

MINUTES
TOWN OF PITTSBORO
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
AUGUST 8, 2005
7:00 P.M.

Mayor Nancy R. May called the meeting to order and gave invocation.

ATTENDANCE

Members present: Mayor Nancy R. May, Commissioners Max G. Cotten, Burnice Griffin, Jr., Clinton E. Bryan, Jr., Gene T. Brooks and Chris Walker.

Other staff present: Manager David Hughes, Clerk Alice F. Lloyd, Attorney Paul S. Messick, Jr. and Planner David Monroe.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion made by Commissioner Bryan seconded by Commissioner Griffin to approve the agenda as presented. Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion made by Commissioner Walker seconded by Commissioner Bryan to approve the consent agenda.

- Minutes of the July 25, 2005 Board of Commissioners meeting.
- Renew franchise agreement with Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc. (PSNC). PSNC is the provider of natural gas service for the Town.

Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

A FRANCHISE AGREEMENT WITH PSNC IS RECORDED IN THE BOOK OF ORDINANCES NUMBER ONE, PAGES 99-110

CITIZENS MATTERS

None

PUBLIC HEARING

Motion made by Commissioner Walker seconded by Commissioner Griffin to go into a public hearing. Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

Commissioner Bryan asked to be excused from the public hearing. Vote Aye-4
Nay-0

**REZONING REQUEST
WILLIAM STEELE III
RA TO MUPD**

Conduct a public hearing for a rezoning request by William Steele III. Mr. Steele's property (9741-05-18-1778) is 96.88 acres and is located immediately west of the CCCC campus. Mr. Steele requests a change in zoning from R-A to MUPD.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Patrick Bradshaw – Attorney for Applicant

My name is Patrick Bradshaw. I practice law in Pittsboro. Our firm represents the family of William Steele and their partners, who have requested annexation and rezoning of property in the extra-territorial jurisdiction of the Town of Pittsboro to a Mixed Use Planned Development district for a planned neighborhood that currently is intended to be known as “Moore’s Ridge.”

The Master Plan for the Steele Property includes all the information required for an MUPD rezoning and includes a traffic impact analysis and a thoroughly documented fiscal impact analysis. The information in the application provides sufficient evidence from which you may conclude that the rezoning will advance the public health, safety or welfare, which your zoning ordinance says is the only relevant issue. The individuals responsible for the preparation of the application are present tonight to vouch for it, and I would like to request that all of the contents of the master plan proposal previously filed with the Town, including the separate traffic impact analysis and fiscal impact analysis, be entered into the record of this hearing.

The Steele Property is located just west of the existing corporate limits of the Town, adjacent to Central Carolina Community College, on about 97 acres of land that has been in Mr. Steele’s family for over 170 years. The property has easy access to the area transportation network without negatively impacting existing traffic patterns. The community will be in easy walking distance of downtown Pittsboro and will greatly enhance the pedestrian environment of the Town. The community will use the Town’s water and sewer utilities. If sewer collection and treatment services are not available within the time that the project must otherwise move forward, the owners are prepared to seek approval from the Town and state regulators of an alternative treatment and disposal system until the Town utility is in a position to accept the community’s wastewater.

The requested zoning map amendment proposes to change the existing RA zoning of the Steele Property to Mixed Use Planned Development, in order to permit a mixed-use residential community of no more than 380 units and up to 60,000 square feet of commercial, retail, office and institutional uses on 97 acres. The property is not located within any Watershed Overlay District. The site's existing zoning permits a wide variety of uses, but it does not allow for master planned mixed-use development with compact lot sizes, reduced dimensional requirements, and preserved open space such as are envisioned for the Steele Property. The change from the R-A district to a mixed-use planned development district will support the growth of Pittsboro while protecting and enhancing the character of the area.

All that is before you in the current application is the zoning of the property, not subdivision or site plan review. The zoning will determine whether the community can proceed as a mixed use development with the requested uses and dimensional standards. It will not determine where lots or commercial uses or recreational facilities will be located within the community. The drawings and illustrations that have been prepared are just examples of how the property might be used, and they are certainly not final. All of the details of arrangement of uses on the property, stormwater management, stream buffers, screening of uses, and similar issues would be subject to future reviews by the Town of subdivision and site plan applications.

The proposal for the Steele property complies with the requirements of the MUPD district and other applicable requirements of the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances. The proposed community advances the goals and implementation strategies of the Town's Land Use Plan, which calls for enhancing recreational resources and open space, preserving water quality, promoting safe and interconnected vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle traffic and flexible amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to allow growth in the Town's jurisdiction. The proposal also promotes the goals of the Chatham County Land Use Development Plan, which repeatedly calls for encouraging growth in the county's existing towns, including their extra-territorial jurisdictions.

