

**MINUTES
TOWN OF PITTSBORO
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
May 7, 2012, 7:00 PM**

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Kenneth Hoyle, Karl Shaffer, Shannon Plummer, Bob Mc Connaughey, Raeford Bland, John Clifford.

Members Absent: Alfreda Alston.

Staff Present: Stuart Bass, Planning Director, Paul Messick, Town Attorney, Paul Horne, Parks Planner, Ileana Platon, Administrative Support Specialist

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kenneth Hoyle called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On the minutes for April 2, 2012 Mr. Shaffer requested correction on the last sentence, it should read that Mr. Shaffer asked for a motion to adjourn, not move to adjourn. **Motion made by Mr. Hoyle for approval of minutes as submitted with one correction. Motion to approve made by Mr. Shaffer seconded by Mr. Bland. Approved unanimously.**

C. OLD BUSINESS

Text Amendment – Pocket Neighborhoods

Mr. Bass stated that this was a continuation of their previous discussion based on the property owner that submitted a proposal for this type of subdivision development. In previous meeting they had discussed on a pocket neighborhood text amendment that would allow this type of clustering of homes along a courtyard. He referred the board members to an attachment with the draft language that was brought up in the last two meetings, the idea is to incorporated into the zoning text amendment. He distributed a magazine article found concerning Pocket Neighborhoods and asked the board members to review the material, he advised that he had made some minor changes.

Mr. Bland asked if a pocket neighborhood could now be built with the current regulation, and if it was prohibited in some sort of way. If the frequency of necessitating this type of development is not common is there a need to do this amendment.

Mr. Bass's response was that a Plan Use development could be created. Utilizing this scenario it would be reviewed on a page by page basis. The plan unit development as it currently is on the zoning board requires a special use permit.

Mr. Hoyle addressed Mr. Bass by asking him if what he was really trying to say is if this is really necessary since it can already be done on a PUD

Mr. Bass replied that it can't be done as a use by right. Mr. Messick had pointed out to him that a plan unit development is required to be located within 500 feet of a major thoroughfare and have direct access on to it this property does not do that.

Mr. Bland asked if it could it be under a special use permit and not a plan unit.

Mr. Bass response was no.

Mr. Hoyle questioned a notation on the second page stating Post tax amendment would limit this concept to R-10 and R12 and asked why it would be restricted to those two.

Mr. Bass replied that those are the 2 districts that are most prevalent in the developed area of town with access to water and sewer. It would be a tool for infield.

Mr. Hoyle claimed he is certainly in favor of infield as much as possible because he was not aware there were properties in dense city limits that are out of skew, but would this accommodate those or would it create problems down the road. Are we looking at this strictly in terms of this one particular project at this time? It's something being looked at in much larger metropolitan areas and has great deal of merit but his concern is not only on the stand point of this pocket neighborhood here but looking down the road in terms where they really want to locate one of these developments

Mr. Shaffer asked to Mr. Hoyle to clarify the concern.

Mr. Hoyle feels negative that it is proposed in Cornwallis because of its proximity to the Roberson Creek area, also to the accessibility of getting in and out of the neighborhood.

At this time **Mr. Messick** said that this is an amendment to the zoning order it has nothing to do with subdivision regulations or storm water regulations, if there is buffers required in those ordinances they are going to apply regardless of what it says. Stream concerns are not involved in the zoning ordinance on this particular category. This is a particular permitted use within that zoning district.

Mr. Plummer expressed that he is not opposed and has read and review the language and it make sense to him, it's just a matter of approving it on R-10 or R12 for infield purposes. This particular lot will benefit if approved. If he had any reservations it would be on the 12 units per acre and would feel more comfortable with 8 – 10 units, but is open to every outcome.

Mr. Shaffer recalled that at the presentation it had a schematic plan which showed the flood plan and the buffers, it was very generously buffered. Much like Shannon he believes is a palatable idea for infield. His only concern is the 1.5 parking space per unit specially to accommodate visitors. He supports the concept and would like to hear some negative connotations but does not understand what those negatives are.

