rather to create a set of standards that would result in attractive commercial buildings. The
 266 question is where to draw the line with regard to standards.

267
 268 Mr. Bradshaw commented that the landscaping requirements are too strict, trees specifically with
 269 regards to the requirements of having them in parking lots.

270
 271 With regard to Mr. Bradshaw's earlier comment, Mr. Porter commented that while yes you can
 272 change the rules, once a building is built, it is there for the life of the building.

273
 274 Rick McCall commented that he prefers to have a nice scenic drive on his way to places. He
 275 added that nice scenery is a good way to get people to come here.

276
 277 Commissioner Randy Krainiak commented that facades can be added to any kind of building so
 278 it looks a particular way from the road. Commissioner Krainiak added that nice things like
 279 landscaping are desirable to make a development look good, but he doesn't know if a standard
 280 for that kind of thing is possible to where everyone has to do it a certain way.

281
 282 Mr. Porter commented that the specific standards are not difficult to achieve when it comes to
 283 design of buildings. There are some limitations to materials, materials that are prohibited:

- 284 • Flat / smooth face block
- 285 • Flat / smooth sheet metal
- 286 • Corrugated metal
- 287 • Smooth vinyl siding

288
 289 Mr. Meadows commented that if one or more of the material prohibitions go too far, then that
 290 material can be removed from the prohibition if that would solve the problem. He added that
 291 these standards are more than just a desire to not have certain types of materials. There are
 292 standards that say if two or more types of materials are used, that the heavier material needs to
 293 go on the bottom.

294

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

295 Mr. Bradshaw asked if the prohibition on corrugated metal applies to the entire building or only
 296 to the front facade. Mr. Meadows responded saying that the intention is that the fronts and sides
 297 of buildings that are visible from streets be the first consideration, and if the Board is OK with
 298 that, then the next consideration is to look at sides of buildings that abut residential
 299 developments. The next consideration after that would be sides that abut non-residential
 300 development, corner lots, and so on.

301
 302 Mr. Meadows further stated that in some parts of the county there are homes that abut
 303 commercial development. A policy question for the Board of Commissioners is whether or not
 304 to control the design standards for commercial developments that abut residential neighborhoods.
 305 Commissioner Krainiak observed that in such situations there are buffer requirements.

306
 307 Mr. Porter asked Mr. Meadows to explain what fenestration is.

308
 309 Mr. Meadows explained that fenestration is:

- 310 • Windows & doors of glass materials
 - 311 ○ The ability to see into a building
- 312 • Standards right now say
 - 313 ○ 25% of the first floor facade that faces the street needs to be transparent.
 - 314 ▪ Can utilize window, glass, doors, or both.
- 315 • Another standard says cannot block windows with window signs. Must maintain at least
 316 25% transparency.
- 317 • Easy standard to meet

318
 319 Commissioner Krainiak asked what the purpose of windows is. Mr. Meadows stated that the
 320 purpose is to encourage people passing by to enter the building and shop there.

321
 322 Mr. Bradshaw commented that the type of business should determines how much fenestration
 323 should be needed.

324
 325 Rick McCall commented that commercial buildings facing the street or on corner lots should
 326 have to adhere to standards that would result in nice looking buildings.

327
 328 There was a brief discussion regarding the amount of transparent glass fenestration for
 329 commercial buildings in the design standards. The standard is 25% of the first floor frontal
 330 facade needs to be transparent through the use of windows or glass doors and not blocked by
 331 signage.

332
 333 Mr. Porter posed the question of should there be a requirement for the amount of windows /
 334 transparent space on the facade of buildings.

335
 336 Rick McCall asked if a warehouse would have to meet these same standards. Mr. Meadows
 337 replied that warehouses are industrial uses and are exempt from the commercial design
 338 standards.

339

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

340 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White commented that the use type determines whether a
 341 building is subject to the commercial design standards or not.
 342

343 Mr. Porter commented that some builders may want to build to the minimum design standards
 344 and the question becomes 'is the building that would be built that way, what is desired as a
 345 commercial building?'.
 346

347 Patricia Delano commented that without the presence of adequate windows and the ability to see
 348 inside a building, some might have reservations against entering such a building if the type of
 349 business were not known in advance.
 350

351 In answer to Mr. Porters earlier question, Commissioner Krainiak stated that there should be a
 352 minimum requirement for windows / fenestration.
 353

354 Mr. Bradshaw, by way of example, commented on the "Taylor's Do It Center" located in
 355 Moyock NC. He stated that there are very few windows in that building and the nature of the
 356 type of business that it is does not necessitate much in the way of windows. His opinion was that
 357 should Camden get such a business, that the requirement for windows would be excessive given
 358 this type of business, and that the requirement for windows should be based on the type of
 359 business.
 360

361 Mr. Meadows stated that the standard reads that no more than 25% of the window can be
 362 blocked with signage, but that does not mean that nothing can go in the window. (i.e. window
 363 displays). Commissioner Meiggs stated that this means that 25% of the total square feet of the
 364 window space (and doors if they are transparent) can have signage, no more.
 365

366 Mr. Meadows asked the Board of Commissioner members present if the consensus is that the
 367 standards applied to building facades for buildings facing the street are acceptable. The general
 368 consensus was that they are.
 369

370 Mr. Meadows added that what can be done is to add regulations that allow an application that
 371 doesn't meet all of the requirements to still be considered. He also added that if certain standards
 372 are not "on the books" that the county will not get that kind of development. Without standards
 373 in place, there is no room for negotiating.
 374