The master plan proposal for the Steele Property will create a residential mixed-use development that is compatible with the small town character of Pittsboro. Approval of the requested rezoning will enable planned growth, preserve open space and generate positive fiscal impacts to the greater community. The planned community will enhance the recreational options of the citizens of the Town. I submit that the weight of the evidence submitted at this hearing will show convincingly that the plan for the Steele Property will advance the public health, safety and welfare.

At this point, I would like to ask members of the project team to come up one at a time to address you about aspects of the plan that are within their areas of expertise.

Robert E. Koontz is a principal in the Pinehurst office of Land Design, a firm that delivers comprehensive land planning and design services throughout the southeastern US. Bob earned his bachelor's degree in Landscape Architecture at the University of Kentucky and is a licensed landscape architect in North Carolina and three other states. He is accompanied by Raymond R. Waugh, a professional engineer who is a partner in Land Design. Ray earned his bachelor's degree in civil engineering at UNC Charlotte, and is a registered professional engineer in nine states, including North Carolina. Bob is going to present the master plan for the Steele Property, and he and Ray are available to respond to any of your questions.

Mr. Koontz made a Power Point presentation on the project. He indicated that the project site is one mile west from the traffic circle. Topographic detail reveals that there are two high points on the Steele tract, one near the property entrance which was formerly the location of the Steele's home. He noted that there is a stream along the west boundary, and Ashford Lake and its' drainage basin along the east property line. He said that a wellness center or some other such use is being considered at the main entrance since it will make such a focal point.

Recreational amenities are being planned for the northwest quadrant of the site. A small village center of about 60,000 square feet with retail, office and potentially some residential uses is being planned in the southeast area of the site. The Town Center is oriented along a village green and a cross axis that connects back to the central park and runs through the town center. This is to be a garden area, something very nice with on street parking in front of the buildings and regular parking lots to support the retail behind. The feeling will be like downtown where the sidewalk goes from the street to the very front of the buildings. This is a central square that has the potential to be a great gathering place and perhaps become a home to a farmers' market. He said they envision art galleries, coffee shop, a restaurant, etc.

He indicated that there are a lot of alleys planned so that garages can be placed at the rear of home sites leaving residences closer to the street. Front porches, sidewalks and clustered housing will contribute to creating the sense of neighborhood and the pedestrian walkways will encourage people to get to know their neighbors.

A large green space is planned just east of the center of the property. It is about nine acres in size and will be used for passive recreation (hiking trails) so that it can continue to function as a drainage feature.

There are 380 dwelling units planned. Townhouses will be situated on 28 foot wide lots; single family homes will be located on 44 foot and 52 foot lots. The largest single family homes will be sited on 65 foot lots and will be in the 2500 to 3000 square foot range. Setback reduction will allow stream and tree protection. The maximum height of structures is projected to be three stories.

The MUPD ordinance requires 4.9 acres of open space and they are planning to provide more than 23 acres, or 24%, including active and passive recreation and buffer open space.

They feel it is important to have sidewalks and pedestrian connections from one end of the development to the other. They wish to connect to the Community College walkway and may be able to provide an amphitheater to benefit the college, this community and Pittsboro at large for community events and college functions.

Some of the open space will be used for Low Impact Development stormwater management functions instead of having a detention pond. They had a successful meeting with Catherine Deininger and the Robeson Creek Watershed group to discuss LID strategies and are committed to incorporating those into the design to capture runoff at the source and minimize any impact to Robeson Creek tributaries. He noted that this plan does not go to the extent of depicting engineered stormwater features but those will be incorporated into the planning as the project proceeds and it is the intention of the developer to treat stormwater runoff at the source by means of bio-retention facilities and other LID features instead of relying on a detention pond. He said, of course, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources will have the final say regarding stormwater management.

Trisha Wingate is a civil engineer who is a project manager with Kubilins Transportation Group in Charlotte. Trisha received her bachelor's degree in civil engineering from UNC-Charlotte. Trisha and her firm prepared the traffic impact analysis that was submitted with the master plan, and I would like to ask her to address her findings.

Trisha Wingate of the Kubilins Transportation Group presented a summary of the Traffic Impact Analysis. She indicated that the studied area of influence as approved by the NC Department of Transportation included West Street and NC 87, West Street and the CCCC drive, and the proposed access to the property. The study area did not extend to the traffic circle in the center of town. All of the intersections are currently operating at a Level of Service of B (LOS D is acceptable). After the background traffic was factored in the intersections still performed at LOS B.