Mr. Clifford's concern is the vision of 4 homes on 20,000 square feet with parking and a common area, specifically in the presentation where each home would be approximately 2,000 square feet in size and feels it would be quite dense for his comfort.

Mr. Shaffer made motion to move this forward as it is written. Mr. Plummer seconded.

Mr. Hoyle announced that motion had been made and duly seconded to move it forward as presented with the input of the Board in terms of it and asked if there were any other

questions or concerns.

At this time **Mr. Shaffer** addressed Mr. Clifford by stating that at this point he is not claiming that the Board has to be totally comfortable with the language in this text amendment but if the process is moved back and forth in public hearings and input from the commissioners it can be modified.

Mr. Hoyle once again made motion to move it forward with regards to languages presented, duly seconded. **The vote was 5 for and 1 against.**

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. REZ-2012-02 Spoon Rezoning Request

Mr. Bass stated that this was a proposed rezoning of approximately 72.7 acres of undeveloped property on the Northwest quadrant of US 64 and US 15-501. It is currently zoned R-A2 and the proposal is C-2. The R-A2 zoning dates back to 1989. In the Staff Analysis is the relationship of the proposed map amendment to the Land Use Plan and to the Future Land Use Map. The property is designated as Thoroughfare Business on the Future Land Use Map with convenient access to 64 and 15-501. The property is also designated within the Transportation Overlay District which means that it is intended to enhance the economic and aesthetic appeal and orderly development. The current zoning R-A2 is defined primarily for low density residential development, served by wells and septic systems. The proposed C-2 zoning is defined as areas that are primarily designed for major highways that run through or around the City customarily located along the major arterial highways and provide retail, office and service areas. This district accommodated intensive commercial uses such as shopping centers and free standing highway business establishments. Currently there is sewer and water lines adjacent to the property but prior to any site development it would require formal engineering studies. The property in question fronts on US 15-501 and average daily traffic count is about 14,000 vehicle trips per day. The access will be an important issue during site and development and it will require approval from NCDOT. Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning. It is consistent with the current Land Use Plan and other applicable adopted plans, policies and documents. Rezoning of this parcel would allow for an increase in the intensity of used and be a significant change for the area, however the site borders two major highways on two sides and is a reasonable location for such uses as allowed in the C-2 District. As pointed out on the map there is two adjacent properties in question that would likely be a part of any kind of development proposal for this area that is not included in this rezoning request.

Mr. Shaffer requested that Mr. Bass show him the two properties in question.

At this time the Board members reviewed the maps provided by Mr. Bass concerning the properties in this rezoning request.

Mr. Hoyle asked Mr. Spoon who was the owner of the property 64 on the bypass at the end of his property, and Mr. Spoon response was the McCloud's.

Mr. Shaffer asked if Mr. Spoon owned all the parcels included in this rezoning.

Mr. Spoon stated that he owns the 33 acre London track, the 20 Odom track. However he does not own the 17 acre Odom track and the 2.9 acre track that was part of Powell Place and believes is already zoned C-2.

Mr. Shaffer claimed it is very applicable to him to approve this request and moved to approve the request. Mr. Plummer seconded

Mr. Hoyle confirmed that motion to approve the rezoning was made and duly seconded.

Vote was taken and it was approved unanimously.