375 Patricia Delano asked if there were standards that require things like smoke alarms, sprinkler
 376 systems, etc. Mr. Porter replied that those types of things are part of the NC Building Code and
 377 not as such standards. They are required by the state and the building inspector inspects them in
 378 the course of construction.
 379

380 Mr. Meadows then spoke of the Administrative Adjustment process:

- 381 • Makes process of application requirements flexible so some standards are not so strict
- 382 • Must be based on real reasoning
- 383 • Reminded the Board that when standards are reduced, the ability to negotiate is limited

384

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

385 Mr. Meadows added that the county doesn't or shouldn't want to strive for a lesser community
386 than what is here today. Commissioner Krainiak agreed, saying that developers can be told "this
387 is the kind of building we want here, these are our minimum standards".
388

389 Mr. Porter commented that there are little to no design standards for commercial development
390 currently. The current code was written at a time when commercial development was not a big
391 consideration for the county.
392

393 Patricia Delano asked if design standards could be based on the size of the building. Mr. Porter
394 replied saying that there are all sorts of formulas that could be applied to determine how much of
395 the standards to apply, but that when it comes to larger buildings, companies are familiar with
396 having to comply with design standards and they are ok with that. Without definitive standards,
397 it leaves staff not knowing what to approve or not approve.
398

399 Mr. Porter added that the current code only allows 16 square feet for commercial signage, and
400 says nothing about pole signs. State law used to be that if something is not addressed in the
401 county code, then it is prohibited. Now state law is that if it isn't in the county code, then what
402 ever code is closest as possible to it is what the decision is based on.
403

404 Mr. McCall asked if it is better to have stricter standards and have the ability to be flexible or is
405 it better to have more relaxed standards and still be flexible.
406

407 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White commented that the county is changing and that for
408 the sake of future development, standards are necessary or the county may become stuck with
409 whatever developers can put in place at minimum standards, and it may not be what the county
410 wants.
411

412 Mr. Meadows stated that options are:

- 413 • Go through the standards piece by piece in detail on this topic
- 414 • The Board could decide to remove the fenestration standards
- 415 • Keep the standards that have been drafted, and create an alternative process whereby an
416 applicant can work with the county on a case by case basis where they can follow a
417 different set of standards which would be subject to approval by the Planning Board and
418 the Board of Commissioners.
419

420 Mr. Bradshaw commented that a case by case scenario would open the county up to the
421 possibility of litigation on matters relating to standards. Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom
422 White agreed. Mr. Meadows stated that he didn't say it was a good solution, only that it was a
423 solution.
424

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

425 Mr. Bradshaw added that he doesn't want to see a county code with no design standards, but that
426 he feels the proposed standards go too far. He further commented that standards that apply to the
427 front of a building for aesthetic purposes shouldn't apply to the back of the building where it
428 won't be seen. He reiterated his earlier point with regard to landscaping in parking lots as un-
429 necessary. He observed that the proposed standards seem more like those of a larger city than a
430 rural county.

431
432 Mr. Meadows stated that if there are sections that Board members don't like, don't agree with,
433 then there need to be meetings to consider alternatives to those sections, not just saying that a
434 section goes too far or disagreeing with it, alternatives need to be presented.

435
436 Mr. McCall reminded those present that the County Manager did say that the code could be
437 amended, text added and deleted. Commissioner Meiggs added that the code is very much a
438 "living document". Mr. Meadows agreed saying that it can be amended.

439
440 Mr. Bradshaw commented that as the document is, it is not the easiest thing to read and
441 understand. He stated his opinion that there are too many requirements. He feels that each
442 section needs to be gone through one at a time and discussed in order to get the code done right.
443 He asked if the code that has already been agreed on can be added in to what is already existing.

444
445 Mr. Porter replied saying that while the existing ordinance can be amended, it is so integrated
446 that changing one section of the existing ordinance will affect other parts which would most
447 likely create conflicting segments of code.

448
449 Commissioner Krainiak asked if there were any particular issues that Planning Department has
450 dealt with in regards to the ordinances that necessitate fixing the ordinances.

451
452 Mr. Porter replied that when commercial developers and others ask what the design standards
453 are, the only answer that can be given is to say that there aren't any. Vice Chairman
454 Commissioner Tom White reiterated his earlier comment regarding the need for standards in
455 order to control the type of development that comes into the county.

456
457 Commissioner Krainiak asked if the state already has certain standards, and if the proposed
458 codes are only to suite the particular needs of Camden. Mr. Meadows replied saying that the
459 state does not regulate the appearance of buildings, and they limit the ability to regulate
460 appearance of single family dwellings, townhomes, and duplexes, etc.

461
462 Mr. Meadows added that one option is that the standards could be turned into guidelines, but
463 cautioned that doing so removes the requirement of an applicant to follow such guidelines. Mr.
464 Meadows further added that with guidelines, the county has no control and cannot force an
465 applicant to follow a guideline that is not a requirement. Standards are requirements, guidelines
466 are not.

