



Planning, Development & Inspections

TEL (PLANNING) 919 856 6310
TEL (INSPECTIONS) 919 856 6222

A Division of Community Services
P.O. Box 550 • Raleigh, NC 27602
www.wakegov.com

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Wake County Planning Board

Wednesday, November 1, 2017 (1:30 p.m.)

Wake County Justice Center
300 S. Salisbury St., Room 2700
Raleigh, North Carolina

Members Present: (8) Mr. Alan Swanstrom (Chair), Mr. Thomas Wells, Mr. Jason Barron (Vice-chair), Mr. Phil Feagan, Mr. Donovan Amos Clark, Ms. Ashley Foxx, Mr. Wayne Maiorano, Mr. Ted Van Dyk

Members Absent: (2) Ms. Tara Kreider, Mr. Asa Fleming

County Staff Present: (9) Mr. Tim Maloney, Ms. Sharon Peterson, Mr. Bryan Coates, Mr. Steven Finn, Mr. Keith Lankford, Ms. Jenny Coats, Mr. Chris Snow, Ms. Alicia Arnold, Mr. Charlie Johnson

County Attorney's Present: (1) Mr. Ken Murphy (Senior Assistant County Attorney)

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Alan Swanstrom called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.
2. **Approval of the Minutes of the July 19, 2017 Planning Board Meeting.**
Mr. Wells requested to amend page 5 changing, "Mr." Kreider to "Ms." Kreider. Motion to approve minutes with change was made by Mr. Wells. Mr. Clark seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
3. **Approval of the Minutes of October 4, 2017.**
Mr. Jason Barron motioned to approve the minutes of Oct. 4, 2017. Mr. Wells seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
4. **Quasi-Judicial Hearing: SV-19-17 Subdivision Variance Request.** Request to allow for a new residential lot to be created without providing road frontage to the lot for property located at 6409 Bissette Road. The property is on the north side of Bissette Road between Smithfield Road and the Wake County / Johnston County line. The applicant is proposing to provide access to the lot with a private access easement instead of a private or public road.

Before the case was heard, Mr. Murphy provided a brief overview of the procedures for quasi-judicial hearings. Mr. Murphy stated that North Carolina law prohibits the practice of law by a non-lawyer. The North Carolina State Bar has determined that it is the unauthorized practice of law for someone other than a licensed attorney to appear at a quasi-judicial hearing in a representative capacity to advocate the legal position of another person, firm, or corporation. In the matter of SV-19-17, the applicant was a registered surveyor acting as a consultant. There did not appear to be an attorney involved. The applicant may testify, but if there were any witnesses opposed the variance request, the surveyor would not be able to cross-examine those witnesses since that would be the unauthorized practice of law. Mr. Murphy also explained that there were 8 of the 10 Planning Board members present and that a vote to approve the variance requires a super majority – all 8 members must approve to grant the variance.

Staff Report and Presentation

Mr. Steven Finn was duly sworn and submitted the staff report, application, and PowerPoint slides into evidence. Mr. Swanstrom accepted them into the record.

Background:

- APPLICANT: Curk Lane, True Line Surveying
- PROPERTY OWNER: Deborah L. Beach
- WAKE COUNTY PIN: 1772-22-1009
- ZONING DISTRICT: Residential-30 (R-30)
- LAND USE CLASSIFICATION: Town of Wendell Long Range Urban Services Area
- WATERSHED: Marks Creek
- CROSS REFERENCE FILES: S-131-16
- CURRENT LAND USE: Vacant

In February 2016, a minor subdivision plat was submitted to subdivide an approximately 5 acre parcel from a 38.57 acre tract. During the review of the minor subdivision it was determined that the subdivision could not be completed as submitted because the proposed tract 2 did not have the minimum 30 foot road frontage required by Article 5-11-12 of the Unified Development Ordinance and the applicant was not proposing to construct a private road as required by Article 8-32 of the UDO.

To provide for frontage to the proposed tract 2, either a private road would need to be constructed to serve as frontage, or tract 2 would need to have direct frontage onto Bissette Road.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the requirements of Sections 8-32-3, 8-32-4, 8-32-5 and 5-11-2 of the UDO to provide a 45' access and utility easement to the proposed tract 2 and to construct a driveway within the easement instead of providing road frontage on to Bissette Road or constructing a new private road as required by the UDO.