2. REZ 2012-03 CHATHAM PARK, LLC Rezoning Request

Mr. Bass began by explaining that this property was right across from the one previously discussed. It is in the Northeast quadrant of US 64 and US 15-501, approximately 187.24 acres currently zoned RA-2 and requesting proposed zoning of C-2. The current zoning dates back to at least 1989. There have been some rezoning in the past, the O&I zoning on the property at 420 Russet Run was approved September 10, 2007 and American Asset Corporation rezoned a 46.77 acres tract from R-A2 to C-2CU on May 13, 2008. This property is just north of this proposed rezoning. As far as the Staff analysis the same things as the previous rezoning would apply. Currently the Subject properties are designated as Thoroughfare Business on the Future Land Use Map. It is within the major transportation corridor district overlay zone. All the uses which are applicable to a C-2 zone would apply to this area. The property would likely be developed off of Russet Run Road which would require improvements during site developments. The same issue is associated with the water and sewer lines. There is currently a sewer and water line along US 15-501 at the location but there may be capacity issues and formal engineering studies would be required prior to any site development. Staff recommends approval of this proposed rezoning. It is consistent with the current Land Use Plan and other applicable adopted plans, policies and documents. Rezoning would be allowed for an increase in the intensity of use and be a significant change for the area. This site borders two major highways and is a reasonable location for such uses as allowed in the C-2 District. At this time Mr. Bass showed the Board members the location of the parcel on the zoning map.

Mr. Hoyle asked for any questions or comments.

Mr. Shaffer and **Mr. Clifford** expressed that it seemed reasonable, appropriate and very straight forward. Motion was made by **Mr. Bland** to accept staff recommendation. **Mr. Clifford** seconded.

Mr. Hoyle announced that motion was made to accept staff recommendation in term to the rezoning and duly seconded. He then addressed Mr. Phillip Culpepper, Planning Consultant for Chatham Park, LLC and asked about an old bus/trailer in the property which has been there for years and it needs to be removed.

Mr. Culpepper responded that if there is such it will soon be gone, but can't recall anything on the property. He then informed the board that all of the development will be off those two state roads, nothing will be on US 15-501.

Vote was taken and it was approved unanimously.

3. SD-2012-01 Proposed Subdivision Development – Whispering Meadows

Mr. Bass explained that this is a proposed development for a thirty-three lot subdivision located on Highway 87 west of the intersection of Highway 87 and Highway 15-501. This is the last undeveloped tract of land in the immediate area. The Willow Springs Subdivision and the Southridge Subdivision are on either side of this tract. It is zoned R-15 and totals 14.23 acres. The Town Board Commissioners reviewed and formally assigned sewer capacity for the first phase containing 12 lots on February 13, 2012. In general the layout that has been shown is acceptable. Hydrostructures, PA has reviewed the plan and preliminary details provided some comments for the engineer and developer and the Fire Marshall and Fire Chief have also reviewed the plan and made some changes. There were two issues for consideration: (1) the absence of curb and gutter (2) the allowance of a sidewalk on just one side of the street. Both issues are provided for in the ordinance. This is a cluster design as provided in the ordinance per Article 5.5.2 WSIV.CA supplemental standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Cluster designs provides for the development of a built upon area of 36% area for projects without a curb and gutter. However streets without curb and gutter must be approved by the Town Board of Commissioners. The provision of only one sidewalk must also be approved by the Town Board, as per the Subdivision Ordinance, upon recommendation of the Planning Board. Staff recommendation is to forward to Town Board for approval subject to completion of the Detailed Preliminary Plat and then final technical engineering review by Hydrostructures.

Paul Horne addressed the board with comments regarding the sidewalk. He apologized for not submitting the data in the packages distributed to the Board Members. For the Board's consideration and review he provided a pedestrian map. He explained that it seems that the standards in our ordinance require sidewalks on both sides of the street as a default. There are provisions for exceptions and those exceptions would be if it can be shown that local pedestrian traffic warrants their location on one side only, or if it is demonstrated that adverse affects would occur from storm water runoff. If it can be show that pedestrian traffic warrants the location on one side only lacking any objective standard for how you would make that decision its rather arbitrary gestation if the storm water may get more technical. For consideration prior to the Board's decision the question is how would the Board want to deal with this, not only for this particular development but overall in the future. If you have the exception it may be beneficial to detail how to evaluate how these decisions are made and then go by the book. Some kind of an objective connotative measure of when you would provide an exception and when you would not. One suggestion is if there will be a sidewalk on one side only it could be wider to accommodate more pedestrian traffic. On external connectivity the proposed subdivision is very close to town, especially Pittsboro Elementary School which hopefully would allow pedestrian access and it would be written explicitly in that language not only for this property but also on the next phase. This planning practice provides connectivity between neighborhoods. Anything in pedestrian plan calls for a side path in front of the development along NC-87 and the subdivision ordinance requires that something on the plan that is called out is supposed to be developed and those pieces of infrastructures be put in place. The development calls for a side path which can also be called a multi use path but there is no design specification for what exactly that would be. DOT has some standard specifications which has provided in the data submitted. This is another area which can be more defined therefore we can notify the developer what exactly the town is looking for.

