



Planning and Zoning Board November 9, 2017 at 6:30 pm

MINUTES

Attendance

Board members present for the meeting were:

Chairman Peter Prichard
Vice-Chairman Craig Groce
Member Harlean Botha
Member Vinnie Goel
Member Rob Taylor, Alternate
Member Lee Langston, Alternate

Board members absent for the meeting were:

None

Staff members present for the meeting were:

Martha Paige, Town Manager
Courtney Tanner, Planning Director
Benjamin Howell, Long Range Planning Manager
Michele Stegall, Current Planning Manager
Dylan Bruchhaus, Planner I
Marty Saunders, Secretary to the Board

1. Call to Order

Chairman Peter Prichard called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm.

2. Invocation

Member Botha opened the meeting with the invocation.

Chairman Prichard determined that *Alternate Member Langston* was the voting member due to the vacancy on the Board.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Director Tanner asked if the Board would like to move item 5.C., the General Overview of the UDO, to another part of the agenda or table it to the December meeting. It was suggested that the presentation be moved to item 7, after the public comment session.

MOTION: *Member Goel* made a motion to adopt the November 9, 2017 agenda as amended. *Member Botha* seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes

4a. September 21, 2017 Work Session

MOTION: *Member Botha* made a motion to approve the Planning and Zoning Board September 21, 2017 work session meeting minutes. *Member Groce* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4b. October 12, 2017

MOTION: *Member Groce* made a motion to approve the Planning and Zoning Board October 12, 2017 meeting minutes. *Member Botha* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5. Presentations

5a. Service Award

Chairman Prichard invited *former Member Esther Dunnegan* forward to present her with a plaque acknowledging her service on the Board. The staff and audience also shared appreciation for her service.

5b. New Employee Introduction

Long Range Planning Manager Benjamin Howell introduced *Transportation Planner Dylan Bruchhaus*. *Mr. Bruchhaus* is a recent graduate from Rutgers University with a Masters Degree in City & Regional Planning.

5c. Unified Development Ordinance – General Overview

Chairman Pritchard moved the item to after 2017-222-0: Draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update.

6. Public Comment Session - Old Business

6a. 2017-222-0: Draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Continued from October 12, 2017 meeting

Planning Director Tanner gave the Planning and Zoning Board an update on the CTP process to date. This included an overview of the work sessions as well as the public comment sessions. *Director Tanner* also explained access to the public comment portal located on the Transportation Plan Update website page. Total comments received through the morning of November 2, 2017 were 261. The public can continue to provide comments through the portal as long as the public comment session is open.

Chairman Prichard then opened the floor for public comments.

- **Ty Elliott** of 1161 Crabtree Crossing Parkway, Morrisville, NC. She came forward to oppose the Crabtree Crossing extension (CCE). She believes the public input process has been flawed. She noted that the approved greenway was not shown to the public in the maps presented for public input. This included the public open houses. She felt the public was misled into believing that there is no currently approved connection between Town Hall Drive and Crabtree Crossing Parkway. Therefore, any lines drawn on maps were without citizens' knowledge that a greenway connection was already approved for that location. Morrisville citizens highly value greenways and parks, bike routes and pedestrian connections. In Morrisville's 2015 Citizen Plan, 23 respondents

asked for improved greenways and bike connections. Only one comment suggested the proposed CCE roadway connection. She stated even that person wouldn't sacrifice an existing greenway had it been properly and accurately disclosed. She brought with her copies of the existing condition maps to back up her comments.

