



MINUTES
Planning Board Meeting
Tuesday, August 13, 2024
Pender County Hampstead Annex
7:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Delva Jordan, Chairman
Damien Buchanan, Vice-Chairman
Jeffrey Pitts
Jeff Beaudoin
Margaret Mosca

MEMBERS ABSENT:

John Gruntfest
Norman "Ken" Teachey

OTHERS PRESENT:

Daniel Adams, Planning Director
Justin Brantley, Deputy Planning Director
Tucker Cherry, Current Planner
Taylor Davis, Current Planner
Donna Sayre, Planning Technician
Tracy Sholders, Administrative Specialist
Trey Thurman, County Attorney
Members of the Public

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Delva Jordan called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

2 ROLL CALL

3 INVOCATION

4 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

5 ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion to approve agenda made by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Mr. Beaudoin.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan	X			
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca	X			
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X
	5	0	0	2

CARRIED.

6 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Mr. Buchanan made a motion to approve the July 2, 2024, minutes, seconded by Ms. Mosca.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan	X			
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca	X			
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X
	5	0	0	2

CARRIED.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT

Doug Holdstein, 313 Creekview Drive, Head of the Deerfield HOA. He read an article regarding the developer of Evolve Hampstead Apartments and Cottages and received several calls from the residents of Deerfield inquiring about it. He was trying to gather information on the project. He mentioned concerns over the rain from Tropical Storm Debbie.

Mr. Adams commented that Pender County and the North Carolina Department of Transportation are working on the Pender Comprehensive Transportation Plan. This is a long-range planning document that identifies major transportation improvement needs and develops long-term solutions for the next 25-30 years in the county. There is currently an open survey for this project.

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS

a) REZONE 2024-68

Adam Moran, Current Long-Range Planner, presented the staff report.

Lewis Lending LLC, applicant on behalf of Glenn Lewis, Owner, Mark M. Lewis, Owner, and Sloop Point Marina Owner's Association, owner, is requesting the approval of a Conditional Use Zoning Map Amendment to expand the current General Business – Conditional District 1 (GB-CD1) to adjacent properties that are currently zoned Residential Performance (RP). The purpose of the rezoning is to expand the existing dry stack boat storage facility as well as to allow for an office, retail space, boat sales, and boat service.

The subject properties are located about 0.5 miles southeast of the intersection of Sloop Point Loop Road and Lewis Road, in the Topsail Township and may be further identified by Pender County PINs 4224-02-0810-0000, 4224-02-7174-0000, 4224-02-7017-0000, 4224-01-6909-0000.

Mr. Adams noted the current conditions would be removed or superseded with one carried over. The 7 conditions are proposed:

1. The 30' wide parcel/access shall be combined with Parcel number (PIN) 4224-02-0810-0000.
2. No structures other than access gates shall be permitted within the 30' wide parcel/access or within 10 feet of the parcel/access.
3. A 5' sidewalk shall be built and paid for by the applicant along the length of the property adjacent to Lewis Road. The location of the sidewalk shall be determined by the Pender County Planning Department, applicant, and the

NC Department of Transportation when the proposed changes in this application are submitted as a Site Development Plan.

4. If the sidewalk addressed in the previous condition is located within the NCDOT right-of-way, then additional landscaping shall be required within the project buffer along Lewis Road to be determined by the Administrator.
5. Permanent signage required for crosswalks, area in front of ship's store and between personal automobile parking lots and drive aisle for forklift, for example: 'CAUTION: Forklift and Heavy Machinery Operation Area'.
6. Boat trailer parking shall be limited to the area noted on the approved concept plan ("Trailer Storage/Overflow Parking (30 spaces)").
7. All parking associated with the proposed use shall be contained on site. (Carried over from the previous application)

Mr. Jodan asked if the current dry stack storage was for small boats and large trailers on the north side property and if the dry stack storage would be limited to smaller boats. He asked for clarification on the stack heights and if they were made to accommodate larger boats.