Mr. Hoyle asked how many units would there be in Phase One in which the answer was twelve and then he thanked Mr. Horne for all the information he brought for the Board and would like to review it before taking any action especially since this is Phase one and there will be thirty-three (33) more units. Thirty-three (33) houses, estimate two kids per home near a school and the curbing and so forth it is something that the Board should absolutely review with more time.

Mr. Shaffer stated that the absence of the curb and gutter would just make this parallel to everything else that is in that area. The sidewalk item is the same, thinking about where there are sidewalks on both sides of the street and there are a handful of places mostly in the heart of town where there is that kind of neighborhood.

Mr. Clifford said that in his experience especially in Potterstone there was always a question on the width of the main road. With cars driving by two people can't walk on the road, and it has been a major issue of mailboxes getting clipped because the width of the road is so tight.

At this time **Mr. Samir Bahal**, architect for the development brought attention to the pond explaining it is about 4800 square feet of jurisdictional wet land, they are proposing to make this into a wetland and a pond close to 11,000 square feet. They are trying to provide more area for this and the homes. With no curb and gutter they can go to 36 percent impoverish area of the house but the lot sizes they will be limited to about 24 percent. This is an advantage they are not going to build more than 24 percent of impoverish but they are allowed 36 percent. The reason they proposed sidewalks on one side is because there is an issue with storm water, a side walk is considered hard surface. The hard surface will be on the impoverish area increasing it would make the storm water management worse. Another issue is of three other neighborhoods in the area, one does not have sidewalks or curb and gutter, the other does not have curb and gutter but has a four feet sidewalk, and the third subdivision has no curb and gutter and a sidewalk only on one side. Also in this subdivision they are trying to place the sidewalk behind the ditch for safety reasons.

Mr. Horne asked if they had performed calculations to see how the additional space for the sidewalks would affect their calculations and if so had that been provided to Hydrostructures.

Mr. Bahl's answer was that no calculations were done for the additional side walk, the calculations were done just for one side proposed.

Mr. Horne advised that some of the new sidewalk requirements were passed in 2009 with the adoption of the pedestrian plan. That is why there is new language now that was not there before. Safety wise on a fifty (50) feet drive way to have sidewalk on both sides would be too difficult to do. A sidewalk has to be a foot or two from where the traveling public is, the vehicles and it won't be safe for a pedestrian to walk that close to cars. We first submitted the sidewalk close to the road but due to staff recommendations we moved it behind the ditch. As proposed there is no curb and gutter, it is really an advantage not to have curb and gutter for storm water and the environment.

Mr. Bland asked if curb and gutter could ever be built in the future, if there is a chance for change. The response was that the chances of that happening are very unlikely.

Mr. Messick said that for the integrity of the street is better to have curb and gutter but no curb and gutter is better for the infiltration of the storm water rather than having it all go to the pond.

Mr. Bland's second question was if the documentation provided to the Board today was the final complete plan. Mr. Bass responded that in a way it was but it still needs the final technical engineering review by Hydrostructures.

Mr. Messick stated that there are really two issues for the Board to consider tonight so the detailed plan can be done. To accept the proposal without curb and gutter and one sidewalk on one side of the street, if the Board thinks it should be different it should go to the Board of Commissioners so they can make the decision of the design. This is not a detail site plan for the planning board to review. The Commissioners have to determine whether they are going to go along with the ditch and swell plan as opposed to the curb and gutter plan, a single sidewalk as oppose to double sidewalks.

