

MINUTES

PLANNING BOARD

BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC

**6:00 P.M. Monday
March 13, 2017**

**Commissioners Chambers
David R. Sandifer Administration Bldg.
County Government Center
Old U.S 17 East**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Eric Dunham, Chair
Joy Easley, Vice Chair
Richard Leary
Chris Stanley
Troy Price
Tom Simmons
Randy Ward

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Michael Hargett, Director
Helen Bunch, Zoning Administrator
Kirstie Dixon, Planning Manager
Connie Marlowe, Admin. Asst.
Marc Pages, Land Planner
Bryan Batton, Asst. County Attorney

OTHERS PRESENT

John Hankins
Stanley Figlewski
Brian Slattery, Brunswick Beacon
Hugh Campbell
Phillip Joyner
Doug Turner
Wayne Smith
Naomi Dumire
Tom Tucker
Diana Liddle
Holly Hewett Long
Chris Musi
Pam Sabalos
Jeff Sheppard
William Bittenbender

Lewis Dozier
Calvin Chandler, Attorney-At-Law
Sonya Rozier
Davis Milligan
Mark Giordano
Scott Nonnenman
Alvin (Buddy) Milliken, Jr.
Michael Norton
Kimberly Tripp Andrews
Anne Neely
Marty Mentzer
Earl Andrews
Brandon Hewett Long
Crystal Tripp Sheppard

I. CALL TO ORDER.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

II. INVOCATION/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

Mr. Dunham said a prayer. The Chair asked everyone to stand and face the U.S. Flag to say the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. ROLL CALL.

There were no members absent.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF THE 13-FEB-17 MEETING.

Ms. Easley made a motion to approve the minutes as written and the motion was unanimously carried.

V. AGENDA AMENDMENTS.

There were none.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT.

There were none.

VII. OLD BUSINESS.

A. Rezoning Z-750CZ – Community Real Estate/Stanley Figlewski.

Request to rezone approximately 12.18 acres located at 5220 Ocean Hwy West (US 17) near Shallotte from C-LD (Commercial Low Density) and R-7500 (Medium Density Residential) to C-LDCZ (Commercial Low Density Conditional Zoning) for Tax Parcel 21200011.

Land Use Plan Map Amendment LUM-750CZ:

Request to amend approximately 12.18 acres located at 5220 Ocean Hwy West (US 17) near Shallotte from LDR (Low Density Residential) to Commercial for Tax Parcel 21200011.

The Chair said this matter was tabled at the 13-Feb-17 Planning Board meeting so the applicant and neighboring property owners could get together to come up with a compromise regarding the buffers. He asked if such has occurred? Mr. Figlewski said they have a presentation regarding their meeting with the neighborhood after the Planning Board's 13-Feb-17 meeting.

Mr. Leary made a motion to open the Public Hearing and the motion was unanimously carried.

Ms. Dixon addressed the Board. She summarized (attached) the applicant's outcome from the post Planning Board meeting with the neighborhood. She stated that the applicant(s) removed some of the permitted uses from Area B (day care facility, bed & breakfast, and professional office [except banks & financial institutions]), which is along Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316).

Mr. Dunham said there are several split-zoned parcels in the area and he asked if staff is proposing any zoning changes to make those parcels consistent? Ms. Dixon said staff is not addressing those split-zone parcels at this time because there has not been an inquiry from the property owners to make a change in the zoning designation.

Mr. Davis Milligan, Executor of the Estate of Clara M. Russ, re-addressed the Board. Mr. Milligan said the applicant has interacted with the neighboring property owners to find out their concerns and the applicant's proposal addresses the neighboring property owners' concerns. Mr. Milligan said he is in favor of the proposed use.