Mr. Moran stated that the current boats would not be associated with the new operation. That is part of the Lewis's boat yard.

Mr. Jordan asked if there was limited access and if the boaters had to request a time to get their boat put in the water.

Mr. Moran stated that his understanding was that there is an app that people use to have their boat taken from the dry stack and placed in the water. He stated he thought it was 1 boat every few minutes or 1 every 15 minutes.

Mr. Jordan questioned how many forklifts they plan to have in operation. Mr. Moran responded that there are two from what he has seen. He noted that they planned to have at least 1 more.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were any questions for staff and there was none.

The applicant's attorney, Mr. Matt Nichols from Wilmington represented the applicant. He advised that he had Brad Schuler who is the land planner with Paramount Engineering and Tim Clinkscales who is a civil engineer with Paramount Engineering available to answer questions.

Brad Schuler, planner with Paramount Engineering, stated the boats would range in size generally from 25-30 ft, but could go up to 34'. The large boats that are currently next door would be relocated. As for the number of forklifts, there are currently 3, with the expansion, it might go up to 5 forklifts.

Mr. Jordan asked about the app and how many boats per hour that could safely get in the water to estimate the trips it would generate on the roads.

Mr. Schuler stated that under the current operation the maximum they could get in the water in one hour is between 15-20 boats. Probably around 18 boats. It takes about 4 minutes to get a boat into the water.

Mr. Jordan asked if that was with 3 forklifts. Mr. Schuler replied yes.

Mr. Jordan stated that with 5 forklifts, it would probably be about 30 boats. Mr. Schuler noted that with the expansion they would probably be between 30-40 boats in a given hour.

Mr. Schuler noted that the previous proposal was proposing 356 new boat slips, 115 parking spaces, a restaurant and the northern dry stack height of four levels. It is the intention that the three-level dry stack would be around the 32' range in height. The current proposal has reduced the number of proposed dry stacks to 112 and increased the parking to 159. The restaurant has been removed which allows more parking to be used for the dry stack operation. One change that is being made is moving the northern dry stack further back from Lewis Road allowing for a better loading area between the two dry stacks. This opens some new area to put some additional parking and tries to keep the forklifts away from the pedestrian activity. The dry stacks will be placed where current boat storage activities are going on. The northern side is wetlands and is proposed to be preserved. In the areas where it is a little narrow, some additional vegetation will be planted. For parking, there is an area reserved specifically for employees, which is 9 parking spaces. The proposal also added the proposed trailer storage overflow parking. It can be used for overflow parking, and additional parking along the front of the building on the western part of the site. In all, there are a 100 parking spaces reserved for the dry stack operation which equates to 1 space per 4.7 dry stacks. The previous proposal had a ratio of 1 space per 7.1 dry stacks. When you include the parking that is for the ship store, and the proposed office building that brings that ratio down to 1 space per 3.9 dry stacks. We did some research and found out that Wrightsville Beach requires 1 parking space for each 6 dry stack storage spaces.

Mr. Buchanan asked Mr. Schuler to repeat the ratios for current and proposed parking.

Mr. Schuler responded that the previous submittal proposed 1 parking space for every 7.1 dry stacks. Currently, 1 parking space per 4.7 dry stacks is being proposed. This does not include the overflow parking, the 20 spaces for the ship store and office building, and the 9 parking spaces for the employees. If those were included, the ratio would be 1 parking space per 3.9 dry stacks. When you compare that to Wrightsville Beach, their requirement is 1 space per each six.

Mr. Buchannan asked what the current ratio is. Mr. Schuler stated its around 1 parking space per seven dry stacks currently.

Mr. Buchanan questioned if there was 115 parking spaces currently. Mr. Schuler said no. The proposal is adding a new row, employee parking, office building parking and then the overflow parking.

Mr. Buchanan questioned with 244 dry stack spaces how much parking was available. Mr. Schuler responded he would have to go back and pull the plan.

Mr. Buchanan said I thought the staff report said 115 for parking. Mr. Schuler responded that is what was proposed for the previous rezoning.