Mr. Shaffer said that since this is our default mode on the southern side of town he is fully in agreement and that the lack of curb & gutter is fine and moved to approve staff recommendation with a draft plan as submitted which includes one side sidewalk and the absence of curb and gutter.

Mr. Plummer seconded.

Mr. Hoyle advised that motion was made and duly seconded with regards to the requested as submitted with staff recommendations and if there was any questions.

At this time **Mr. Bland** said that he understood that when they submit this to the Commissioners they will be getting the same records he has and of what may be missing, then it will be up to them to decide.

Vote was taken and it was approved unanimously.

Mr. Shaffer asked if he could make a comment to the engineer and Mr. Hoyle granted his request. He stated that he is familiar with the use of a level spreader as a discharge structure but it appears in the document that it is an influent size structure. Will the pool remain a permanent water structure?

Mr. Bahal's response was yes. The level spreader will be spreading the water from the top into the pond.

Mr. Shaffer said he did not see the application there, he has only seen them used where they are discharging water from a structure into a defused set. It appears that the level spreader would more prudent at the west edge.

4. REZ -2012-04 Rakhshani Enterprises, LLC Rezoning Request.

Mr. Hoyle stated that the owner of the property has secluded himself when it comes to the board of Commissioners.

Mr. Bass began by explaining that this is a 6.61 acre tract of land at the end of Bellemont Ridge Road. The owner is Rakhshani Enterprises, LLC. It is currently zoned R12 (Medium Density Residential) the proposed zoning is O&I – CU Office & Institutional with a Conditional Use. The R-12 zoning dates back to 1989. According to the Land Use Plan and Future Land Use Map the property is designated as Traditional Neighborhood this category is an area of Pittsboro that includes a mix of uses in close proximity to each other including single family, duplex, multifamily, mixed use, and business that complement existing uses. This property is also in the designated Transportation Overlay District which is our corridor district overlay zone extending 1,250 feet from the right-of-way boundary on both sides of the roadway. The current zoning R-12, is defined as medium density residential areas mostly single-family homes and certain open areas where similar residential development will likely occur. The proposed zoning O&I is defined as

certain land areas with structures that provide office spaces for professional services and certain institutional functions. This district is usually small and may include older homes, the regulations are designed to permit development of the enumerated functions and still protect and be compatible with nearby residential districts. This is a proposed Conditional Use rezoning limited to the particular use that has been required for, the Yoga Wellness and Research Center. There is a list of uses that would be permitted but as part of this proposal they would be excluded from the district. Water and sewer services are available to the site. Formal engineering studies would be required prior to any site development. The property's point of access would be off of Bellemont Ridge Road. This is currently a dead end off of Bellemont Road which is a local road maintained by the Town. Through access goes to Thompson Street, where the latest traffic counts by NCDOT shows approximately 810 vehicles trips per day. Staff recommends denial of the proposed rezoning. Although the proposed rezoning is not completely inconsistent with the current Land Use Plan as described it does represent a departure from the surrounding development and existing zoning which at this time is exclusively residential. Rezoning would allow for increased intensity of use and a distinct change in use for the area. The single point of access through the existing residential development with no other current means of ingress/egress is also a concern. However, alternatively, the proposal of a Conditional Use district would limit development to this particular proposed use and does allow for the opportunity to mitigate associated impacts to the neighboring properties. Access from 15-501 (Hillsborough Street), may be a consideration and could possibly provide a better alternative for ingress/egress to the site. Provided in the packet distributed is a synopsis of the proposal by the developer as well as a site plan.

Mr. Hoyle said that this was not a public hearing but would like to ask some questions. Noticing the electronic equipment in the room he wanted to know if Mr. Rakhshani had a presentation on the proposed development.