Ms. Sonya Rozier, Project Manager, re-addressed the Board. Ms. Rozier said they have made numerous attempts to meet with neighbors and property owners adjoining the subject property. She stated that they have had several conference calls with staff after the initial Planning Board meeting. Ms. Rozier said they sent out invitations for a second meeting with adjoining property owners as well as posted a notice(s) on US 17 and Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316) inviting neighbors to schedule a meeting at their convenience. She stated that they were available on site from 2:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Ms. Rozier said 66% of the neighbors did not respond to the invite by mail or posted notice(s). She stated that 3 adjacent property owners responded to the invite and they are in favor of the proposed project as presented. Ms. Rozier discussed the cards signed by adjoining property owners that attended the 28-Feb-17 Neighborhood Meeting. She stated that many adjoining property owners expressed concern with the community maintaining a residential feel at the 13-Feb-17 meeting. Ms. Rozier said their company intends to build a state-of-the-art assisted living facility that will maintain a homelike environment. Ms. Rozier said they are not comfortable with moving the facility closer to US 17 because doing so will diminish the residential feel of the property and minimize the safety of the residents and staff. She further stated that keeping the building away from US 17 will allow for leisure walking without fear of disorientation and traffic harm to their Alzheimer patients. Ms. Rozier concluded that their Certificate of Need (CON) project was approved with a specific budgetary allowance and the State will only allow that budget to be exceeded by 15%. She said if portions of the property is sold in the future, it will only be to decrease the project cost in order to make the project financially viable and sustainable.

Mr. Hugh Campbell, operator of the proposed facility, re-addressed the Board. Mr. Campbell said they want the facility to be inclusive of the residential community. He stated that the lighting will be oriented to the site and traffic (e.g., trash pickup and deliveries) will be the same as any residential community and least disruptive as possible. He further stated that the facility will blend into the community and have a residential character.

Mr. Stanley Figlewski, Community Real Estate, re-addressed the Board. Mr. Figlewski briefly discussed the proposed buffers as presented at the previous meeting. He stated that the proposed rear buffer is 250% more than what is required for the facility along Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316); they are proposing a 50' undisturbed buffer on the eastern boundary and a 20' buffer on the western boundary. Mr. Figlewski said the other neighbors are significantly farther away from the subject property. He reiterated that there will be no additional traffic on Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316). Mr. Figlewski said there were concerns with no commercial zoning along Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316), so they elected to request a conditional zoning with limited commercial activity along Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316). Mr. Figlewski concluded that a

nursing home facility would be allowed in the current zoning, which requires more medical attention than the proposed use.

Mr. Alvin E. (Buddy) Milliken, Jr., Broker for the property, re-addressed the Board. Mr. Milliken briefly discussed the commercial trend in this area as it relates to the adjacent property owners of the subject property. He reviewed slides of property adjacent to and/or across Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316) showing existing vegetation on the subject property and neighboring properties that currently reduces the ability to see on the site. Mr. Milliken reiterated that the proposed buffers exceed the minimum requirements by the Brunswick County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Mr. Phillip Joyner, Civil Engineer for the project, re-addressed the Board. He discussed a visual map that indicated the distance adjacent property owners are from the subject property. Mr. Chris Stanley asked the distance from the wood line to the veterinary building? Mr. Figlewski said he is uncertain of the exact distance between the subject property's wood line and the veterinary building.

Mr. Milliken continued to discuss the difference in a residential development with individual lots, which is currently allowed in the R-7500 zoning district versus the proposed assisted living facility. He reviewed a visual display of permitted uses in the R-7500 and C-LD zoning districts. He made a comparison of a nursing home facility, which is a permissible use in the R-7500 zoning district and an assisted living facility, which is a less intensive use than a nursing home facility. Mr. Milliken said they will not be proposing any commercial uses in Area B of the zoning area, which is adjacent to Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316).

Mr. Mark Giordano re-addressed the Board. He stated that the applicant has not offered any new proposal for increasing the buffer(s). He stated that the neighborhood meeting was not conducive to the adjoining neighbor's schedules because the meeting times were scheduled during the middle of a workday. Mr. Giordano was dissatisfied with the way the applicant(s) handled the situation. He felt that the applicant(s) can accomplish what they want to do with a larger buffer, but they want to maximize their investment by placing future buildings on the site closer to US 17 rather than moving the proposed facility closer to US 17.

Mr. Wayne Smith re-addressed the Board. Mr. Smith said the adjoining property owners want protection from the proposed facility and an additional buffer will provide for such. Mr. Smith reiterated that the adjoining farming activity will likely generate calls from the applicant(s) when the farmers spray herbicides and pesticides on their crop, because it will likely be harmful to the patients housed in the proposed facility. He said the applicant(s) has been permitted by the State to build their facility in the Shallotte area, but it does not have to be on this specific site.