- **Chris Elliott** of 1161 Crabtree Crossing Parkway, Morrisville, NC. He came forward to oppose the CCE. He asked why the CCE was shown on the existing conditions map in the proposed CTP as it was removed from the 2009 Transportation Plan. Instead, it is shown as a future roadway complete with a sidepath, a pedestrian pathway, located a safe distance from fast moving traffic. CCE has not been accurately depicted in each draft of the proposed plan presented so far. The proposed plan also ignores the CCE greenway in the 2009 Plan. He also wanted to know why the CCE was put in the CAMPO 2045 plan, since it is not currently approved in the Morrisville roadway plan. It is his understanding that only approved town roadways can be entered into the regional CAMPO plan. He understood that *Long Range Planning Manager Howell* stated before the Planning and Zoning Board and Town Council that the CCE was entered into the current draft CTP as result of public requests specifically received at the public open houses. He believes this support came from a resident supporting commercial interests over neighborhoods. He ended with questioning the equity in the process.
- **Pamela Wright** of 1012 Kelton Cottage Way, Morrisville, NC. She was representing the Board and community of the Kelton Square Condominium Association and indicated that they are opposed to the CCE.
- **Tony Owen** of 749 Crabtree Crossing Parkway, Cary, NC. Mr. Owen was present representing the Board of Directors of Preston Falls Villas. He came forward to say they oppose the CCE. He had a question regarding a statement that was on ABC11, CAMPO's deputy director was quoted to say that the CCE was included in their draft 2045 Plan for evaluation. At the CAMPO board meeting on October 25, 2017, comments were received from both the Towns of Cary and Morrisville, resulting in the Town of Morrisville's request that the project be removed from consideration. The second comment refers to the Town of Morrisville's Planning Department's mission being to "administer development policy that will enhance the quality of life for residential and corporate citizens." He added that the engineering report described metrics such as shoulder widths to volume capacity. Nowhere in the report does it include a quality of life metric. He indicated that he believes the road connection would destroy quality of life by connecting dots on a map.
- **Tom Beebe** of 125 Hampton Pines Drive, Morrisville, NC. His initial concern is for the connection of Town Hall Drive to any street coming out of the RTP area. His understanding is that data from engineers in the past indicates that any connection to Town Hall Drive is a flawed design. He was concerned about traffic from a commuter artery out of RTP coming onto Town Hall Drive that would load onto McCrimmon and Morrisville-Carpenter Roads. He urged the Board not to compound the problem by putting RTP traffic onto Town Hall Drive and loading it onto Crabtree Crossing. He opposed additional traffic through a residential area since it would be commuter traffic. Funneling commuter traffic onto Crabtree Crossing, a two lane residential street, is a poor plan on multiple levels. Crabtree Crossing is not designed to handle that much traffic. This would add safety issues to the street and would add traffic as a

cut-through street. He believes it would be dangerous. This is not the time or place to put a connection onto Crabtree Crossing.

- **Karen Uebel** of 201 Ridge Creek Drive, Morrisville, NC. She opposes the CCE. She understands that we need to provide commuter connectivity on roads that are designed for commuter traffic, not roads that have single family homes fronting on them. There are approximately 75 residences that front on Crabtree Crossing. She feels that it is not appropriate to run commuter traffic past people's mailboxes as a permanent solution to traffic congestion. The solution is to address the hard problems like NC 54. She stated that the Town needs to address the problems to keep the commuter traffic on commuter roads.
- **Margaret Broadwell** of 109 Stella Court, Morrisville, NC. She brought new information in the form of added names to a petition opposing the connection of Green Drive and Clements Drive. The petition had 42 names on it. She urged the Planning and Zoning Board to make a recommendation to the Town Council to remove the proposed Green and Clements Drive connection from the plan. She is also opposed to making a thoroughfare through Crabtree Crossing.
- **Lisa Riegel** of 104 Grey Bridge Row, Cary, NC. Previously, she talked about an interconnected network of bike pathways, sidewalks and greenways. Her information from CAMPO was not to worry, the money was not there and Crabtree Crossing would never be a thoroughfare. She believes that if the Town wants there to be a low velocity pathway for people to walk and bike, the plan should reflect that. Secondly, she brought up VisionZero which promotes eliminating traffic fatalities. The best way to do this is through good road design with lower speed options. Lastly, is Induce Demand in which you open a roadway that people will migrate to, similar to what happened when the railroad overpass was under construction. Her hope is that the Town will keep the CCE as a greenway.
- **Daniel Reynolds** of 120 Clements Drive, Morrisville, NC. He spoke in regard to the possibility of connecting Green Drive with Clements Drive. He had three reasons to oppose that. First, there is already a cut-through which serves the connectivity issue. This means that connecting Clements with Green would not serve any better purpose. There is already a cut through from International to Southport. The second comment is that the road is not up to standard to service commuter traffic. Lastly, the homes fronting on Clements are twelve low density residential homes. This cut-through would result in a huge increase of traffic on the road. He also opposed the CCE.
- **Raymond Reynolds** of 128 Clements Drive, Morrisville, NC. He also stated that he opposes the proposed cut-through from Clements to Green. It would just put a lot of traffic where there are a lot of families. The road was designed for a small residential community and not for commuter traffic. International Drive already cuts through from Aviation Parkway to NC 54. He believes that it would be redundant to make the proposed connection. He also spoke against the CCE.
- **Rich Caira** of 114 Hampton Pines Drive, Morrisville, NC. He spoke against the CCE. First, safety is an issue. The speed limit is difficult to maintain at present. An extension would only make it worse. Secondly, the extension would impact existing home values in a negative way. Thirdly, the character of Prestonwood would change.