Mr. Rakhshani explained that the presentation will show what their plans and how it would vary from the existing possibility of use on this land which is not that significant. The present use of R-12 allows for a bed and breakfast and/or room and board type of operations. Basically what they are trying to do is very similar except in a bed and breakfast guests would be arriving and leaving at various times, in this particular situation there will be courses that last one to two weeks, guests would be arriving at the beginning of the course and leaving when the course is completed. The traffic would be minimal and there would only be four to five employees at the location.

Mr. Hoyle asked the Board if they would like to see the presentation reminding them this was not a public hearing.

Mr. Shaffer wanted to know if there would be the potential for customer to come in on a daily basis and **Mr. Clifford** questioned if they would ever have a one day lecture or seminar. The response was no.

Mr. Rakhshani claimed that he had spoken to numerous homeowners in the neighborhood and informed them that they would offer a weekend course specifically for the Chatham Forest Community so they can attend and utilize the amenities in the facility. He explained that this would be a place where executives living in a fast pace environment would come to relax.

Mr. Plummer assumed by the attendance at this meeting there had been communication with the residents at Chatham Forest.

Mr. Rakhshani expressed that he has tried to set up a meeting with the Home Owners Association

to speak to the residents in general but has not been successful, therefore, he has gone door to door collecting a substantial number of petitions in favor of this project.

Mr. Hoyle addressed Mr. Rakhshani by confirming that this is a business which he is requesting to situate it in a residential area. Even if it is outside of the Home Owners Association jurisdiction access to it would be through the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Plummer asked if there has been any effort to gain access through Hillsboro Street.

Mr. Rakhshani answered that it would be something he would have to work on if he purchases the property. Currently he only has a contract on that lot and two others lots inside Chatham Forest which he would be using for his residence.

At this time the Board discussed and questioned who owned the property by the water tower which is adjacent to the access of this parcel.

Mr. Hoyle believes Mr. Voller still owns the property and once again asked if the Board would like to see the presentation.

Mr. Bland suggested that they allow individuals present to convey their opinions since they had already heard from the prospective owner of this parcel. **Mr. Shaffer and Mr. Hoyle** agreed and **Mr. Hoyle** said he had received about 36 personal letters from residents in the community that are totally against it.

Mr. Oakley Bennett, President of the Chatham Forest Homeowners Association introduced himself and made known that there were several members of the homeowners association present. He stated that he had 108 petitions opposing this project. He claimed that with him he had letters that were sent to every homeowner in Chatham Forest describing what Mr. Rakhshani wanted to do and the concerns the association had. He continued by saying that he has lived in Chatham Forest for 12 years and the reason he chose this location was because he wanted a pleasant and safe area to live and raise his family. His children were born there and constantly play in the driveway and ride their bikes around the neighborhood. The propose Wellness Center will create additional traffic and have a definite personal impact on the area. There will be construction vehicles traveling thru the neighborhood while they are building this center. Looking at the model provided there will be several large Mediterranean style structures which will prolong the building process. In the package provided there is a NLF which is somewhat misleading. It states that amenities for this center are in Chatham Forest, the basketball courts, playground, sidewalks and neighborhood. In addition the land owner has express interest in selling this parcel of property to the Home Owners Association if this approval is not accepted for the spot zone. He stated that the land owner advised him that the contract had expired.

Mr. Rakhshani responded that it is pending from the outcome of the zoning and even after that he has a choice to purchase the land.

Mr. Bennett continued by stating that he has some direct concerns on this spot zoning. It is actually not much different than an extended stay hotel. Guest will visit the spa, maybe get some treatments and leave. In addition there will be a daycare center, a 24/7 staff that will have to travel daily as well as delivery vehicles navigating through the neighborhood that will disrupt our friendly family oriented community. He presented a zoning map that showed a square where the spot zoning would be just to make it more apparent where this development is in relation to the neighborhood. The only route to reach this center is along Chatham Forest and maneuvering through residential streets. It poses a definite hazard to our children it can be disruptive to the community's way of life.