Mr. Schuler continued with a sidewalk would be added along Lewis Road. There has been a 31% reduction in the number of slips between the previous and current proposal and the parking was increased by 38%. The height of that northern dry stack was reduced and the ability to convert that building into a restaurant has been removed.

Mr. Buchanan asked what the ingress and egress for the property is. Mr. Schuler showed the 2 current locations and stated they have gates. With the expansion, a third drive would be added which already exists. Mr. Buchanan asked for clarification on whether it was 1 or 3 entries. Mr. Schuler stated that there are currently 2 driveways to the existing dry stack operation.

Mr. Jordan inquired if the current parking was paved. Mr. Schuler replied that yes, it is paved. Mr. Jordan wanted to know how many spaces were proposed originally. Mr. Moran responded that the conditions of approval for the previous presentation was 42 spaces which are currently required.

Mr. Jordan asked for the height of the 4 high dry stacks. Mr. Schuler responded that there is a 42 ft maximum. Mr. Jordan asked for clarification if that was the height of the stack itself or the height with a boat. Mr. Schuler advised that it is the height of the dry stack itself. Mr. Jordan said so you could probably add 4 to 5 ft to the height of it depending on the height of the boat. Mr. Schuler answered yes, it is 42 ft plus the height of the boat stored there.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were any additional questions for the applicant at this time. Mr. Beaudoin replied that an issue that came up last time was trash. Mr. Schuler advised that there were trash receptacles there today and is positive they will add some to the areas they are expanding. There's a dumpster on site with multiple trash receptacles. There is also staff on site during the operating hours that help with the maintenance of the facility.

Ms. Mosca questioned the operating hours of the facility. Mr. Schuler responded with 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Ms. Mosca wanted to know if it was 7 days a week, and Mr. Schuler replied yes.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were any more questions for the applicant.

Mr. Thurman asked Mr. Schuler if he looked anywhere other than Wrightsville Beach. Mr. Schuler stated that he does not believe Wilmington has any standards and Mr. Thurman stated one parking space for every 6 slips. Mr. Schuler asked if it was wet slips or dry stacks. Mr. Thurman stated it is for the dry stacks. Swansboro has 1 for every 3. Mr. Thurman advised going to Wrightsville Beach which, short of Figure Eight, has the most expensive real estate in Southeastern North Carolina, and may not be comparable just for consideration on how many spots they need and how many slips. Mr. Schuler advised the reason they were aware of Wrightsville Beach is because they amended their code last year, it was previous 4 and they went to 6.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were any more questions for the applicant.

Mr. Buchanan asked if the current ratio was 1 per 4.7 dry stack spaces. Mr. Schuler stated yes, without the overflow parking and the parking for the retail store and office. Mr. Buchanan asked why that parking was being taken out of the calculation. Mr. Schuler stated because it also had the potential to be used for temporary trailer storage. For example, on a big event weekend, they can make sure that parking is available. Mr. Buchanan questioned if they had a designated area for trailer storage. Mr. Schuler responding yes. Mr. Buchanan questioned the need for overflow parking for additional trailer storage. Mr. Schuler stated for the dry stack operations, this is an option to be used for customers on very busy weekends when needed. Most of the time outside the summer months, there are not a lot of people taking their boats out so this amount of parking would be more appropriate during the busy weekends. Therefore, they want to have the ability that if someone needed to temporarily store their trailer during the off months it would be a possibility.

Mr. Jordan asked are you saying that during the peak season that those spaces would not be storing boat trailers. Mr. Schuler stated that we have to fit all the customer parking on site so on those weekends they can make that parking available in order to comply with the condition.

Mr. Buchanan wanted to know if the establishment has rules for vehicles per boat slip membership. Mr. Schuler advised that it is 1 per slip.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. There were none.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Norma Troutman, 611 Moore's Landing Road, stated that she has property 2 lots down from the site and is concerned about the quality of the water with additional boats. Additional boats in the marina or dry stack will influence the environment. Another concern is that the boats can become flying missiles because they are not in any way

anchored down. This was voted down the last time they applied, and I am concerned that they will keep coming back for additions.