- **Matt Massey** of 300 Prestonwood Parkway, Cary, NC. He was at the meeting representing the Prestonwood County Club and stated their opposition to the Crabtree Crossing extension. The ambiance, the setting, the feeling found at Prestonwood would be greatly diminished. Safety for the residents and employees of the Country Club would also be affected since the employees have to cross Crabtree Crossing a lot. He hopes that Crabtree Crossing gets pulled from the plan.
- **Erik Staub** of 132 Factors Walk Lane, Morrisville, NC. He stated he was present to represent the quiet majority. He stated he did not know if he could support the plan or not. He spoke in favor of increased connectivity. If the CCE would improve traffic in the Town, he would be interested in studies so the Board and Town Council could make an educated decision.
- **Mark Santry** of 221 Ridge Creek Drive, Morrisville, NC. He believes that quality of life would be negatively affected by the proposed CCE. His experience with the grade crossing/bridge project and the attempted detour had negative results. Motorists used the Crabtree Crossing neighborhood as a cut through. High traffic volumes resulted in the mornings and afternoons on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Commuters were not respectful of neighbors trying to go to work. He expects the same thing to happen if the CCE is approved.
- **Jeanne Trenergy** of 229 Ridge Creek Drive, Morrisville, NC. She spoke in opposition to the CCE. She also indicated that in conversations with Cary residents that she heard it would be possible to construct a cul-de-sac where Morrisville meets Cary on Crabtree Crossing. She is not sure if this is plausible. She is concerned about her quality of life and home value if the extension is built.
- **Charles Matthews** of 209 Orianna Drive, Morrisville, NC. He began with comments regarding the current plan for eliminating the turn from Morrisville-Carpenter onto NC 54 and indicated that he supported the extension of Crabtree Crossing. He believes that Morrisville-Carpenter Road has been the subject of many bad decisions in the past. He does not wish to push a bad decision on another neighborhood, but that the removal of the proposed CCE would have detrimental effects on the residents on Morrisville-Carpenter. If the junction is closed, in order to get to Park West motorists would have to go 3-4 miles out of the way. He urged the Board to work with the community; specifically the Savannah and Morrisville-Carpenter communities. However, he does not wish the additional traffic on the Crabtree Crossing neighborhood.
- **Stefanie Reed** of 1672 Legendary Lane, Morrisville, NC. She came forward to support the CCE. She was concerned about the intersection at Town Hall Drive and Morrisville-Carpenter Road. There needs to be alternatives if the extension doesn't happen. She stated that she was not a supporter of 147 connecting with Town Hall Drive. She believes that the CCE and 147 connection are two separate issues. She also stated that there were too many barriers with the railroad. She believes there needs to be a more thorough study before CCE is removed from the plan.

- **Charles Cook** of 772 Crabtree Crossing Parkway, Cary, NC. He supported the statement made earlier that the Board should vote their conscience. He used the analogy that a lion that goes out and gets his food and kills his prey has no conscience. If the Board made an arbitrary decision, and voted your personal decision, it would be like the lion. He asked that the Board listen to those that have come before with comments. He invited the Board to come to Crabtree Crossing Parkway and observe the neighborhood activity. He believed that would point out the conscience to the members of the Board. He continued by saying that the traffic (and commuters) traveling through the neighborhood would not use their conscience and slow down. He asked the Board not to approve the plan.
- **Alan Knuckles** of 105 Bending Oak Way, Morrisville, NC. He re-iterated concerns regarding the CCE. Safety is one of the most important issues. He asked the Board to oppose the extension.
- **Anneli Leander** of 1212 Crabtree Crossing Parkway, Morrisville, NC. She understood that there needed to be a change to NC 54 due to the conditions for commuting. She stated that it was incompetent to take highway traffic through a residential street. If the CCE is built she believes she would have trouble backing out of her driveway. The neighborhood lived through the positive change with the overpass. However, it was difficult with the additional traffic experienced on their street. She hopes there is a solution for NC 54.
- **Erwin Winz** of 120 Hampton Pines Drive, Morrisville, NC. He spoke against the CCE. As an engineer and scientist, he felt that there will be more problems throughout the transportation system. He believes traffic should be routed around neighborhoods, not through them.