467

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

468 Commissioner Krainiak asked if the Board of Commissioners can deny an application because a
469 guideline was not followed. Mr. Meadows replied saying that legally if it is a guideline then the
470 application cannot be denied, only if it were a standard that was not followed could it be denied.
471

472 Mr. Porter stated that if guidelines are used instead of standards, then applications would be back
473 to being considered on case by case basis, and would not be able to be denied for not following
474 guidelines. If standards are used, and are not followed, then there is a legitimate reason for
475 denying an application.
476

477 Mr. McCall asked about the possibility of utilizing the variance process to get around some
478 standards. Mr. Meadows replied saying that variances require an applicant to prove that there is
479 a non-personal hardship, which was not caused by the applicant, which is the reason why a
480 standard cannot be met. Companies looking to locate to Camden County will find a way to
481 comply with standards.
482

483 Mr. Porter commented that even mom & pop stores should be able to comply with standards
484 because even though the percentages are the same as they are for larger buildings, the expenses
485 for smaller buildings are much less. Mr. Meadows suggested that there could be exceptions
486 written into the code for smaller buildings.
487

488 Commissioner Krainiak asked if there could be a review board for situations where an applicant
489 didn't want to comply with the standards and instead proposed their own criteria / standards.
490

491 Mr. Meadows stated that a process could be created for those who don't want to comply. Such a
492 process would need to be Quasi-Judicial in nature, and there are legal dangers with using such a
493 process. Mr. Meadows added that a safer alternative for a developer would be to consider using
494 the process for a Planned Unit Development.
495

496 Commissioner Krainiak asked if there was a way to appeal standards. Mr. Meadows replied that
497 it would go before the Board of Adjustment if there was a situation where an applicant felt a
498 standard was misapplied either by Board or Staff. He added that the Board of Adjustment is not
499 a review board that someone can go to if they simply don't want to follow the standards. He
500 further added that the Planned Unit Development option, while not Quasi-Judicial, would
501 achieve the same kind of thing where an applicant can suggest their own standards. Planned
502 Unit Development would be less legally dangerous because it is not Quasi-Judicial. It does not
503 carry the same limitations as the commercial design standards and is thus a more viable tool for
504 people to use if they want to deviate from the standards.
505

506 Mr. Porter commented that many years ago, almost all commercial uses required a special use
507 permit, even home occupations. The Board of Commissioners at that time asked staff to look at
508 the Table of Permissible Uses and pull out things that didn't need to go before the Board. Those
509 items then became such that they only needed a simple zoning permit.
510

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

511 Mr. Porter added that the proposal here is:

- 512 • Minor Site Plans become an item for Administrative Review & Approval
 513 • Major Site Plans go before the Planning Board but not the Board of Commissioners
 514 • Special Use Permits go directly to the Board of Commissioners, removing the need for
 515 Planning Board to hear them.

516
 517 Mr. Porter stated that the idea is to make it easier for commercial businesses to obtain the permits
 518 needed to come to Camden County. Good minimum standards are necessary so that staff can
 519 look at things and know whether or not to approve something that is an administrative decision.
 520 Businesses will not be deterred by standards.

521
 522 Patricia Delano asked if there was room for negotiation regarding requirements such as the
 523 amount of glass (windows), can it be based on the size of a building in a tiered fashion.
 524

525 Mr. Meadows suggested using the Administrative Adjustment process for that, allowing staff to
 526 make adjustments to certain standards such as the amount of fenestration on a frontal facade.
 527 Allow staff to make a certain amount of adjustment to the requirement by setting an allowable
 528 range of variation and if the applicant wanted to go beyond that, they would have to go to the
 529 Planning Board who would then make the decision to allow it or not. This approach could be
 530 used for any standard.

531
 532 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White asked if that would get the county into trouble by
 533 treating one person differently from another. Mr. Meadows replied that it could create more
 534 potential for legal problems than not allowing deviation from the standards. He added that it
 535 would be a happy medium to allow some deviation.
 536

537 Mr. Porter suggested that there could be a reasonable range of deviation in order to provide some
 538 flexibility. He added that there should still be a good reason provided by the applicant for
 539 needing deviation.
 540

541 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White agreed with Mr. Porter's suggestion saying this would
 542 be less likely to result in legal issues because all applicants would be treated the same.
 543

544 Mr. Meadows suggested a table listing all the standards, range of allowed deviation, and
 545 rationale for allowing deviation. He added that if there are specific commercial design standards
 546 that Board members would like to see some adjustment to, that they should provide some
 547 suggestions as to how they should be adjusted. He also added that the consensus he's hearing on
 548 the Administrative Adjustment procedure is that it be broadened to create flexibility.
 549

550 Mr. Porter commented that Parking & Landscaping can be added as separate topics of discussion
 551 for a future meeting.
 552

553 At this time, Mr. Meadows moved on to the next topic of discussion: Farmland Compatibility.
 554

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

555 Farmland Compatibility

- 556 • Section 5.5 of the Proposed Revised UDO
- 557 • Intent of these provisions is to protect existing farm operations from new development
- 558 coming in, specifically to protect against grievances by new residential land owners
- 559 against farm operations that were there first.
- 560 • Current approach is to require a 50 foot vegetative buffer between farm operations and
- 561 major subdivisions.
- 562 • Proposal is the same as current, but add some specific standards as to the types and
- 563 amounts of vegetation required, and the added incorporation of a fence, berm, drainage
- 564 ditch, or combination of these into the buffer.
- 565

566 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White asked if there were any provisions that would protect

567 the trees from pesticide spray when farmers are crop dusting / spraying. He added that more than

568 likely such spray would harm if not kill trees.

569

570 Mr. Meadows replied saying that it becomes a question of balance. How far should the

571 Farmland Compatibility standards go. While it is true that people in subdivisions that abut

572 farmland moved to that location, the courts are supporting them when it comes to issues like

573 noise, odor, pesticide overspray, etc., from the farm. The idea is to protect the farms from

574 situations like that occurring in the first place by adding standards that require buffers, open

575 space, etc.

576

577 Mr. Bradshaw asked what good a fence, as part of a buffer, would do. He observed that it would

578 not stop odors, spray, etc. Mr. Meadows replied saying that the only thing a fence is likely to do

579 is prevent a child from wandering into the farm field, and thus protect the child from harm.