Mr. Scott Nonnenman re-addressed the Board. Mr. Nonnenman reiterated that the adjacent property owners across Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316) want additional buffers, but nothing has been offered by the applicant(s). Mr. Nonnenman said they are not opposed to the facility, but additional buffering should be considered so the site is not visible to the adjoining property owners. He felt this can be accomplished if the facility is moved closer to US 17. Mr. Nonnenman reiterated that the second neighborhood meeting was a divide and conquer technique as opposed to having a group meeting with the community. He concluded that he and his neighbors are trying to preserve the rural character of their community.

Mr. Figlewski said they allowed for flexibility of the scheduling of the neighborhood meetings; in that, the times could be changed if needed and they did not receive any calls to accommodate a scheduling conflict from the neighboring property owners. He reiterated that they do not feel the

facility should be closer to US 17 as it will not preserve the residential appeal they are trying to maintain.

Mr. Doug Turner re-addressed the Board. Mr. Turner said the proposed facility is an intrusion in a residential neighborhood. He said his property is in close proximity (rock throwing distance) to where the dumpsters will be located on the subject property. Mr. Turner felt that additional buffers should be imposed on the proposed facility to protect adjoining property owners.

Mr. Calvin Chandler, representative for Dana and Patricia Sargeant, re-addressed the Board. Mr. Chandler said his clients want a 50' buffer on the west side of the property rather than the proposed 20' buffer in order to maintain the same buffer that is proposed on the northern and eastern boundaries. Mr. Chandler said the applicant can still develop the property if such occurs and the adjoining property owners can maintain their current lifestyle.

Mr. Dunham asked why the vacant area (approximately 25') between the proposed parking and the proposed buffer in the rear could not be included in the buffer? Mr. Joyner said this is a preliminary site plan and there will likely be grading beyond the edge of the pavement for parking. Mr. Figlewski said that area will likely be landscaped because there are currently dead trees in that particular area.

Mr. Milliken said there is a wide range of distances from adjacent and/or neighboring properties. He said they met with the adjoining property owners on the west side of the subject property and their buffer concerns have been addressed. Mr. Milliken said some property owners live more than 1,000' from the subject property and the buffers should be based on the distance structures and/or parcels are from the subject property. Mr. Milliken said safety and aesthetics should be addressed without compromising the applicant's right to develop this property, while complying with the conditions agreed upon.

Mr. Chris Stanley asked why a 50' buffer cannot be on the west side for safety purposes? Mr. Campbell said the Alzheimer patients will be on the west side and a courtyard is proposed in that area for those patients. He said the Alzheimer patients need a protected area to ensure they don't wonder from the premises. Mr. Campbell indicated on a visual map that the proposed courtyard will be on the western side of the facility. Mr. Simmons suggested turning the retention pond in a vertical position to gain more access on the east side of the property. Mr. Joyner said the retention pond maybe relocated or smaller. Ms. Rozier said they wanted to ensure the Zemkes have the least exposure to the facility because they live closest to the facility on the eastern property boundary.

Ms. Easley asked about the budgetary allowance not exceeding 15% of the projected cost. Ms. Rozier said the projected cost is for the entire project, including but not limited to, the purchase of the property, operating cost and all construction costs for 3 years. She said there would have to be an application amendment to the State if said cost exceeds 15% and a revisit from the State Certificate of Need (CON) Division would have to occur.

Mr. Dunham asked staff about a nursing home facility being allowed on the subject property. Ms. Dixon said a nursing home facility is permissible in the R-7500 zone with a special use permit approval by the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Bunch said buffers would be imposed based on the use (vacant or developed) on adjoining property(ies) as well as the zoning designation on adjacent property(ies).

Ms. Dixon interjected that staff recommended that the property not be subdivided initially as the applicant(s) wanted to do. She stated that the applicant(s), initially, wanted to request a rezoning of the property, but staff suggested that conditional zoning would be more appropriate. As a

result, staff also suggested that the applicant(s) create an Area A and Area B to provide for flexibility of future expansion of the project.

Mr. Mark Giordano reiterated that the applicant does not want to increase the buffer because they want to make more money on the site. Mr. Dunham clarified that a nursing home facility could be placed on the property with Board of Adjustment approval with less buffers. Mr. Giordano said the community should not have to suffer because the applicant(s) refuse to provide sufficient buffers from adjoining property owners.