That concluded the public comments session.

Director Tanner gave the Board an update on the public comment sessions held as of this meeting. She then talked about the schedule as well as the future events ahead. *Chairman Prichard* stated that more time is necessary to review the CTP and wanted to know when a new version would be available.

Director Tanner identified areas requiring more information as requested by the Planning and Zoning Board and Town Council. Some of the CTP changes that are in progress include a comparison to the 2009 Plan including highlights of the accomplishments of the 2009 Plan, information about what projects have been funded, information about what projects have been built and information about what projects have been removed. She then addressed items in Chapters 2 through 5 as well as the Appendices. The consultants will need to dig deeper into the modeling to understand the traffic patterns through or within Morrisville. That will help determine if, for example, Davis Drive, Town Hall Drive or Aviation Parkway, etc. are commuter roads. Many other points also need clarification for better understanding. Under Alternative Traffic Modes, Figure 4.2 (map) there are alignments on the map that shift in different directions. Therefore, the information is not accurate. In Chapter 5, all the action and policy statements are being revised to be measurable. There are also a number of acronyms that need to be spelled out and a glossary of terms will be added. These are fairly

substantial changes that the consultants will need to address. A new version of the CTP is anticipated to be available in January, and presented to the Board in February.

Benjamin Howell, Long Range Planning Manager, gave an update and more information on the 147/Triangle Parkway Extension. This area would connect the existing 147 at NC 540 down to potentially McCrimmon Parkway. It is a NCDOT project, not a Town project.

Member Taylor then asked what *Mr. Howell* meant by committed project? *Mr. Howell* indicated that the funding is committed. *Member Langston* wondered if there is any chance to affect a change in some sort of direction by the Town lobbying NCDOT. If 147 were to connect to Davis Drive; that would certainly help Town Hall Drive and potentially Crabtree Crossing. *Mr. Howell* stated that the Town Council could make a policy decision that could be forwarded on to NCDOT. *Member Taylor* asked if the 147 project were to be substantially changed, would excluding the Crabtree Crossing extension significantly change the impact of the project. *Mr. Howell* responded that NCDOT is not looking that far down the road. They are focused on the extension itself. They are looking along McCrimmon Parkway at the intersections of Davis Drive and NC 54.

Mr. Howell then went on to clarify the Triangle Regional Travel Demand Model. It is a predictive model used to forecast peak periods and daily trips and is updated roughly every 5 years. The updated model has to be approved by outside agencies. The Plan used the 2010 model, since a more recent model is not available. To address this, Kimley-Horn made some changes to reflect a newer transportation network. Maps (Figures 3.1 and 3.3) show current conditions and funded or committed road projects. Once the Board and Town Council confirm a preferred road network, an additional model would be run to go into the Plan.

Member Taylor explained that he wanted a model run, without CCE since this information was needed. Would it alleviate problems to have it in the model? If not, would we be ok with what the model looks like without the extension. *Mr. Howell* asked for clarification that the requested model would be with and without the short extension and noted that the problem was that the model included other roadway projects that would pull traffic away from the extension. *Director Tanner* clarified that what the Board would like to see is a model run that is mapped and shows NC 54 with 4 lanes, Davis Drive with 6 lanes, the Airport Boulevard extension, and all funded road improvements minus the Crabtree Crossing Parkway extension.

Director Tanner then addressed the tentative schedule. *Chairman Prichard* said the Planning and Zoning Board needed an appropriate amount of time to absorb the information.

Member Langston was still interested in addressing intersection improvements; like Morrisville Parkway at Davis Drive. There are constantly back-ups there because cars want to turn right. Is there a chance to look at an intersection improvement that would add a right-turn lane? *Director Tanner* said the intersections could be discussed and prioritized.