580

581 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White reiterated that trees as part of a buffer are a problem

582 to farmers where crop-dusting / spraying is concerned.

583

584 Mr. Meadows suggested a menu of choices for buffer separations, such as canals, berms, or other

585 types of separations.

586

587 Commissioner Krainiak commented that a farmer will find a way to spray his crops if he can't

588 use a plane. He'll use a tractor with a spray arm if he needs to.

589

590 Mr. Bradshaw suggested instead of canopy trees, that some variety of fast growing tree be

591 utilized. Mr. Meadows replied that could be done, or even staggered rows of trees and shrubs.

592

593 Mr. Bradshaw added that if there are existing trees / woodland, that they should be used, even if

594 they are on the farm side

595

596 Mr. Meadows clarified that the wooded area referred to would be on the developer side. He

597 stated that what he's hearing is that if there is already vegetative material on the farm side, that

598 the developer shouldn't be required to place a buffer.

599

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

600 Commissioner Garry Meiggs stated that approach would be a bad idea because if, after the
601 developer develops all the way to the property line, the farmer decides to clear his land, then
602 there is no buffer at all and there is a problem then. He added that the farmer is not responsible
603 for creating a buffer between his land and a development, that is the responsibility of the
604 developer.

605
606 Mr. Meadows reiterated that the intent is to prevent situations which would result in complaints
607 from residents against farmers. He added that what he is hearing is that there should be some
608 kind of space between farm and residential uses. He asked the Board members their thoughts on
609 the requirement of vegetative buffers. He added that canals are also an option.

610
611 Cathleen Saunders expressed agreement with Mr. Bradshaw that there should be mixed types of
612 vegetation - understory and canopy trees, and shrubs.

613
614 Mr. Porter asked for consensus on the following:

- 615 • Does there need to be a 50 foot buffer?
- 616 • If so, can it be comprised of open space, stormwater ditch / linear pond, or does it have to
617 be vegetative?

618
619 Mr. Meadows stated that there was a stipulation that a buffer had to incorporate a fence, berm, or
620 a ditch, or some combination of these.

621
622 After a brief discussion regarding fences, consensus was to get rid of the fence requirement from
623 the vegetative buffer but to leave the berm and ditch.

624
625 Consensus to Mr. Porter's questions were that there does need to be a 50 foot buffer and that it
626 can be either vegetative, open space, or stormwater ditch / linear pond.

627
628 At this time, Mr. Porter asked for the Board to set a date for another meeting to continue this
629 presentation. The Board chose Wednesday, July 25, 2018 at 4:30 in the Camden County Senior
630 Center for the next meeting.

631

CAMDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Joint Meeting – July 18, 2018

632 **ADJOURN PLANNING BOARD & BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**633 *Motion to Adjourn Planning Board*

634	RESULT:	PASSED [UNANIMOUS]
635	MOVER:	Rick McCall, Board Member
636	SECONDER:	Cathleen M. Saunders, Board Member
637	AYES:	Leary, Delano, Harris, Saunders, McCall, Bradshaw
638	ABSENT:	Albertson

639 The Planning Board adjourned the joint meeting at 6:45 PM.

640 *Adjourn Board of Commissioners*641 Vice Chairman Commissioner Tom White adjourned the joint meeting of the Camden
642 County Board of Commissioners at 6:45 PM.

643

644

645

Chairman Calvin Leary

646

Camden County Planning Board

647

648

649

650

651

Vice Chairman Tom White

652

Camden County Board of Commissioners

653

654

655 *ATTEST:*

656

657

658

*Amy Barnett, Planning Clerk*660 *Assistant Clerk to the Board of Commissioners*661 *Clerk to the Planning Board*



**Camden County Planning Board
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY SHEET**

Minutes

Item Number: 3.3

Meeting Date: November 14, 2018

Submitted By: Karen Davis, Clerk to the Board
Administration
Prepared by: Amy Barnett

Item Title Planning Board / Bd of Commissioners Minutes July 25, 2018
(Please Note: Already Considered and Approved by BOC)

Attachments: Planning Bd / Bd of Commissioners July 25, 2018
(PDF)

Camden County Planning Board
Camden County Board of Commissioners
UDO Work Session
July 25, 2018; 5:00 PM
Senior Center
Camden, North Carolina

MINUTES

The Camden County Planning Board and the Camden County Board of Commissioners met jointly for a UDO work session on July 25, 2018 at 5:00 PM at the Camden County Senior Center.

Planning Board Chairman Calvin Leary and Board of Commissioners Vice Chairman Tom White called their respective board meetings to order at 5:05 PM.

Planning Board Members Present: Chairman Calvin Leary, Vice Chairwoman Patricia Delano, Board Members Cathleen Saunders, Rick McCall and Steven Bradshaw.

Board of Commissioners Members Present: Vice Chairman Tom White, Commissioners Garry Meiggs, Randy Krainiak and Ross Munro.

Staff Present: Planning Director Dan Porter, Permit Officer Dave Parks, County Manager Ken Bowman, Clerk to the Board Karen Davis

Dan Porter began the meeting by reviewing with the group the following:

- Comprehensive Plan Vision Statement
- Priority Action Strategies
- Purpose of the Unified Development Ordinance
- Strategic Goals

Chad Meadows of CodeWright Planners, LLC then further expounded on the purpose of the Unified Development Ordinance.