Relevant UDO Sections: Requirements for road frontage come from Sections 8-32 & 5-11-2

- 8-32-3 Road Frontage Required
- 8-32-4 Public Road Standards
- 8-32-5 Private Road Standards
- 5-11-2 Requires 30' of frontage

UDO required Class B private road

- 45 foot wide easement
- 16 foot wide road width
- 8 inches of compacted gravel

Viable Options For UDO Compliance

- Construct private road to UDO standards
- Move lot closer to Bissette Road
- Have new lot front on Bissette Road
- Make new lot 10 acre exempt lot

The Planning Board must make positive findings on All of the following findings of fact from G.S. 160A-188 in order to approve this variance request:

1. Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property;
2. The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from personal circumstances, as well as hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the general public, may not be the basis for granting a variance;
3. The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of a variance shall not be regarded as a self-created hardship;
4. The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved.

Applicant Presentation

Witnesses duly sworn: Curk Lane, True Line Surveying; Edward Kassa

Mr. Lane stated that he and the potential buyer of the lot cannot meet the UDO requirements that were discussed with Adam Cook and Planning staff. The 5-acre location is the choice location for the homeowner to build a house. Mr. Lane stated that the only option would be to make the lot a 10-acre lot; however, it is unclear whether or not the seller would sell an additional 5 acres. Mr. Lane stated that there is a utility easement on the property and was able to maneuver down the existing gravel road and it is accessible by public safety. He is making the variance request to prevent the potential buyer from building a private road to private road standards for one home.

Mr. Lane asked if the findings of fact were submitted into evidence. Discussion followed between Mr. Jason Barron and Mr. Ken Murphy explaining that the burden of evidence is on the applicant.

Mr. Lane stated that the unnecessary hardship is for financial in building and maintaining a private road. Mr. Swanstrom stated that the standards are in place so that emergency services could access the home if needed. Mr. Lane stated that there would not be a guarantee that the road would be maintained to any particular level if the variance were granted.

Ms. Foxx asked Mr. Lane to state any other hardships if the variance were not granted other than financial issues. Mr. Lane stated that:

- The burden is that the UDO restricts the length of a flag pole on a flag lot and therefore the lot could not be established at the desired location unless a variance is granted for the length of a flag pole.
- The purchase of an additional 5 acres has not been discussed and it is unknown whether or not this could be accomplished.
- The cost to build a private road would be three times the cost of a gravel road. The homeowner would be required to have a maintenance agreement with himself (as the only homeowner) that would require engineering certification of any repair to the private road standards.

Mr. Wells asked for clarification of the location of the existing private drive. It is currently contained in property owned by the seller.

Mr. Wells asked for clarification of the property to the north and specifically if it could be sold to individuals that could need access to Bissette Road. Mr. Lane confirmed that the land could be sold and other homes could be built.

Mr. Swanstrom asked about the easement access. Mr. Van Dyk pointed out that the application is for a 45' easement and the survey shows a 30' easement. Mr. Lane stated that the 30' easement is the minimum required. The 45' easement remains unchanged and is what the board would consider.

Mr. Van Dyk asked for clarification on the road access to future development to the North. Mr. Lane confirmed that any future property owner would access the same road and if there were three or more homes a paved road would be required.

Mr. Clark asked if the 5-acre parcel could be sub-divided in the future. Mr. Lane confirmed.

Mr. Phil Feagan asked if a future subdivision would require a variance. Mr. Lane confirmed.

Mr. Barron stated that he thought that the applicant had met the fourth condition of findings of fact -the requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved. However, Mr. Barron said that he did not believe that the applicant had met the 2nd requirement that states the hardship resulted from a condition that are peculiar to the property. Mr. Barron asked if Mr. Lane could speak to the 2nd requirement. Mr. Lane said that the property in question is the only property for sale and is the best location for the home site.

Ms. Foxx asked Mr. Lane if it was his professional opinion that the homeowner would be safe. Mr. Lane confirmed. Mr. Feagan asked if there were any comments concerning EMS or Fire Department comments – there were none to note. According to Mr. Lane, there are no fire hydrants on Bissette Road.

Mr. Van Dyk asked if there are any additional reviews required by public safety if the variance were granted. Mr. Finn stated that there were none.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Murphy for clarification of finding #3 as to the hardship created by the property owner – clarification of whether the finding refers to the existing property owner or the future property owner. Mr. Murphy read the language. Mr. Barron commented that the lot doesn't exist and he stated he had not heard evidence that the hardship already exists.

Mr. Van Dyk asked the length of the driveway. Mr. Lane stated that it was 4,700 feet. He asked for more evidence that if the variance were granted the road would not pose public safety problems.

Mr. Maiorano asked for clarification of the public utility easement mentioned in the application. Mr. Lane stated there is no recorded easement and there is no water or sewer in this area. Further, easement access would be available for telephone, television/cable and power company access.