She noted that the study indicated that the development would generate 376 morning peak hour trips and 706 pm peak hour trips. A signalized intersection at the entrance is recommended. The project exit should have two outbound lanes with at least 100 feet of storage in the left turn lane. In addition, an eastbound Left turn lane on Hwy 64 should be built with at least 100 feet of storage.

Lucy Gallo is a certified public accountant and a founding partner of Miley Gallo & Associates who specializes in economic development, economic impact analyses and fiscal impact analyses. Ms. Gallo is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of South

Carolina and for over 15 years served as executive vice president of one of North Carolina's largest independent certified public accounting and consulting firms. I would like to ask Lucy to address you concerning the fiscal impact analysis she has performed concerning the Steele Property proposal.

Lucy Gallo of Miley Gallo & Associates presented a summary of the Financial Impact Analysis. She indicated that the revenues considered are site specific and revenue specific. They only considered residential property taxes, motor vehicle taxes and property and sales taxes related to the commercial area.

She said there are four types of sales tax associated with the project: Article 39, 40, 42 and 44. Although there are limited opportunities for point of sale sales tax collection, the majority of sales tax dollars in Pittsboro are distributed on a per capita basis.

The estimates of expenditures for the project have been developed for the town's budget but they also looked in to fine tuning estimates for more critical areas like Fire, Police and Street Maintenance. Additional costs were included for providing extended service for these items because it was felt to be warranted.

The project consists of 380 dwelling units with an average value of \$210,000. They were fortunate in this case that the developer commissioned a Market Feasibility Study; often with small projects like this they don't have such sophisticated information on which to base average home value. That study also examined the attributes of this project in terms of its competitiveness in the area for its unique design.

Pages 28 and 30 of the study reflect estimates of revenue and associated operating capital. As indicated, Access and Capital Recovery Fees collected will be 1.8 million dollars. Cost estimates for project generated improvements came in at 1.4 million dollars, so about 400,000 dollars are generated in excess revenue which can be applied elsewhere for system maintenance and future repairs.

Michael Rosetti is a close friend and, in this case, development partner of the Steele family. Michael received his bachelor's degree in business and economics from Towson University in 1977. He has over 25 years of professional experience in building and development and is a founding owner with his father of a very successful development company in Georgia. I'd like to ask Michael to come up and introduce himself to you, to tell you about his relationship to the Steele family and this property and to describe his background and experience as they relate to the development of this community.

Michael Rosetti owns a development company and is working on Peachtree City, Georgia. He indicated that he had been building there for over 20 years. His experience started with his father's company working weekends from age 12 and he continued

through high school and college. He has built over 2000 homes in Peachtree City; it is a planned community in excess of 15000 acres. It is a model planned community for the whole country. It represents cutting edge design and planning.

He feels that it is very important to assemble a good team because nobody knows everything. Parker & Associates were hired to do a feasibility study which is a little unusual for a project this size but very important to a developer to know if a project will work and what elements will make it work. Then it's necessary to find a good land planner. Land Design is a cutting edge outfit, one of the best in the country. They coordinated with the feasibility study and started to develop a plan along with my expertise and the expertise of the property owner.

Traffic impact and economic impact are important to understand so they retained good firms to provide the necessary information. All these elements represent deliberate approaches to development and are things he insists upon to get a first class plan drawn. Along with deliberate planning is quality execution. The main goal of a good plan is to arrive at a quality product that's going to last, that is going to be of minimal impact to the city in the future as far as maintenance of roads, open space needs to be sustainable, amenities need to be well constructed and landscaping needs to be done properly and irrigated. As a developer he comes in to play to make sure those thousand pieces are completed and done in a quality manor.

Mr. Rosetti said he did not actively pursue this project. He has known the Steele family over 20 years, they are good friends. Finally the time came to form a partnership and develop this piece of property they've been discussing for years.

Mr. William Steele is gravely ill and could not be here tonight. I can assure you that the entire Steele family is passionately committed to this land and this project and to doing something here that will enhance the Town of Pittsboro, and Mr. Steele regrets that he could not attend tonight. Mr. Steele's son, Patrick Steele is here. Patrick did a portion of his undergraduate studies in economics at the University of Georgia and ultimately obtained a bachelors degree in economics and government from Harvard University. Patrick has training and experience as a specialty painting contractor and started his own residential restoration and preservation firm that eventually grew to over 50 employees. Patrick is a resident of the Pittsboro extra territorial jurisdiction and will be actively involved in the development of this project with Michael. I would like for him to come up and talk to you about his and his family's commitment to this property and their vision for this project.