Dan reviewed the comments from the meeting with local sign businesses. During the discussion the following changes were decided upon by consensus:

- Special signage for business grand openings, etc. – 30 days
- Signs in residential districts – up to 20 square feet
- Mixed Use Table max face area for window signs - 50% window coverage
- Monument signage – Up to 6 feet in height

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75

Kenneth Wallace of 136 S. Trotman Road requested an opportunity to address the group. Mr. Wallace expressed his concern in regard to the aesthetics of new business construction and signage. It was his request that county leadership take this into consideration when allowing new business, especially chains and franchises, to develop in the county and ensure that any new construction fits in aesthetically with the existing community. He was particularly concerned with limiting the impact of free-standing pole signs lining the roadside and building signage. He showed examples comparing what he considered good and bad signage.

Chad Meadows reviewed the **Commercial Design Standards** current approach and the following changes were made by consensus of the group:

- Building Orientation – Design standards apply to primary entrance and the side facing a street.
- Fenestration – 25% of the first 10 feet in height; any deviation will require SUP.

Chad Meadows reviewed the **Limitations on Accessory Structures** current approach and the following changes were made by consensus:

- Size – No limit on accessory structure size other than what is already limited by setbacks and impervious surfaces.
- Location – Limiting location on accessory structures to no farther forward than the front façade on lots smaller than 2 acres; 2 acres and larger – no limitation on location.

Chad Meadows reviewed **Open Space** current approach and proposed key changes. The following decision was made by consensus:

- Reduce residential requirement from 15% to 5% of development area.

Chad Meadows began the discussion concerning **HOA and Escrows** current approach and proposed key changes.

As part of the HOA and Escrows discussion, Steven Bradshaw presented the following:

Camden Storm Water Management

Purpose: To provide a more effective and efficient Storm Water Management (SWM) process.

Proposal: The county performs inspections and recertifications requirements for Developments and inspects home owners for culvert maintenance issues that impend the flow of storm water from their or other's properties. Any repairs or maintenance issues are turned over to the HOA or home owner which has 90 days to repair or the county performs repairs and assesses the home owners for all cost! Recertifications fees are paid by the HOA on an annual basis. Note: Only the HOA portion will be addresses in the UDO, but wanted to expand the SWM concept while on the subject. The SWM discussions must be coordinated with the HOA section.

Justification for change:

1. HOAs are weak when it comes to assessments.
2. HOAs have failed/gone out of existence. If HOAs can't or won't perform, what does the county do then?
3. What prevents HOAs from depleting SWM funds provide by the developer under 6.4.8? Section 6.3.10 is a much better
 4. Each HOA will need to learn the requirements, contact an Engineering firm to certify, and contract contractors to perform the repairs.
 5. The county SWM person will be the expert and with an ongoing relationship with and Engineering firm (lowest bidder) can reduce cost of certifications.
 6. The county does not require a current homeowner to clear/replace a culvert blocking the ditching along the roads. I have been working with Brian to develop a dumping/fill ordinance.
 7. The county will be required to keep track of recertification requirements anyway per the new UDO section 7.1.5.B, D and E.
 8. Having a county wide Storm Water Management plan will insure funds are spent in the most productive manner.
 9. County taxes are tax deductible; HOA fees are not.
 10. IT WOULD SAVE THE HOME OWNERS MONEY and the system will be maintained.

Discussion: I want to start by saying that I fully support developments being designed to incorporate storm water issues. The requirement to maintain the first 5 inches of rainfall will significantly improve what we have now. I do object to what I see as two classes of homeowners; one with thousands of dollars of up front cost and large potential cost for maintenance and those that pay next to nothing!

Ways the County Control method is simpler and much more efficient:

1. Having repeat business, the county could bid out certifications to several firms.
2. The county will have to track all developments anyway and go after the ones that don't comply.
3. Contractors like repeat business and will be much more responsive to an ongoing business relationship.
4. If you have a neighborhood system it is an island; without a good drainage plan outside the development, you will still have storm water issues. A coordinated county wide system would work much better. I have been working with Brian to develop an any dumping/fill ordinance.

Dan Porter explained that a Special Assessment Taxing District would be required to be set up for each subdivision if the county were to adopt Mr. Bradshaw's plan. Concerns from the group were expressed in regard to county resources (staff, funds, etc.), liability and the legality of the plan.

After discussion, it was decided by the majority of the group to proceed with the HOA and Escrows key changes as proposed by staff.

Chad Meadows reviewed **Stormwater Maintenance Details** current approach and proposed key changes.

92 After discussion, it was decided by a majority of the group to proceed with the key changes as
 93 proposed by staff.

94
 95 Chad Meadows reviewed **Mandatory Potable Water Hookup** current approach. The following
 96 was decided by a majority of the group:

- 97 • New major subdivisions - must connect to public water supply.
- 98 • New minor subdivisions with water line availability – must connect to public water
 99 supply.
- 100 • New minor subdivisions without availability would not require connection to public
 101 water supply.

102
 103 Chad Meadows reviewed **Fire Hydrants** current approach and proposed key changes from
 104 previous discussion with the Board of Commissioners which was that all new major subdivisions
 105 would be required to install 6-inch lines and fire hydrants, even if fire hydrants were just flushing
 106 hydrants. No changes were decided upon by the group.

107
 108 Chad Meadows reviewed the issue of **Minor Subdivisions** current approach of up to five lots –
 109 four tracts and a residual. Waiting period is five years before additional development is allowed
 110 on the same parent tract to be considered a minor subdivision. It was decided upon by a majority
 111 to keep the current approach.

112
 113 It was decided by consensus of the group to allow staff to complete the issues of Parking and
 114 Landscaping and send the proposed changes to the group for feedback.