Ray Melton, 626 Moore's Landing Road, stated he owns lots 653 and 643 on Moore's Landing Road. My concern is my pier and floating dock. They want to dump the double forklift drop off inside that boat basin and there is currently 34 ft of clearance. They are talking about dropping the double forklift there and my boat is 10 ft wide, and a customer's boat is 10 ft wide how are 100 or more boats going to get through there all the time. Jason Dail allowed me to put my sea wall in front of the boat basin so it's only about 49-48 ft now. With my floating dock and their current floating dock, we have about 34 ft. By the time my boat goes out and a customer goes out, you have about 10-14 for boats to go in and they are trying to do the double drop over there. My main concern is all the extra traffic over by my boat. Mr. Beaudoin said that is approved by CAMA so whenever they put that in there's a certain offset from your dock. Mr. Melton said Jason Dale told me to reach out to Coast Guard who told me to reach out to Wildlife who told me to reach out to Planning and Zoning. He said to keep coming to the meetings and talk to the board to see if I can get anything done.

Trisha Wahrenberger, 202 N. Sea Lilly Court, said she is a current slip owner at the marina and feels that we need this as a community. There are public docks right next to the marina. As a resident of Pecan Grove, our personal development dock is also there. Having extra slips where people can be in the slips and not have to trailer the boats in can help with the traffic back up on Lewis Road. We have been at the marina for 4 years now and the app works. You put your time in and if it is booked, you need to pick a different time. There are kids at the dock to help you. There are trash cans there. There is a big dumpster there now. This is something the community needs, they just have to figure out something with the public docks. I think this is a positive as a whole.

Beth Ogden, 363 Twin Oaks Drive, stated it has been 7 months since the Board of County Commissioners unanimously opposed this expansion. There is very little change to this, there is more parking, but my concern is environmental. The North Carolina Coastal Federation will be preparing a written letter opposing this expansion to the Board of County Commissioners. There is excessive noise caused by the forklifts which start at 6:30 a.m. This was denied previously, and they are coming back 7 months later with some changes. The residents don't want this. It's not just about the traffic it is about the environmental end of it. The request tonight is to deny this Lewis Landing application.

Ms. Mosca made the comment that there is only one parking pass given out. So on a holiday weekend, if I have that one parking pass and invite 6 of my friends and they're in four different cars, they are going to wind up parking in the public access. This is going to clog up parking spaces that could otherwise be used for the rest of the public. I have a concern over not having control over how many cars are parked that belong with the marina boats or just public wanting to access the public launch. Mr. Pitts responded that if it is not a truck and trailer, they cannot park there, and they can enforce the

towing; I know they do at Wrightsville Beach. There are several designated spaces for vehicles, the others have to be a truck and trailer. Ms. Mosca said there are a lot of non-trailer spaces and again, my concern is that they are going to be swallowed up by overflow parking by adding in this extra ability to put boats in the water.

Linda Thurston, 2434 Sloop Point Road, stated she and her husband are managers of the marina currently. As for the parking, we do have one parking pass issued per boat owner. We also issue quest parking passes for the day. On big holiday weekends, I send out emails that begin with, please make sure you are watching your speed, your trash, and consolidate cars as much as possible. We had a situation on Memorial Day weekend where we did tow cars. If you did not have a parking pass, then your car was towed.

Mr. Jordan asked if the access, on the property in question, would be a boat drop area? Mr. Moran, replied yes, the extra area, would mean it is much bigger than what is there now. Mr. Jordan asked the dimensions on the rectangular area in question. Mr. Buchanan asked Mr. Moran if you're looking at that new ramp, is it on the previous plan. Mr. Moran replied not to this extent, I believe there is a small little area that is pretty much existent, but this is a more expanded drop zone that is new to this proposal. Mr. Buchanan stated they did have some sort of ramp proposed on the previous plan for their customer business operation. It seems that this one has changed to allow for the business operation to be towards the North and for boat manufacturers or other storage of the properties to the West to utilize a smaller one. Mr. Buchanan asked if that was correct with Mr. Moran, replying there is one current drop zone next to the ship store and then there's the current drop zone that's been traditionally used by the Lewis boatyard. These were the two drop zones that were in the previous proposal, this is an additional one that is being included.