Ms. Naomi Dumire addressed the Board. She asked if there is going to be parking in the rear of the building? Mr. Dunham said the UDO regulates the number of parking spaces required for staff and visitors of the facility and a parking area is proposed adjacent to Old Shallotte Road NW (SR 1316). She suggested that a 75' buffer be on the rear of the property. Mr. Dunham said the Board has to decide how much of a buffer is sufficient and Ms. Dumire felt that a 75' buffer is not unreasonable.

With no further comments, Ms. Easley made a motion to close the Public Hearing and the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Dunham read over the worksheet that was previously completed by the Board. He felt that the proposed buffers are adequate. Mr. Stanley said, at that time, he thought the applicant(s) and neighbors should get back together and workout the buffer issue(s) so the project would be more acceptable in the community. Mr. Dunham said the proposed rear buffer exceeds the minimum requirements of the UDO by 150%. Ms. Easley said there is no specified requirement for a conditional zoning and Mr. Dunham agreed. Attorney Batton reminded the Board that the applicant(s) must agree to the conditions should the Board decide to alter what has been agreed upon by the applicant(s) and property owner.

THEREFORE, on the basis of all the foregoing, Mr. Price made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to approve from C-LD (Commercial Low Density) and R-7500 (Medium Density Residential) to C-LDCZ (Commercial Low Density Conditional Zoning) Tax Parcel 21200011 in conjunction with an amendment to the Official Brunswick County CAMA Land Use Plan Map from LDR (Low Density Residential) to Commercial Tax Parcel 21200011 located at 5220 Ocean Hwy West (US 17). The motion was denied with Mr. Simmons, Ms. Easley, Mr. Ward and Mr. Stanley opposing.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

A. Planned Development Conceptual Plan Approval – PD9

Name:	Inlet Point Planned Development
Applicant:	Inlet Point at Shallotte LLC (%Tom Tucker)
Tax Parcels:	230PA04201 and 2300002003
Location:	Located off Village Point Road SW (SR 1145) near Shallotte, NC
Description:	This is a proposed Planned Development which will consist of 144 townhome lots on a gross site of 26.4 acres creating an overall density of 5.45 units per acre.

Mr. Pages addressed the Board. Mr. Pages read the Staff Report (attached). Mr. Pages identified the proposed area on a visual map. Mr. Pages said staff recommends approval based on the following conditions:

- That the development shall proceed in conformity with all plans and design features submitted as part of the planned development application and kept on file by the Brunswick County Planning Department;
- That the development of the parcel(s) shall comply with all regulations as specified in the Brunswick County Unified Development Ordinance; and
- Add a note on the site plan at the north side of the hammerhead on Sun Sail Drive to state “Area to Parcel 2300002008 – Reserved for Easement for Possible Future Roadway Connection.”

Mr. Dunham asked staff the number of heritage trees that are on the site? Mr. Pages said the Board was provided a heritage tree survey prior to the meeting and Kacy Cook with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission submitted information (attached) to Michael Norton outlining the maritime forest area.

Mr. Ward made a motion to open the Public Hearing and the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Tom Tucker introduced himself and Mr. Michael Norton to the Board.

Mr. Michael Norton, McGill Associates, addressed the Board on behalf of Mr. Tucker. Mr. Norton said they had 2 neighborhood meetings as well as a technical review committee meeting. He stated that the major concerns at the neighborhood meeting(s) were the amount of additional traffic that the development would generate and the impact of the development of the property as opposed to leaving it as is. Mr. Norton discussed the overall conceptual plan to develop the project with regards to buffers (approximately 4.0 acres of periphery buffers and an additional 20’ buffer adjacent to residential home sites), wetlands (1.54 acres) and open space (10.48 acres including 1.4 acres of recreational open space) requirements as well as the proposed housing type. Mr. Norton said the proposed project will be a low impact development. Mr. Norton said the applicant feels there is a need for townhomes in this area and Mr. Tucker concurred. Mr. Tucker further stated that they are only proposing 144 units, but they can develop up to 196 units on the site. Mr. Tucker said Kacy Cook, with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, visited the site and she recommended they preserve the maritime forest on the site. As a result, they are providing a 50’ separation between the delineated wetlands and the proposed residences.