115
 116 The public hearing will be set on September 10, 2018 and will be held on October 1, 2018.

117
 118 The joint meeting of the Board of Commissioners and Planning Board adjourned at 8:55 PM.

119
 120
 121
 122 _____
 123 Calvin Leary, Chairman
 124 Camden County Planning Board

Tom White, Acting Chairman
 Camden County Board of Commissioners

125
 126 ATTEST:
 127
 128 _____
 129 Karen M. Davis
 130 Clerk to the Board of Commissioners



**Camden County Planning Board
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY SHEET**

New Business

Item Number: 4.1

Meeting Date: November 14, 2018

Submitted By: Amy Barnett, Planning Clerk
Planning & Zoning
Prepared by: Amy Barnett

Item Title UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat

Attachments: UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat
(PDF)

See Inserted Attachment for Maps

Final Plat
Sandy Hook Crossing
UDO 2016-09-14

1. **Applicant:** Avery Family Revocable Trust
2. **Agent for Applicant:** Steve Bradshaw
3. **Address of Agent:** 102 Avery Drive
Shiloh, NC 27074
4. **PIN:** 03-8964-00-94-3691
5. **Name(s) of Current Owner(s) of Record:**
6. **Street Address of Property:** See Final Plat
7. **Location of Property:** Off Sandy Hook and Batlett Roads
8. **Flood Zone:** X
9. **Zoning District(s):** Basic Residential (R3-1)
10. **General Description of the Proposal:** Final Plat Phase Sandy Hook Crossing – 16 lot Major Subdivision
11. **Date Application Received by County:** October 16, 2018
12. **Received by:** David Parks, Permits Officer
13. **Application fee paid:** Yes.\$800.00 Check #1024
14. **Completeness of Application:** Application is generally complete.
15. **Documentation received:**
 - A. Application fee
 - B. Final Plat
 - C. As Builts – 2 copies signed.
 - D. NCDOT letter on Pavement Certification
 - E. Copy of Restrictive Covenants
16. **Compliance with Preliminary Plat Special Use Permit:** All requirements of the Special Use Permit issued for this development have been met or guaranteed (i.e. bonded)
17. **Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of Final Plat for Sandy Hook Crossing Major Subdivision.



Land Use/Development Application

County of Camden, North Carolina

Depending upon the type of proposal, the proposal may require a Zoning Permit, Conditional Use Permit, or Special Use Permit. This form is used as the start of the application process. All applicants must submit a site plan (see "Minimum Site Plan Requirements") and a valid Health Department permit. Applicants for a Conditional Use Permit or Special Use Permit should review the "Requirements for Conditional Use Permit and Special Use Permit Applications".

Applicants for a subdivision must submit this form as their Special Use Permit application.

Please consult the Planning Office, (252) 338-1919, with any questions about your application.

Office Use Only	
PIN:	<u>07-8964-00-94-3691</u>
UDO#	<u>2016-08-14</u>
Date Received:	<u>10/16/2018</u>
Received by:	<u>SD</u>
Zoning District:	<u>RJ-1</u>
Fee Paid \$	<u>800.00</u>
Please Do Not Write In This Box	

Pa
ck #
1024

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

Applicant's Name: Avery Family Revocable Trust of July 14, 2000

If the Applicant is acting as agent for another person (the "principal"), please give that person's name on the line below and submit a copy of the agency agreement / letter with this Application.

Steven Bradshaw

Applicant's Mailing Address: 102 Avery Drive

Shiloh NC 27974

Daytime Phone Number 252-455-1028

Street Address Location of Property: +/- 22ac Sandy Hook & Bartlett Roads

General Description Of Proposal Sandy Hook Crossing - Final Plat (16 Lot Major Residential Subdivision)

I swear or affirm that the foregoing information and all attachments hereto (now or subsequently provided as part of this application) are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signed: Steven O Bradshaw

Dated: Oct 16, 2018

Flood Zone? X
 A
 AE
 AEFW

Located in Watershed Protection Area? Yes
 No

Taxes Paid? Yes
 No

Attachment: UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat (2217 : UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat)



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ROY COOPER
GOVERNOR

JAMES H. TROGDON, III
SECRETARY

October 24, 2018

Mr. Glenn Lamb
C & L Concrete Works Inc.
210 East Highway 158
Camden, NC 27921

Subject: Pavement Certification – Sandy Hook Crossing
Camden County

Dear Mr. Lamb:

We have received the attached test report from GET Solutions, dated October 1, 2018, for the construction of Sandy Hook Crossing in Camden County.

The Pavement Design consisted of 6" of ABC Stone Base overlain with 2" of S-9.5B Surface Course.

Based upon our review, the asphalt surface and aggregate base courses are in general conformance with the Minimum Design and Construction Criteria for Subdivision Roads.

This road will be eligible for petitioning the addition to the State System of Maintained Roads upon completion of paving, and. satisfying all other applicable minimum NCDOT criteria.