Patrick Steele said his family had owned this property for 170 years. His father wanted to be here tonight but is too ill. But the whole family shares his passion for this property. He wanted to create a neighborhood that all would be proud of and would be a heritage to the family.

He said he has bought his great great aunt's farm, is restoring it and plans to be a part of the community for the rest of his life.

Ginny Gregory – 136 Mantis (Redbud development)

I spent fourteen years being the head gardener at Fearington Village and as I looked over this plan I thought I might be a person who might give a little reflection about what I saw a planned community become. I think there was an enormous amount of trepidation when Fearington started developing. It had been Jessie Fearington's farm and a local boy came in and started developing and people didn't really know what to think about it or what to expect. What I saw, in the time I worked there, was that people started coming to it, people from all over the world. They came to Fearington and started walking their dogs with each other and had coffee at the Market with each other. They had grandkids that connected with other grandkids at the pool.

In a very strange, convoluted way, neighborhoods started being formed, the kinds of neighborhood I grew up with. It was very interesting to see what I least expected to form as I worked there. When I look at this project it looks to me like there is the same potential and there's the same potential with somebody from around here, not coming from California. That's pretty important to me, the local concept. In terms of the well being of the community, I think it can be a wonderful boost for Pittsboro. I think we desperately need things like this.

Randall Goodman - 2454 Hanks Chapel Rd. (Scout building 1020 US 64 West):

Thank you for hearing me this evening on these issues. First of all let me say that I am representing only Boy Scout Troop 93 tonight and not necessarily the views of the Harold Boone Memorial Scouting Fund.

A little background: The Harold Boone Fund was formed years ago when Harold Boone, longtime Scoutmaster of our troop, passed away. Its intent is to support Scouting in our area. It was initiated and is administered by former members of Troop 93. The Fund owns the property of the Harold Boone Scout Park and has been instrumental in the success of Scouting in the Pittsboro area.

Because of the foresight of those initiating the Fund, Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Venture Scouts, and Girl Scouts in our area have a place to meet, camp, and learn essentially free of charge. The facilities are also used for training scout volunteer leaders at the district and council levels. Over the years, Troop 93 alone has helped about 800 young men from the Pittsboro area to grow into responsible citizens.

As explained in my letter to the Board, the singular issue Troop 93 has with the Steele property master plan is essentially one of liability. Liability insurance for the Scout

Property would cost approximately \$1800 per year. That represents 2 more fundraisers each year and does not easily fit within our budget or schedule. All members of a Scouting organization are already covered by liability and medical insurance while attending official scouting functions. Hence, we should not need the additional liability coverage so long as activities on the Scout property are by members only.

Though the proposed connecting walking trail certainly has potential to benefit both the Troop and the proposed development, we believe any benefits to the scouts would be minimal. In recent years, our Troop leaders have noticed that few youth walk to our meetings – their parents usually drive them. Most of our troop camping and hiking activities are conducted in National Forests, Parks and our Council Scout Camps. The additional liability of youth not covered by our insurance far outweighs any potential benefit.

Even though we are relatively remote to most Pittsboro housing, we have already experienced some issues with community youth using our basketball court and rope bridge. We invited those youth to join us so that they could enjoy the facilities while supervised and insured. We dismantled the rope bridge to limit our liability. We have restricted erecting other outdoor facilities also to limit liability. We believe that a heavily vegetated buffer zone or a hedge fence such as multi-floral rose may limit the temptation for housing development youth to stray onto our property unsupervised.

Concerned parties have made a number of suggestions for solutions to the liability issues. I'm sure our Troop committee and the Harold Boone Fund executives will be happy to discuss and consider those presented in written form at our next meeting.

I mentioned another issue in my letter regarding a possible trade of some land between the Harold Boone Fund property and the Steele development property. After some discussion, I realize that this is probably not the appropriate forum to air this issue. That suggestion was originally made in part to help protect a small stream that runs across the Scout property and across the Southeast corner of the Steele property. That stream is not shown on the development concept drawing that was shared with him. It did not show a turn lane either. Again, I am sure that the Harold Boone Fund executives would be happy to discuss this issue at a future date.

I have discussed some of these issues with a representative of the State development and would be happy to continue those discussions toward a workable solution.

Debbie Huffstetler - 252 Ashford Drive.

I enjoy living in Pittsboro because it is a small town. I choose not to live in Cary or Chapel Hill with its large development and all the transients. Before the Board considers rezoning this huge property to a mixed use planned development I would like to read a couple of statements from the Town of Pittsboro webpage.

“Residents of Pittsboro embrace small town values of respect for one another and a strong sense of community.”