Member Botha agreed that she would like to have more updates and details with the new model run.

Director Tanner summarized the Board's requests.

- Run a model with all the improvements, minus Crabtree Crossing Parkway extension.
- Each Planning and Zoning Board member will come back deciding where they want to see long term, mid-term and short term intersection improvements.
- Staff will summarize key public comment themes and bring back specific discussion topics for the next meeting.

Director Tanner reminded the Board that the public comment session was still open the Board needed to make a decision on the next steps.

Chairman Prichard indicated that he would like to see the website portal left open but to close the current public comment. He stated he wanted to re-open the public comment session when the next draft is complete. The Board agreed.

MOTION: *Member Goel* made a motion to close the public comment session. Member *Botha* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

A recess was taken at 8:08 pm
The meeting resumed at 8:24 pm

5c. Presentations (continued)

Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) – General Overview

Director Tanner began by giving the Board some history about the creation of the UDO. The process began in 2011 with an assessment of the current code, which led to a Town-wide rezoning and adoption of the new UDO on July 4, 2014.

The themes of the document were: Streamline the Development Process; Create Certainty while allowing Flexibility; Modify Zoning Districts to Implement the Land Use Plan; Improve Development Quality; and Increase User-Friendliness.

The result was the merging of various regulations into two manuals of standards, the UDO Administrative Manual and the Engineering, Design and Construction Manual. The UDO itself is made up of eleven articles. These articles begin with legal and administrative guidelines and goes on further to cover the review procedures for different types of development applications. The zoning tables describe all the districts and their use standards. These development regulations address all facets of a development project. There are also stormwater management and engineering requirements incorporated as well as performance standards. Lastly, nonconformities, enforcement, and interpretations and definitions complete the UDO.

Member Taylor had questions about how enforcement takes place; proactively vs. from complaints. *Director Tanner* explained that whether a violation is reported or discovered, there is an obligation to see that it is resolved. There are other ordinances that deal with nuisances, such as tall grass or abandoned vehicles. The enforcement process itself can often take a year or longer.

7. Old Business – None

8. New Business – Public Comment - None

9. New Business

9a. Sign Code

Current Planning Manager, Michele Stegall, reviewed the status of the Sign Code update, which started earlier this year. The update was driven by the 2015 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*. That decision dealt with first amendment rights and the content neutrality of signs.

She used a “real estate” sign as an example of a type of sign. Unless you read the sign, you don’t know it is a real estate sign. If reading the sign is necessary to define the sign, the regulation is in violation of *Reed*. *Member Langston* asked for clarification. *Ms. Stegall* explained that sign regulations need to be content neutral. The issue is how signs are regulated and the regulation cannot be based on the sign’s message. *Member Taylor* understood that the Town cannot make a specific rule for a “real estate” sign, because that is a category of content. *Ms. Stegall* added that the Town’s existing code isn’t very different than most codes and that in response to *Reed*, communities across the country are updating their Codes.

The Sign Code update began with the issuance of a RFP earlier this year and the hiring of a consultant, *Ansel Glink*, to complete the update. Stakeholder interviews were then held in July. The consultant has since issued a Key Issues Report. *Ms. Stegall* provided an overview of the report. She noted that the stakeholder interviews confirmed that the existing regulations are working fairly well. Most stakeholders indicated that they felt that the Town’s main “business” sign regulations are fair and several stakeholders noted that the Town’s regulations were more reasonable than some other communities. The concerns that were expressed focused on the regulations for temporary signage.

Member Langston wanted a better understanding about multi-faced signs, such as those found at Park West Village or Bethany Village. He felt the signs are cluttered and not easy to read. He asked if the Town could require one sign per business in a panel. *Ms. Stegall* explained that current regulations control the number and sizes of signs, but not how much square footage is allotted to each tenant. That is for the owner to decide and with *Reed* the message on the panels cannot be regulated. *Member Taylor* then asked about the aesthetics of these signs and *Ms. Stegall* indicated that sign materials could be regulated. *Member Langston* again inquired about the readability of these signs. *Ms. Stegall* indicated that it might be possible to require a minimum letter height for legibility and that she would discuss this possibility with the consultant.