Sincerely,

Randy W. Midgett, PE
District Engineer

Attachments

Cc: J.D. Jennings, PE
C.W. Bridgers, PE
D.B. Otts, PE
G. Cooke
File

Mailing Address:
NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT FIELD OFFICE
1929 NORTH ROAD STREET
ELIZABETH CITY, NC 27909

Telephone: (252) 331-4737
Fax: (252) 331-4739
Customer Service: 1-877-368-4968

Website: www.ncdot.gov

Location:
1929 NORTH ROAD STREET
ELIZABETH CITY, NC 27909

Attachment: UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat (2217 : UDO 2016-09-14 Sandy Hook Crossing Final Plat)



**Camden County Planning Board
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY SHEET**

New Business

Item Number: 4.2

Meeting Date: November 14, 2018

Submitted By: Amy Barnett, Planning Clerk
Planning & Zoning
Prepared by: Amy Barnett

Item Title UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat

Attachments: UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat
(PDF)

See Inserted Attachment for Maps

Final Plat
Mill Run Subdivision
UDO 2015-06-07

1. **Applicant:** Assorted Development Corporation
2. **Agent for Applicant:** Bissell Professional Group
3. **Address of Agent:** P.O. Box 42
Kitty Hawk, NC 27949
4. **PIN:** 01-7090-00-07-6888/01-7090-00-17-0117
5. **Name(s) of Current Owner(s) of Record:** Assorted Development Group
6. **Street Address of Property:** Mill Run Loop
7. **Location of Property:** Off Sharon Church Road South Mills
8. **Flood Zone:** X
9. **Zoning District(s):** Basic Residential (R3-1) (Common Open Space Subdivision)
10. **General Description of the Proposal:** Final Plat Mill Run – 45 lot Major Subdivision
11. **Date Application Received by County:** October 25, 2018
12. **Received by:** David Parks, Permits Officer
13. **Application fee paid:** Yes \$2,250.00 Check #1157
14. **Completeness of Application:** Application is generally complete.
15. **Documentation received:**
 - A. Application fee
 - B. Final Plat – 7 copies
 - C. Recreational Plan
 - D. As Builts – copies signed.
 - E. Letter from NCDOT Pavement Certification
 - F. Copy of Restrictive Covenants
 - G. Landscaping Estimate
16. **Compliance with Preliminary Plat Special Use Permit:** Developer required to provide bond for Landscaping/recreational improvements. All other requirements of the Special Use Permit issued for this development have been met.
17. **Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of Final Plat for Mill Run Major Subdivision based on condition that developer provide bond for landscaping/recreational improvements not constructed.



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ROY COOPER
GOVERNOR

JAMES H. TROGDON, III
SECRETARY

October 24, 2018

Mr. Glenn Lamb
C & L Concrete Works Inc.
210 East Highway 158
Camden, NC 27921

Subject: Pavement Certification – Mill Run Subdivision
Camden County

Dear Mr. Lamb:

We have received the attached test report from GET Solutions, dated October 1, 2018, for the construction of Mill Run Subdivision in Camden County.

The Pavement Design consisted of 6" of ABC Stone Base overlain with 2" of S-9.5B Surface Course.

Based upon our review, the asphalt surface and aggregate base courses are in general conformance with the Minimum Design and Construction Criteria for Subdivision Roads.

This road will be eligible for petitioning the addition to the State System of Maintained Roads upon completion of paving, and. satisfying all other applicable minimum NCDOT criteria.

Sincerely,

Randy W. Midgett, PE
District Engineer

Attachments

Cc: J.D. Jennings, PE
C.W. Bridgers, PE
D.B. Otts, PE
G. Cooke
File

Mailing Address:
NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT FIELD OFFICE
1929 NORTH ROAD STREET
ELIZABETH CITY, NC 27909

Telephone: (252) 331-4737
Fax: (252) 331-4739
Customer Service: 1-877-368-4968

Website: www.ncdot.gov

Location:
1929 NORTH ROAD STREET
ELIZABETH CITY, NC 27909

Attachment: UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat (2218 : UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat)

MILL RUN LANDSCAPING BOND CALCULATIONS

Contractors Bid Amount: \$39,387.20
125% Bond Amount: \$49,234.00

(See attached AIA Form G703)

APPLICATION AND CERTIFICATE FOR PAYMENT AIA DOCUMENT G702 PAGE ONE OF 2 PAGES

TO: Gary Dunston

APPLICATION N° 7

Distribution to:
OWNER

PERIOD TO:

FROM: Countryscapes Landscaping Inc
366 N Gregory Rd
Shawboro, NC 27973

SECTION: A
PROJECT NO: Mill Run

CONTRACTOR'S APPLICATION FOR PAYMENT

Application is made for Payment, as shown below, in connection with the Contract. Continuation Sheet, AIA Document G703, is attached.

1. ORIGINAL CONTRACT SUM.....	\$868,931.13
2. Net change by Change Orders.....	\$13,125.00
3. CONTRACT SUM TO DATE (Line 1 - 2).....	\$882,056.13
4. TOTAL COMPLETED & STORED TO DATE.....	\$824,777.88
(Column G on G703)	
5. RETAINAGE:	
a. 10 % of Completed Work	\$82,477.79
(Column D+E on G703)	
b. % of Stored Materials	
(Column F on G703)	
Total Retainage (Line 5a+5b or Total in Column I of G703).....	\$82,477.79
6. TOTAL EARNED LESS RETAINAGE.....	\$742,300.09
(Line 4 Less Line 5 Total)	
7. LESS PREVIOUS CERTIFICATES FOR PAYMENT (Line 6 from prior Certificate)	
	\$638,394.19
8. CURRENT PAYMENT DUE.....	\$103,905.90
9. BALANCE TO FINISH, PLUS RETAINAGE.....	\$139,756.04
Line 3 Less Line 6)	

CHANGE ORDER SUMMARY	ADDITIONS	DEDUCTIONS
Total Changes approved in previous months by Owner	\$-	\$-
Total approved this Month	\$-	-
TOTALS	\$-	\$-
Net change by Change Orders	\$-	

The undersigned Contractor certifies that to the best of the Contractor's knowledge, information and belief the Work covered by this Application for Payment has been completed in accordance with the Contract Documents, that all amounts have been paid by the Contractor for Work for which previous Certificates for Payment were issued and payments received from the Owner, and that current payment shown herein is now due.