Mr. Dunham asked if they, initially, intend to build models with a clubhouse? Mr. Tucker said the clubhouse will likely be developed near the end, depending on the market.

Ms. Kimberly Tripp Andrews addressed the Board. Ms. Andrews was opposed to the proposed development because this is a single-family residential community. She felt that the proposed development will remove the quaintness of their community. Ms. Andrews was also concerned that there is only 1 point of ingress and egress to the property, which could potentially generate a minimum of 300 vehicles accessing that 1 road. Ms. Andrews said her 82 year old mother lives beside the road and her bedroom is approximately 30’ from the subject property. Ms. Andrews said they currently have problems with speeding motorists in the area and this development will only compound the issue, which could result in fatalities for people trying to maneuver in the area with the increased traffic generated from this development. Ms. Andrews reiterated that the proposed townhome development does not fit with the small community and family atmosphere of Shallotte Point. She felt that a lower density development comprised of single-family homes would be more appropriate.

Ms. Diana Liddle addressed the Board. Ms. Liddle was opposed to the proposed project because it will detract from what this community stands for, which is a family-oriented community.

Ms. Anne Neely addressed the Board. Ms. Neely was concerned with the 1 entrance and exit if an emergency was to occur. She was also concerned with the wetlands and potential pollution in the river. Ms. Neely asked that the Board consider the quality of life of the people currently living in the area in their decision-making.

Ms. Holly Hewett Long addressed the Board. She presented the Board with a handout (attached) regarding the history of the Shallotte Point community. Ms. Long was concerned with the potential traffic generated by the proposed development and the limited access to the property. She reiterated that there are currently speeding motorists in this neighborhood. Ms. Long was opposed to the area to Parcel 2300002008 being reserved for an easement for a possible future roadway connection. Ms. Long suggested that the matter be tabled and further studies conducted to ensure public safety for the Shallotte Point community.

Mr. Chris Musi addressed the Board. Mr. Musi felt that the proposed development will not be appropriate for this area because it does not fit into the character of the Shallotte Point community. Mr. Musi said the proposed development will ruin the natural characteristics of this area. He felt the proposed multi-family development should be in an area that is compatible with that particular use. Mr. Musi urged the Board not to be penny wise and a pound foolish with Shallotte Point.

Mr. Dunham asked how much developable land is on the subject property? Mr. Norton said there are 1.54 acres of wetlands, but they are setting aside approximately 5 acres.

Ms. Pam Sabalos addressed the Board. Ms. Sabalos read a poem about a thousand year old oak tree in the neighborhood that represents generations of families in the Shallotte Point community and she urged the Board to preserve the history of Shallotte Point.

Ms. Crystal Tripp Sheppard addressed the Board. Ms. Sheppard said her family owns the ditches in Pintail Point Subdivision and there are currently stormwater runoff issues in the neighborhood. She stated that flooding will be an issue if the applicant does not provide for stormwater runoff. Mr. Dunham said there is a retention pond proposed on the edge of the subject property. Mr. Norton added they are proposing 20' of stormwater swales on the site. He identified several areas on the site that have stormwater runoff features. Mr. Norton said on-site drainage has to be managed and collected before it is released in the natural tributaries.

Mr. Jeff Sheppard addressed the Board. Mr. Sheppard reiterated that his family owns 70 acres in this area. He said they were not allowed to change the flow of the ditches in this area and he was concerned with the applicant being allowed to do such. Mr. Pages interjected that the developer has to comply with State and local stormwater regulations per the Brunswick County Stormwater Engineer. Mr. Sheppard said there is property in the area that is always wet and the proposed development will only create more stormwater runoff.

Ms. Marty Mentzer addressed the Board. Ms. Mentzer asked if wetlands can be purchased and developed? Mr. Dunham said wetlands have to be protected and undisturbed. Ms. Mentzer felt that this development will pollute the area. She felt that the area should be left alone.

Mr. Earl Andrews addressed the Board. Mr. Andrews said they do not want the traffic from the proposed development on Pintail Avenue SW. He felt that the proposed development will trap the current residents of Pintail Point should there be another 100 year flood. Mr. Andrews was also concerned with traffic fatalities in the area due to speeding motorists.