Mr. Beaudoin asked for clarification on the number of boat drops. Mr. Moran stated that the current proposal has 3. Mr. Beaudoin asked where they were located on the map. Mr. Moran stated that there is one by the ship store, that was currently used by the forklifts to come pick the boats off the dry stack. I don't believe the dry stacks currently use this drop zone that has been in existence for a while, the boatyard is using that one. Those are the two that were on the previous proposal from last year. The larger one here has been added. Mr. Beaudoin asked if they could use any of those three. Mr. Moran replied yes.

Mr. Jordan asked the applicant if they had the dimensions of this. Tim Clinkscales with Paramount engineering, stated that we do not have the dimensions, but an Environmental Firm is in the process of obtaining a CAMA permit. Mr. Clinkscales stated this is public water way, and it isn't a private water way. So, if they obtain the permit then I think Jason Dale will give the go ahead. Davey Environmental Group, in Wilmington, doesn't submit CAMA permits at this level that can't be permitted. This property has the same rights to that body of water as the northern track. Proper permitting processes are taking place. The width here is 60ft. Mr. Jordan questioned if that is 60 ft on the slip. Mr. Clinkscales responds yes. Mr. Beaudoin asked Mr. Melton

the width of the channel if you are backing boat, dropping a boat in and it's gliding out a little bit towards the North. What is the width of that to your dock. Mr. Melton said our land meets up in the head of the bason. It comes 90 degrees off the intracoastal waterway, and you have to do 15 ft each way. Mr. Beaudoin questioned how far from right where you break into the water to your dock, looks like it is over 100 ft. Mr. Melton said no. With my boat lift, there 8 ft dock and you add the new one there, it will be 30 ft.

Mr. Beaudoin asked how the winds are typically blowing? Mr. Melton reply's Northeast.

Mr. Schuler, said the comment about the Wilmington standard for parking, 4 to 1, I think that's a maximum. Mr. Thurman stated that Wilmington does not have a minimum for marinas. Mr. Schuler says the point here is that there is quite a bit of parking. The condition which we would be required to meet is we have to have all our parking on site. Operationally, we have to keep it on site. Mr. Beaudoin stated, and you have the overflow area as well. Mr. Schuler responded that is correct.

Mr. Buchanan asked if the only portion of this currently that is under conditional zoning is the southernmost parcel on the waterfront. Mr. Moran responded yes. Mr. Buchanan said I think a question was asked why they came to us first for approval before going to CAMA. Am I correct to say that if this is the portion to the North, they can still submit to CAMA right now without a conditional rezoning for that larger ramp. Mr. Moran states, a landowner, not the current marina, could submit for a CAMA permit for various types of improvements. Mr. Buchanan stated that there would be no jurisdiction by this body, the county staff or ordinance to say you can't do that because currently those parcels are not under the conditional restrictions. Mr. Adams stated it would depend on the use. Mr. Buchanan asked if the current residential performance parcel where this large ramp is being proposed is dependent on the zoning to get a CAMA permit to put something there. Mr. Adams replied not necessarily to get a CAMA permit but to operate it in the manner they are proposing.

Mr. Buchanan asked the applicant to describe where the ramp was previously located. Mr. Schuler stated that the current docks already have CAMA approval, and they are requesting a modification to change it to a larger ramp. They are essentially taking an existing access and widening it. Mr. Buchanan asked if those docks where currently in place. Mr. Schuler responded yes. Mr. Buchanan requested to know if they are for commercial use. Mr. Schuler answered yes, there is an existing boatyard on the property. I know it is zoned RP but it has historically been used as a commercial site.