“The town has all the appealing qualities of small town North Carolina: such as friendly, caring people; a low crime rate; relatively low cost of living and a slower, gentler pace of life. These qualities coupled with its close proximity to the employment centers, cultural activities and retail conveniences of the adjacent cities of the triangle make it a particularly appealing place to call home.”

I feel that these statements speak for the residents of Pittsboro. I believe that these folks come here and don't even live in Pittsboro and build a development of this size in our town they're compromising our small town values. Therefore, I am opposed to the rezoning of the Steele property for a Mixed Use Planned Development.

Liz Cullington – 390 Rocky Hills Rd.

My name is Liz Cullington, and I live at 390 Rocky Hills Road, Pittsboro, in the ETJ. I ask you to reject this rezoning, because the master plan is incomplete and confusing, and fails in many key provisions in the Town's zoning ordinance.

Under Section 5.6.6 Standards, the plan fails a number of requirements.

The plan fails para E(a) (quote) “The on-site transportation circulation system shall be integrated with the offsite transportation system of the Town.” The development does not circulate traffic but has only a single access point off Hwy 64. The requirement for multiple access points, which is preferred by emergency services, is specifically mentioned in other sections. Under #(4)(a) there are supposed to be “appropriate linkages off site,” not just one. In E(4)(c) there is a requirement for principal vehicle access points, plural.

Under para 5.6.6H(III) the project is required to have appropriate turn lanes for those access points, but there is no plan for one at the single access point, possibly because it would require obtaining the scout hut property. Just on roads, parking and transportation generally the plan fails all the most important requirements. Because of the lack of access to other roads I am not sure that even a revised plan could meet these requirements.

Section 5.6.6(F) regarding storm water management is very important for a project with such high requested density and 100% lot coverage. The Town's zoning ordinance specifically requires that stormwater be managed on site, yet the master plan neither shows nor describes a single stormwater retention pond. There is a significant danger of flooding to the dairy farm to the south, and pollution of the cow pond near Hwy 64, by oil and antifreeze from the parking areas. It appears that all this pollution is just to be allowed to pollute the farm and the streams running off the property. In heavy rains there

is a danger of flooding both over 64 and via the creeks to where 902 crosses Robeson Creek near the Town Park.

The large map labeled “Illustrative Master Plan” in the application is incredibly deceptive, as well as incomplete, because it shows the entire residential areas as if those lots were made up entirely of lawn and trees, with no roofs at all.

Yet the applicant’s proposed zoning and lot standards page indicates that, in fact, both “mixed use” and residential areas can have 100% lot coverage, by roof, driveway, a narrow walkway between houses, garage, etc. The set backs for detached homes are so tiny that it appears that the plan is for larger homes with no yard at all.

The amount of landscaping that will be on even the largest lots would not show up on a map of this scale. There certainly will not be growing room for the roots of the canopied trees shown here anywhere except the creek area in the center of the project.

Secondly, the forested or landscaped tree canopy area has been extended over the property lines so that it appears that the undisturbed, natural or landscaped area is larger than it will be, and that buffers will be deeper than they actually area. The buffers appear to be no more than 25 feet but this map lets you think they are 120 to 200 feet deep.

Both these problems with the plan are important because it’s been demonstrated that when the picture and text provide conflicting information it is the picture that wins out, whether on a conscious or subconscious level. When text and table differ, text wins out.

So I am troubled that there are two different density limits in the application. The text describes single family homes on lots 44 to 65 feet wide, but the Lot standards page gives a minimum width of 21 feet.

Only this map, not the text gives any indication as to the total number of homes. The map refers to 90 town homes on 4 plus acres, almost 20 to an acre, and 285 single family homes on 58 plus acres, nearly 5 to an acre, the proposed zoning and lot standards page requests an overall “permitted use” in ALL the residential areas of 20 domestic units an acre.

Since the applicant is proposing 4 story buildings for all residential areas, I am concerned, that, as written, more homes, people and impact could be squeezed into this development by the creation of up and down duplexes.

Yet nothing in the MUPD or in this plan requires that any of the housing built be affordable by any standard, so the project fails to provide any benefit to students of

CCCC. It may allow residents of this unnamed, and possible retirement development to walk to evening classes in basket-weaving but will not permit local students of CCCC's accredited programs to live closer to the school.

So I urge you to reject this proposal until a revised master plan is submitted, that meets the requirements of the Town's zoning ordinance, includes appropriate stormwater management and transportation provisions, and includes an accurate master plan map that shows the residential area buildings and lot coverage to scale, and at the maximum requested in that new plan.