Mr. Brandon Hewett Long addressed the Board. Mr. Long said the proposed development will change the dynamics of this community. Mr. Long reiterated that the ingress and egress was

under water on the subject property last October during a hurricane. He suggested that the plan be re-evaluated to match the existing community.

Mr. Dunham said there is similar zoning completely surrounding Shallotte Point. Mr. Long said he is uncertain when this area was zoned to R-6000. Mr. Dunham said he has been a member of the Planning Board for several years and he did not recall this area being rezoned. Ms. Holly Hewett Long said this area was always zoned R-7500, but she was told by Ms. Dixon that the zoning change occurred in 2000.

With no further comments, Mr. Leary made a motion to close the Public Hearing and the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Stanley asked staff why a hammerhead is required as a condition for approval. Mr. Pages said it does not have to be a condition if the Board chooses not to require such. Mr. Stanley said the threshold for a shorter cul-de-sac is not an option and Mr. Pages concurred. Mr. Pages said the site geography does not allow for a shorter cul-de-sac. Mr. Stanley clarified that connectivity is not a probability in the near future. Mr. Dunham said all adjoining and surrounding properties are zoned R-6000, excluding the property to the west that is in the Town of Shallotte's jurisdiction, which is currently zoned Commercial Waterfront and Mr. Pages concurred.

Mr. Stanley clarified that a residential subdivision would allow for more vehicle trips (approximately 1,000 versus 840 for the proposed project) per day and Mr. Dunham concurred.

Mr. Price made a motion to approve the Planned Development. The motion died for lack of a second. Mr. Simmons expressed concern with potential flooding in the area. Mr. Simmons made a motion to deny. The motion failed with Mr. Leary, Mr. Price, Mr. Dunham, and Mr. Stanley opposing. Mr. Price made a motion to approve the Planned Development excluding Condition #3 [Add a note on the site plan at the north side of the hammerhead on Sun Sail Drive to state "Area to Parcel 2300002008 – Reserved for Easement for Possible Future Roadway Connection"] and the motion carried 4 to 3 with Mr. Dunham, Mr. Leary, Mr. Price, and Mr. Stanley in favor and Ms. Easley, Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Ward opposing.

B. Proposed Revisions to various provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance including the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.

Ms. Dixon addressed the Board. She stated that the details of the refinements (attached) were included in the Board's packet for review. Ms. Dixon said staff is available for any questions. She further stated that a Public Hearing is required. Ms. Dixon said staff recommends approval, with a noted correction in Section 5.2.3., Industrial Use Grouping, that should include industrial parks as a permitted use in I-G and C-1. Ms. Dixon said staff also provided a copy of Appendix B that addresses parking for the disabled and parking space with access aisle as regulated by the North Carolina Building Code.

Ms. Easley asked staff about assisted living facilities being allowed as a permissible use with special use approval by the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Dixon said staff is proposing to define assisted living facilities and allow them as permissible uses in the same zoning districts as a nursing home with Board of Adjustment approval and as a limited use in the C-LD and NC zoning districts. Ms. Bunch interjected that assisted living facilities will have the same zoning options as a nursing home facility, but they are less intrusive than a nursing home facility.

Attorney Batton suggested that this be tabled, the Board review the material submitted by staff and staff provide a detailed presentation for the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Stanley made a motion to table this matter and the motion was unanimously carried.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS.

- Planning Board Cases Update

Ms. Dixon addressed the Board. She stated that the Board of Commissioners approved rezoning case Z-751 from NC (Neighborhood Commercial) to C-LD (Commercial Low Density) at their Monday 06-Mar-17 regular meeting and they approved the Brunswick County Trail Plan.

Mr. Stanley expressed concern with the Board having to approve a conceptual plan that may change after-the-fact. Mr. Dunham said this action is no different than the Board approving a rezoning change with no knowledge of what will be placed on the site other than the permitted uses in zoning district. Mr. Hargett reminded the Board that conditional zoning is another tool to address issues that some property owners face with developing their property.

X. ADJOURNMENT.

With no further business, Mr. Leary made a motion to adjourn and the motion was unanimously carried.