Referring to the Land Use Plan spot zoning is not the way to go for the future of Pittsboro. When considering this rezoning please be aware on the impact this will have on our residential neighborhoods. He went on to explain that reasons the land had not been sold previously could be to the stagnant economy but recently he has seen improvement in the real estate market. Homes that were on short sale or foreclosure have been purchased. If this land is not purchased by the Homeowners Association it can be bought by a developer and developed into residential housing. **Mr. Shaffer** requested to move and accept staff recommendation and deny the request for rezoning. At this time someone in attendance requested to speak in favor of the development.

Mr. Hoyle advised her that there was a motion on the floor.

Mr. Bland seconded the motion.

Mr. Hoyle announced that there is a motion on the floor that the staff recommendation be accepted and deny rezoning request.

Mr. Shaffer stated that it is a residential area, the community has the assumption that it was to remain that way and to allow a commercial business in the center of this neighborhood makes no sense, specifically with the dangers of traffic.

Mr. Hoyle asked if there were any questions in regard to the motion.

Vote was taken to accept staff recommendation and deny rezoning request.

It was Approved Unanimously.

After the vote the individual so requested to comment on the topic was allowed to speak. **Michelle Berger** introduced herself as a Chatham Forest homeowner, Yoga teacher and UNC professor. Her partner is also a Yoga teacher. They have both transformed their lives thru Yoga specially her partner, Tim, he is about 60 years old and has used Yoga to heal himself from Crohn's Disease and Diverticulitis. She went on to inform on how many people practice Yoga and its benefits. She had heard about the proposed development/Wellness Center last year. Recently she heard that some of her neighbors seemed to have a particular way of looking at the proposal. After speaking with Mr. Rakhshani and reading the information he provided it is very clear that this is place where people are looking for a Health Style Intervention and not a medical facility. It would only have a two week long retreat. It is a place for Holistic Health support, clients would not come to disturb or make any demands on the neighborhood. In her conversations with Mr. Rakhshani she found how willing he is to figure out how he can support the Chatham Forest community since he was planning to live there. She also made aware that on Thompson Street there is the Pittsboro Center for Natural Medicine. This is a very innovative place and as Pittsboro grows this kind of Holistic Health Community may be something the town can be known for. Yoga as a Holistic Health Modality and it is supported by the National Institute of Health. This kind of process is about helping people and believes Mr. Rakhshani had an amazing opportunity to support the community if allowed.

Mr. Bland said that no one on the Board disagrees with those comments or remarks. It is just in the wrong location.

Mr. Plummer agreed. By any means he does not want their vote to seem like a negative connotation on the idea of the center. It is just the location.

Mr. Rakjshani requested the opportunity to present his idea to the Board and show the purpose of the center.

Mr. Hoyle advised that the members of the Board had already made a recommendation and voted on the issue and said that it is a good concept but let's take it somewhere else.

E. Board Member Concerns

Mr. Shaffer went back to the subdivision Phase One topic that was approved earlier. He asked what would be the best way to pass the idea of a proposed side path which is similar to a peripheral sidewalk on a major artery.

Mr. Bass answered that it has to be a requirement in the subdivision ordinance. *Mr. Horne* said it would be inserts. It would have to be done incrementally to avoid criticism about a side path to nowhere.

Mr. Shaffer asked if it is required that this new thing by virtue of the fact that east to west from there is already built it would be a dead end.

Mr. Horne responded that the Board can hear that, the public needs to answer and DOT may place some funding into it and get this.

Mr. Plummer expressed his concern about not being a good liaison on the Main Street Program. Due to his son's baseball games schedule on the same days he has missed several meetings. He welcomes anyone on the Board that would like to fill the void.

Next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 4, 2012 at 7:00pm.

Mr. Hoyle asked for motion to adjourn, motion made by **Mr. Bland** and **Mr. Clifford** seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35pm.