Mr. Jordan inquired how many spaces the overflow parking consisted of. Mr. Schuler answered with 30 spaces. Mr. Jordan stated you said typically in the off season it is used for trailer storage. Mr. Schuler responded that in the off season, you will not need the excess parking. It will be for peak season, the summertime. In the off season, there will be a lot of unused parking and there will be the ability to get some use out of the area with temporary trailer storage for the marina customers. Mr. Jordan asked when the off season begins and ends. Mr. Schuler responded Memorial Day to Labor Day, is probably peak season. Mr. Jordan asked does that mean that from Memorial Day to

Labor Day there will not be any trailers stored in that parking area. Mr. Schuler answered no, I am saying it could be used for that. The other peaks are the weekends, so a Monday in the summertime you are not going to have the traffic as you would on a Saturday. This allows the opportunity for that parking to be used for some temporary trailer storage in the event it does not need to be used for customer vehicles. Mr. Jordan asked if during the weekdays, you could use that overflow parking for trailer storage. However, on the weekends, the busiest time, the trailers will be removed, and it will be an overflow parking lot. Mr. Schuler responded yes. Mr. Clinkscales noted that this would put them below the 4 parking spaces per slip. Mr. Schuler noted that if they include the 30 spaces, they would be at a ratio of 1 parking space per 3.6 dry stacks.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. There were none.

Mr. Jordan asked if there were anymore questions for staff. There were none.

Mr. Beaudoin made a motion to approve the Zoning Map Amendment and to make a finding that the approval is consistent with the following policies and goals in the Pender 2.0 Comprehensive Land Use Plan:

- 4.2.1: Connectivity
- 4.3: Alternate Modes of Transportation
- 4.4: Access to Public Trust Waters
- 4.4.H: Water-Based Tourism and Development
- 5.1.D: Focused Growth and Development
- 5.1.K: Commercial Development
- 5.1.M: Commercial Waterfront

Along with the seven conditions that were stated earlier in addition to ensure and eight condition which the applicant said they are already doing, to ensure that there are public trash receptacles always on the site.

Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan		X		
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca		X		
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X

	3	2	0	2
--	---	---	---	---

CARRIED.

b) REZONE 2024-69

Daniel Adams, Planning Director, requested a continuance for this case until the September 4, 2024 meeting.

Delva Jordan made a motion to continue the case and Mr. Buchanan seconded.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan	X			
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca	X			
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X
	5	0	0	2

CARRIED.

c) MDP 2024-70

Justin Brantley, Current Planner, presented the staff report.

Oak Ridge Properties at Olde Point, LLC, applicant and owner, is requesting approval of a revision to the Oak Ridge at Olde Point Master Development Plan to add Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers (2007 NAICS 531210) and Commercial Banks (2007 NAICS 522110) to the permitted uses within the previously approved Master Development Plan.

The subject properties are located on the eastern side of US HWY 174 between its intersections of Country Club Drive to the south and Ravenswood Road to the north in the Topsail Township.

Mr. Jordan asked if the applicant was making a presentation. Mr. Brantley stated no but they were available to answer questions.

Mr. Jordan asked if anyone had any questions for the applicant. There were no questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

John Filippi, 219 Ravenswood Road, asked how many of you live in Hampstead and how many have visited the Sheetz. Mr. Beaudoin asked if he was referring to the left turns being made from Sheetz. Mr. Filippi said that they cannot get out of Ravenswood due to the traffic. I don't mind a bank or a real estate office, but a restaurant would result in even more traffic. When a true emergency happens, they will not be able to get out as they are land locked. There will be a rude awakening due to the loss of life during such an event.

Beth Butler, 113 Coots Trail, President of the HOA for Olde Point stated she was present at the January 2021 Planning Board meeting and my concern then was the safety of the kids and elderly. There was a traffic study done for Ravenswood and Jessi Leonard with the DOT said a crosswalk was needed in 2021. We got on the list for extra funding but did not make the cut. I spoke with Mr. Sneedeen about kids going to Sheetz and thinking about safety. We are on a semi-circle and are trapped. This is a safety issue. I just want to prevent a bad accident and we need help with safety. We love what the developers are doing in the area.