Contractor: Countryscapes Landscaping Inc

By: Clay Cartwright Date: 10-01-2018

State of: _____ County of: Camden
Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ 2017

Notary Public:

My Commission expires: _____

ARCHITECT'S CERTIFICATE FOR PAYMENT

In accordance with the Contract Documents, based on on-site observations and the data comprising the above application, the Architect certifies to the Owner that to the best of the Architect's knowledge, information and belief the Work has progressed as indicated, the quality of the Work is in accordance with the Contract Documents, and the Contractor is entitled to payment of the AMOUNT CERTIFIED.

AMOUNT CERTIFIED.....

(Attach explanation if amount certified differs from the amount applied for. Initial all figures on this Application and on the Continuation Sheet that are changed to conform to the amount certified.)

Architect:

By: _____ Date: _____

This Certificate is not negotiable. The AMOUNT CERTIFIED is payable only to the Contractor named herein. Issuance, payment and acceptance of payment are without prejudice to any rights of the Owner or Contractor under this Contract.

Payment of the above AMOUNT DUE THIS APPLICATION is recommended.
Date _____
Resident Project Representative

Payment of the above AMOUNT DUE THIS APPLICATION is recommended.
Date _____
Owner

By: _____
(Authorized Signature)

Attachment: UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat (2218 : UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat)

CONTINUATION SHEET

AIA DOCUMENT G703 PAGE 2 OF 2 PAGES

AIA Document G702, APPLICATION AND CERTIFICATE FOR PAYMENT, containing

Contractor's signed Certification is attached.

In tabulations below, amounts are stated to the nearest dollar.

Use Column I on Contracts where variable retainage for line items may apply.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 7

APPLICATION DATE: 10/01/18

SECTION:

ARCHITECT'S PROJECT NO: Mill Run

A ITEM NO.	B DESCRIPTION OF WORK	C SCHEDULED VALUE	D WORK		E COMPLETED THIS PERIOD	F MATERIALS PRESENTLY STORED (NOT IN D OR E)	G TOTAL COMPLETED AND STORED TO DATE (D+E+F)	H BALANCE TO FINISH (C-G)	I RETAINAGE
			FROM PREVIOUS APPLICATION (D + E)	% (G/C)					
	E & S 01400	\$79,370.00	74,970.00	-	-		74,970.00	4,400.00	7,497.00
	Drainage	\$130,858.13	126,435.38	-	-		126,435.38	4,422.75	12,643.54
	Earthwork	\$269,670.00	267,670.00	-	-		267,670.00	2,000.00	26,767.00
	Stone	\$55,137.50	55,137.50	-	-		55,137.50	-	5,513.75
	Asphalt	\$94,775.00	-	91,675.00	-		91,675.00	-	9,167.50
	Utilities	\$115,433.30	111,465.00	-	-		111,465.00	3,968.30	11,146.50
	Concrete	\$74,300.00	50,524.00	23,776.00	-		74,300.00	-	7,430.00
	Overhead	\$10,000.00	10,000.00	-	-		10,000.00	-	1,000.00
	Landscape	\$39,387.20	-	-	-		-	-	-
	Change Orders	\$13,125.00	13,125.00	-	-		13,125.00	-	1,312.50
		\$882,056.13	\$709,326.88	\$115,451.00	\$-		\$824,777.88	\$57,278.25	\$82,477.79
	GRAND TOTAL								

CAMDEN COUNTY
new energy. new vision

Land Use/Development Application
County of Camden, North Carolina

Depending upon the type of proposal, the proposal may require a Zoning Permit, Conditional Use Permit, or Special Use Permit. This form is used as the start of the application process. All applicants must submit a site plan (see "Minimum Site Plan Requirements") and a valid Health Department permit. Applicants for a Conditional Use Permit or Special Use Permit should review the "Requirements for Conditional Use Permit and Special Use Permit Applications".

Applicants for a subdivision must submit this form as their Special Use Permit application. Please consult the Planning Office, (252) 338-1919, with any questions about your application.

Office Use Only	
PIN:	61-7080-00-07-6 888 01-7080-00-17-0117
UDO#	2015-06-07
Date Received:	10/25/18
Received by:	AP
Zoning District:	R3-1
Fee Paid \$	3,250.00
Please Do Not Write In This Box	

60 CK #
1157

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

Applicant's Name: Assorted Development Corporation

If the Applicant is acting as agent for another person (the "principal"), please give that person's name on the line below and submit a copy of the agency agreement / letter with this Application.

Bissell Professional Group - Mark Bissell, P.E.

Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 402

Kitty Hawk NC 27949

Daytime Phone Number 252-255-0100

Street Address Location of Property: Property fronted by Sandy Lane, Keeter Barn Road and Sharon Church Road

General Description Of Proposal Special Use Permit - Final Plat - Mill Run - 45 Lot Common Open Space Major Subdivision

I swear or affirm that the foregoing information and all attachments hereto (now or subsequently provided as part of this application) are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signed:
GARLAND N. DUNSTAN, JR. (Assorted Dev Co)
Dated: October 1, 2018

Flood Zone?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	Located in Watershed	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Taxes Paid?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
	<input type="checkbox"/> A	Protection Area?	<input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> No
	<input type="checkbox"/> AE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> AEFW				

Attachment: UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat (2218 : UDO 2015-06-07 Mill Run Subdivision Final Plat)