I would also encourage you to revisit and revise the MUPD section of the zoning ordinance. For instance, under the standards of Section 5.6.6E(4)(b) the roadway plan should be required to permit not just access but "rapid and direct access" by emergency vehicles to all lots or units.

More importantly it is totally inadequate to require that stormwater retention ponds only have to handle one inch of rainfall when we are capable of experiencing far greater amounts than that.

There is absolutely no requirement in the MUPD that any of the living units be affordable by any standard, or that any of the units be affordable rental units, even though much higher density is allowed, and Pittsboro and Chatham both have an extreme shortage of affordable rental housing.

You may find it appropriate to develop additional standards that would be applicable to specific types and sizes of projects: small infill projects in current non-residential areas, projects in currently residential areas, projects of less than 10 acres, 25 acres, and so on, up to several thousand acres, and so on.

When the MUPD was first approved, it was in tandem with Powell Place, but it was stated that it was needed to encourage downtown redevelopment. However there is currently no requirement about how much of what use is allowed in projects of different sizes. Thus the MUPD is currently a way to get higher density for an outlying residential development as long as it has just enough commercial development to enhance its marketability. The current proposal identifies only half of the development as "mixed use."

George East – 44 Royal Pines Court – he is speaking for Ashford Lake Homeowners Association.

We the property owners in Ashford Lake, having had a very amicable meeting with Mr. William Steele, and his three sons, their developer, and others involved in the Moore's Ridge project, request the following:

1. A 30 foot natural (undisturbed) buffer be left along Ashford Lake to prevent run off and to protect wildlife.
2. Buyers of property in Moore's Ridge, in promotional literature and covenants, be informed that Ashford Lake is private and not for their use.
3. The property between the Ashford Lake development and the creek, on the east side of the Steele property, remain natural and undisturbed because of being a flood area.
4. If a private sewage treatment facility is required for your development that its placement not be adjacent to Ashford Lake development.
5. That the proposed walking path below the dam be removed from the plan.
6. That the number of lake front lots be reduced (preferably by 50%).
7. Reduce the density of total dwellings.

Betty East – 44 Royal Pines Court –

We all appreciated the gracious meeting with the Steele family and the opportunity to see their plan. Although they seem to comply with the town requirements I have concerns with the results of some of their studies. I was very surprised that the town did not require that the traffic study extend into the courthouse traffic circle. Their study to the stop light at 87, as you heard, indicates no problem we were told.

Conversation we had with the finance person implies that the impact on schools was not expected to be a problem because the plan has starter homes or of retirement appeal. I don't believe that is really realistic. Sales certainly will not be limited to no children families. There is concern with the number of single parent households with children and with that comes more traffic taking children to their scheduled activities. This number of vehicles should be of concern to Pittsboro if you've been in town lately.

A compact community has no appeal to us as retirees. In 2002 we chose Ashford Lake for its desirable, quiet property with limited number of houses all with a view of a beautiful natural woods and a private lake as you can see on the map that is Ashford Lake belonging to our community, protected with covenants that prevent uninvited guests with uncontrolled behavior and risks. And we have discussed a link with that concern of liability. To open this private lake by removal of a natural woods physical barrier destroys the main reason we chose to live in Pittsboro. Even if they are told Ashford Lake is private but a visual amenity they will come to the lake, don't you think?

From my reading about protecting water rights and wildlife, a twenty foot buffer, which it sounds like it is going to be, is not adequate. Please be considerate of those already invested in Ashford Lake homes, a beautiful area of your town. Thank you.

Catherine Deininger – 124 Goldberry Lane – representing Haw River Assembly.

The Haw River Assembly would like to offer comments on the application from William Steele III for rezoning of his property off of 64 West from residential-agricultural (R-A) to multi-use planned development (MUPD). We are a non-profit citizen organization dedicated to the protection of the Haw River watershed. Our membership and volunteers include many residents of the town of Pittsboro and those living in its ETJ.

Essentially, you are being asked to allow a rezoning from a low density requirement that could be served by wells and septic systems to a high density development that will require the use of public water and wastewater treatment.

My concern is for water quality in the Robeson Creek watershed, which will be effected by a more dense development. Two tributaries of Robeson Creek flow though the Steele property. I and other members of the Robeson Creek Watershed Council (RCWC) met with Mr. Steele and his development team a couple of weeks ago to review the conceptual design that was created for the Master Plan for this rezoning request. We talked about ways the plan could be improved so that it would minimize the impact on water quality. In particular we talked about how this development could use design principles for low impact development (LID).