Ms. Stegall read through a number of sign types in the existing Code such as gas pump signs, now hiring signs, credit cards signs, etc. and noted that all of these categories will need to be eliminated. She then touched on political signs. The State has regulations for political signs that likely violate *Reed*. The consultant is recommending that the Town continue to follow state law for political signs. *Member Langston* was concerned with political signs being located in medians or the right-of-way and affecting visibility. The Town’s Code was amended to match State code related to this type of sign and its location. *Director Tanner* added that there are no quantity limits, and at times candidates are asked to remove signs in certain locations. Political signs are prohibited in sight triangles

and if the Department is made aware that a political sign is causing issues with visibility, the Town can remove the sign.

The consultant gave the Town three options as an alternative to regulating signs by land use.

- Regulating signs by zoning district
- Creating new sign regulation zones
- Regulating signs based on property size

Staff is recommending that the Town create new sign districts. It allows regulation based on character. In a mixed-use development, it could also allow breaking the uses, or areas, of a development out in different ways. Focus could also be placed on the character of a commercial corridor. For example, NC 54 is made up of multiple zoning districts. Creating sign districts may also help with the regulation of electronic message signs. Creating the zone map may still be a challenge and staff has some outstanding questions about how a change to the sign district map would be administered. Would it be treated the same as a rezoning? Staff's second option would be to proceed with regulation by zoning district. Property size doesn't seem to work well.

Ms. Stegall then reviewed some of the consultant's other recommendations. The terms and definitions in the Code will need updating. Another recommendation from the consultant had to do with prohibiting pole signs. The alternative would be ground or monument signs. At this time, there could be nonconforming pole signs based on current regulations that would need to be brought up to the new standards if changes to these signs were proposed.

Chairman Prichard brought up historic markers that are typically pole signs.

Another recommendation was the prohibition of all non-government signs from being located in the right of way. A few select signs are currently allowed in the right-of-way. *Ms. Stegall* noted that the biggest impact this would probably have would be on temporary directional signs to residential developments under construction. New maintenance regulations are also recommended.

Member Botha felt like the simplest approach would be best, easiest to implement. *Chairman Prichard* agreed with *Member Botha*.

Member Taylor expressed his concern with the sign zones system, as related to an investment or business. If the sign district gets changed due to aesthetics and not their business needs, that can create issues. He does feel like the intentions of the change will be right. When created he believes sign districts regulations should favor businesses. *Ms. Stegall* stated that existing signs would be grandfathered in and considered nonconforming. Triggers for compliance would be brought into play when a change is required.

Member Groce agreed that the Town has to do something. He is, however, concerned about who will be the "sign police" and what will the costs be? He does think the sign district approach sounds like the best.

Chairman Prichard was still concerned about the historical markers. *Ms. Stegall* indicated that it may be possible to treat them as government purpose signs and will discuss the concern with the consultant.

As significant concerns were not raised about the Town's existing sign regulations. *Ms. Stegall* indicated that in creating new sign regulation zones that the goal would be to keep the regulations as similar as possible to what they are today.

9b. Adoption of the 2018 Meeting Schedule

MOTION: *Member Botha* made a motion to approve the 2018 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting Schedule. *Member Groce* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

9c. 2018 Chair and Vice Chair Appointment Recommendations

Director Tanner facilitated the process of electing the 2018 Chair and Vice-Chair to forward to the Town Council for approval.

Chairman Prichard was recommended for the position of Chair by a vote of 4-1.

Member Groce was recommended for the position of Vice-Chair by a vote of 5-0.

10. Staff Comments

Director Tanner reviewed the October 2017 Planning Newsletter.

New applications were Mason Farms Estates, a detached single-family development, and a site plan for 2200 Perimeter Park, an industrial use.

11. Planning and Zoning Board Comments

Member Groce asked about the status of filling the ETJ position on the Board.

Director Tanner updated the Board on the attempts to reach out to residents of the ETJ and indicated that there are no potential candidates as of yet. Another mailing will go out and it will go to residents as well as property owners. There is a question regarding the code and the Statute regarding filling the position.

12. Upcoming Term Expirations

None

13. Upcoming Events

None

14. Adjournment

Member Langston made a motion to adjourn the meeting. *Member Taylor* seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:34 pm.

Peter Prichard,
Planning and Zoning Board Chair

Marty Saunders,
Secretary to the Board

Date

Date