Mr. Beaudoin asked who maintains the cut through under the current plan? Mr. Sneedeen explained that the property was owned by Ravenswood Maintenance Association which was controlled by Hampstead Town Center. They are responsible for 2/3 and I am responsible for the remaining 1/3. The connections are controlled by DOT. 1 turning lane has been added and once the water line issue with Pender County is resolved a second turning lane will be added. The permanent markings on the roads will be done in 30 days as the roads had to cure. DOT does have long term plans to add improvements for the intersections, however, they are waiting until the new bypass is complete.

Ms. Butler asked how to approach the DOT regarding crosswalks. Mr. Jordan advised that the statement he read at the beginning, "Comments should be limited to only those issues concerning whether the rezoning, text amendment, or Master Plan application should be recommended favorable or unfavorable". We are getting off topic. The time for public comment is at the beginning of the meeting. There is nothing the board can do to recommend or have the traffic issue resolved.

Trey Thurman advised that the DOT would not allow and would take anyone to court if they places things on the roads/intersections without their permission. Ms. Butler said it is not the DOTs division. Mr. Sneedeen said they do not need a DOT permit but are working with them to put traffic controllers in the road. Mr. Buchanan told Ms. Butler that the WMPO & DOT may be able to help her as they deal with smaller projects like this. Mr. Buchanan said that a crosswalk would have to have a light.

Ms. Mosca stated that the only thing the board is to be addressing is adding 2 types of uses to the project. Ms. Mosca said traffic and crosswalks have nothing to do with the case at hand.

Ms. Mosca made a motion to approve the addition of the two uses to the Master Development Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buchanan.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan	X			
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca	X			
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X
	5	0	0	2

CARRIED.

9 DISCUSSIONS

Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Moran stated that the first steering committee meeting was held on June 24, 2024, with a good group of people attending. He stated that the Board will be updated of the progress at least every other month.

Mr. Moran stated that public engagement is slated to start in the fall and the staff will need the Board to help engage the public and keep them engaged.

Mr. Buchanan asked if minutes are taken during the meetings. Mr. Moran stated that the County's consultant has taken minutes, and it has been discussed as to how to make the minutes available. Mr. Buchanan asked if the minutes and presentations can be made available to the Planning Board to which Mr. Moran responded affirmatively.

Mr. Buchanan stated he attended the meeting and there was interesting data that was presented that would be important for the Board to review.

Mr. Jordan stated that the Board has not had a workshop in quite a while so this may be a very good topic to hold a workshop on. Mr. Moran stated that there are also some

text amendments that are currently being worked on that would be good to include in a workshop as well.

Mr. Moran stated that a few of the consultants that gave presentations at the first meeting may be willing to conduct a virtual presentation for the Board during the workshop.

10 NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Adams advised that next month there would be 7 cases, 5 on the East side of Pender County and 2 on the West side. Would the board like to have a long meeting on September 4 or divide it up into two meetings? One in Hampstead for the East side cases and one in Burgaw for the West side cases. Mr. Beaudoin made a motion to have two meetings. Mr. Buchanan seconded the motion.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan	X			
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca	X			
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X
	5	0	0	2

CARRIED.

September 4, 2024, at 7:00 p.m.
Pender County Hampstead Annex
15060 US Hwy. 17
Hampstead, NC 28443

September 9, 2024, at 7:00 p.m.
Board of County Commissioners Room
805 S. Walker Street
Burgaw, NC 28443

11 ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Beaudoin made a motion to adjourn with Mr. Pitts seconding the

motion.

Motion to approve

	For	Against	Abstained	Absent
Delva Jordan	X			
Damien Buchanan	X			
Jeffrey Pitts	X			
Margaret Mosca	X			
John Gruntfest				X
Jeff Beaudoin	X			
Norman (Ken) Teachey				X
	5	0	0	2

CARRIED.

Adjourned at 9:17pm.