Mr. Steele and his team indicated that they were open to looking at including low impact development (LID) design strategies that we discussed at our meeting. As their plan now stands, it will have a high impact on our local streams. I've attached a list of design principles outlined by the Center for Watershed Protection. I ask that if the Town Board decides to grant this rezoning, it require that these principles be used as much as possible in the development of a final plan for this property to offset the higher impact caused by the increase in density. Up front attention to details such as reducing the total length of residential streets, providing sidewalks on only one side of the street, using vegetative open channels for stormwater, reducing street width, catching stormwater in bioretention areas along residential streets and parking areas, etc. will make a huge difference in the impact this development will have on the Robeson Creek watershed. Use of LID will also create a development that will be attractive and a joy to live in due to its attention to preserving the natural elements of the site.

I am familiar with the eastern edge of the Steele property from the stream assessments I've conducted in the Robeson Creek watershed over the last couple of years and I know that there are wetlands on this part of the property. Also other members of the Pittsboro community have told me that there is a drainage area that runs through the property and the new State flood maps that Pittsboro received within the last few weeks shows this drainage area as a flood plain. Considering this, I ask that the Town Board make sure than an environmental assessment is conducted on the property before any development plans are approved.

Haw River Assembly position is if there is to be growth that it is done within the Towns boundaries.

We offer these comments in the spirit of wanting the best for Pittsboro's future. Thank you very much for considering our concerns, and your efforts on behalf of the town.

James Prince-97 Royal Pines Court

My property borders the Steele property. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. I'm a retired Navy captain; spent over 30 years in the navy serving my country in two wars and now serving my country as a naval science instructor teaching young people about honor, courage and commitment and about leadership. During my years in the navy my home was wherever the navy sent me. When we chose to retire, we looked for a place that was peaceful, serene, with friendly neighbors and a beautiful setting. My concern is very simple; we found that in Ashford Lake with a commitment that the surrounding area if developed would be residential. Now I find the possibility of my house being in the middle of town, which is not quite what I expected. The walking trail that the developer proposes would border my property and instead of being a peaceful place as it is now we'll be covered with pedestrian traffic. The joint parking lot that you're talking about between the community college and the development will be in my back yard. So that's my concern, it's very simple. My dreams are pretty much down the drain as far as a place that's going to be peaceful.

George Terrell-1500 Hwy 64 West

My property is a stone's throw away from the Steele property. Like many of us I am anti-growth per se. The influx of transients that have come in has been abundant and they're relentless. But these things you can't stop, it's inevitable right now; this area's in the crosshairs. Mr. Steele, a few years ago I met him. He came across to me as a person of great concern about his old family complex. At one time he thought of cutting all the trees down for profit and I mentioned that he should probably do a select cut because of the beauty of the land, which, I was surprised he did.

There is great concern with the Steele family about the land. I know the mass of buildings is not popular per se, but I have a feeling that what we're about to see in the neighborhood in the coming years is going to be along the lines of what's happening in Cary but there is some concern about how much building is done and that it's done in a proper way.

I don't have a view of any homes and I've lived there about fifteen years. The few neighbors I do have are good people like the Reeves here and a few others and now the Steele's. What's going to happen is that it's obvious in one way or another there's going to be an excess amount of building going on and I very much don't want it but if it's going to happen, I want it to be as good as possible.

Ed Holmes-1062 Old Graham Road.

I had a phone call late this afternoon from Bill Steele whom I've known for many years. I've known Patrick's mother for 55 years. They are the type of people you very much want to deal with in life. Bill's health is terrible and he asked if I'd go and stand in for him. They stand behind their word. They don't do anything cheap or shoddy and if we're going to have development I think they are the type of people we want to have doing it here.

Larry Green

I own Heartwood Pine Floors. I've only known Patrick Steele about six months when he bought some heart pine from me to remodel the old farmhouse he's living in. In those six months I've talked to him many times about this project and I'm convinced that he's determined to build a real quality development. We all know growth is coming to Pittsboro and Chatham County. I think it's a good feeling to go with a project that will be done by folks we can trust.

Motion made by Commissioner Brooks seconded by Commissioner Walker to go out of public hearing and refer public comments to the planning board for recommendation.

Vote Aye-4 Nay-0

Motion made by Commissioner Brooks seconded by Commissioner Walker to reinstate Commissioner Bryan.

Vote Aye-4 Nay-0

**ALL HANDOUTS ARE RECORDED IN THE BOOK OF RESOLUTIONS
NUMBER ONE, PAGES 139-153**

**LIZ CULLINGTON'S WRITTEN COMMENTS ARE RECORDED IN THE
BOOK OF RESOLUTIONS NUMBER ONE, PAGE 156-158**

OLD BUSINESS

Consider a possible contract with Insight Research, Inc. to conduct a customer survey program.

Commissioner Cotten stated he considers it a waste of money and is opposed to it. If it is done he would ask that it be done after election as to not violate election laws.

Commissioner Walker asked what election laws?

Motion made by Commissioner Bryan seconded by Commissioner Walker to table until a later date.

Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

NEW BUSINESS

Consider a possible shared leave policy.

Motion made by Commissioner Brooks seconded by Commissioner Walker to approve the shared leave policy.

Commissioner Bryan asked who will keep up with it.

Manager Hughes stated the Town Clerk would.

Commissioner Cotten asked how the employees feel.

Manager Hughes stated it is a benefit to the employees and he can not see them having a problem with it.

Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

Conduct discussion on community-based policing strategies.

Commissioner Brooks stated he would like to have a police department that reflects some of the things in our mission as a community.

He feels too much emphasis is placed on traffic control. He would rather see the police department protect citizens in town and not the ETJ area. Statistics show a lot the department does have to do with traffic.

Commissioner Brooks would like to see the following:

- Police officers meet with the citizens (stop by and introduce themselves especially to the older citizens). Get to know the citizens.
- Go to homes and offer the service of engraving items for identification in case of theft. Show them how to protect their homes and/or businesses.
- Would like to see our police officers have an opportunity to do different things (like if they are involved in a case to have the opportunity to follow through on it). So they will have an appreciation for what each of them does. He thinks this would boost moral in the department.
- Get some educational videos and show them at the library or community building. (child abuse, etc.)

Commissioner Brooks stated he rode through town late one night and saw an officer out of his car checking doors. He thought that was great.

Commissioner Walker stated he agrees with Commissioner Brooks about community policing. Sometimes community policing does take place. He gave an example of when he and his daughter were in the yard and Officer Wayne Roberson stopped by – his daughter and some more of the neighbors children were in the yard and Officer Roberson started talking with them and gave them a “junior police” badge sticker. His little girl was really excited about it. He would like to see more of that done.

Mayor May stated Officer Jeremy Wright went over to Walnut Grove and spoke with the seniors about what they should do about keeping their doors locked.

Commissioner Brooks stated he read about a community that was going to an automatic system that would notify residents in the event of an emergency. He knows that we probably can not afford it, but would like to look into it.

Manager Hughes stated someone is coming in the next couple of weeks to do a demonstration.

Jeffery Starkweather – Attorney in town – he agrees that the police should be apart of the community. Years ago we acquired the name of being a “speed trap” town and then Larry Hipp came in and turned things around. Residents and merchants should feel the police are someone they can trust and not that you have to look over the shoulders and are given a ticket for going nine miles over the speed limit.

Commissioner Cotten stated he feels there should be a balance between the two. The police can not ignore someone that is speeding and he know that most of the time tickets are given if they are fifteen miles over the speed limit. He has been very pleased with the department’s response over the last six months to a situation in his neighborhood.

Consider appointments to Recreation Advisory Board. In-town applicants are Sarah Carr, Charles A. Gillis, and Andrew Allden. ETJ applicants are Hugh Montgomery and Julie Boone Cummins.

Commissioner Cotten stated he asked that this item be put on the agenda. It is not the number of members that are required to have the committee. He feels if we start the committee maybe we can get the rest of the slots filled.

Commissioner Brooks stated the questionnaire that the perspective members are required to complete needs to be improved. He feels we should not stop taking applications and leave it open for more applicants.

The board requested that it be advertised on the town’s website.

Manager Hughes stated he is on the board of directors for the YMCA and he has been in conversation with them about administering some programs for the Town.

Motion made by Commissioner Walker seconded by Commissioner Bryan to table the matter and have a representative from the YMCA to come to a meeting and make a presentation. Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

Solid waste update by Commissioner Cotten.

Commissioner Cotten briefly went over the proposed policy (a copy of which are attached in the book of resolutions).

Commissioner Cotten requested that if anyone had comments to be forwarded to the committee that they put them in writing and get it to him before the first week in September.

STAFF REPORTS

Manager Hughes reported that the SCADA system at the water tank has been installed.

COMMISSIONER CONCERNS

Commissioner Brooks stated some residents on his street have expressed concerns about the bio-degradable paper bag requirement for grass clippings. There is no where in town to purchase them and they are expensive.

Manager Hughes stated we will allow them to place them in paper grocery bags.

Commissioner Bryan asked Planner Monroe to check the sign at the Village Motel.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by Commissioner Cotten seconded by Commissioner Brooks to adjourn. Vote Aye-5 Nay-0

Nancy R. May, Mayor

ATTEST:

Alice F. Lloyd, CMC, Town Clerk