Mr. Casa is the potential buyer and stated that the access easement runs along the west side of the property. Moving the home could not be moved from the chosen location because the property is low lying and "soggy". Based on his personal inspection the property along the front near Bissette Road is nearly four feet lower than the road.

Mr. Van Dyk asked if staff had any information from Public Safety. Mr. Finn did not have any additional information.

Mr. Maiorano asked for the difference between 5 acre and a 10 acre exempt lot. Mr. Finn replied that the 10-acre exemption is according to NC State statute.

Hearing no individuals speaking in opposition Mr. Swanstrom closed the public hearing.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Barron stated that he was not comfortable that condition #3 had been met and the hardship was being created by the potential buyer. Mr. Maiorano agreed that condition #3 has not been met. Ms. Foxx agreed that she would need additional evidence supporting #3 to grant the variance. Mr. Swanstrom said that he would like more clarification of condition #1 and #3.

Mr. Van Dyk stated that a 4,700 foot drive way not in compliance with private road standards could be a risk and would like more input from public safety on the issue.

Board members then discussed granting a continuance providing the applicant an opportunity to present additional evidence at a future meeting. Mr. Swanstrom re-opened the public hearing to ask the applicant if they would like to a continuance of the matter to the December 6, 2017 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Lane stated that he would like to continue the case until the December 6, 2017 Board meeting. He was then asked if they would like to hear testimony of Charlie Johnson, Wake County Fire Marshall today or defer to the next meeting. Mr. Lane preferred to defer testimony.

Ms. Foxx moved to continue the variance to the December 6, 2017 meeting. Mr. Maiorano seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

5. **ZP-896-17 - Rezone two parcels totaling 1.994 acres located at 9317 and 9313 Daffodil Drive (just south of the main Wake Tech campus and east of Fayetteville Road) from Residential-30 (R-30), to Conditional Use-Office and Institutional (CU-O&I).**

Mr. Amos Clark requested a recusal for item ZP-896-17 as his firm is representing the client. Motion to accept request was made by Mr. Maiorano, seconded by Mr. Van Dyk and approved unanimously.

Mr. Keith Lankford presented the staff report and presentation to the Board.

Current Zoning: Residential-30 (R-30)

Proposed Zoning: Conditional Use-Office and Institutional (CU-O&I)

Existing Land Uses: Single-family dwelling and vacant lot

Petitioner: Charlie Yokley

Design Firm: The McAdams Company

Owner: Dr. Stephen Scott, Secretary to the Board, on behalf of the Trustees of Wake Technical Community College

PINs: 0689703357 and 0689703586

A conditional use rezoning means that the petitioner has voluntarily offered certain conditions as part of the rezoning petition in an attempt to mitigate the potential for adverse impacts of the rezoning and subsequent development upon the surrounding properties.

Wake County Land Use Plan

The Wake County Land Use Plan's General Classification map designates this area as Fuquay-Varina's Short-Range Urban Services Area (SRUSA). SRUSAs are defined as areas within the county's zoning jurisdiction that are intended to be urbanized—probably within the next ten years. Please see the discussions below under the "Input from the Town of Fuquay-Varina" and "Utilities" sections for information regarding coordination efforts with the Town of Fuquay-Varina.

The subject properties, Wake Tech's main campus, and much of the surrounding area are located within a 772-acre Regional Activity Center (RAC) as designated on the Fuquay-Varina/Garner Area Land Use Plan. The RAC is the largest type of Wake County's three classifications of activity centers, allowing for the widest range of uses and for the most intensive types of uses. The RAC classification is intended for large-scale urban land uses that provide for a primary job base.

RACs are described in the Wake County Land Use Plan (Chapter III, page 14) as being serviced by major thoroughfares and municipal water and sewer. A few of the large-scale urban land uses listed as appropriate for an RAC are shopping malls, large hotel/motels, restaurants, large office parks, community colleges, industrial parks, research and development parks and employment centers.

Given the proposed zoning district for the subject lots (Conditional Use-Office and Institutional), the stated proposed use (an access road to support the community college), and the allowable range of possible uses, the requested rezoning would be consistent with the Wake County Land Use Plan's Regional Activity Center designation. Furthermore, the primary use (community college), proximity to major thoroughfares (i.e.—Fayetteville Road/US 401 and the pending future NC-540 interchange), availability of utility services by the Town of Fuquay-Varina, and the employment base provided by Wake Technical Community College, comply with several of the Land Use Plan's goals. Among those goals are:

- Goal #1—To guide quality growth throughout the County in conjunction with affected local governments;
- Goal # 2—To encourage growth close to municipalities, to take advantage of existing and planned infrastructure, such as transportation, water and sewer facilities;
- Goal # 3—To encourage the development of communities which provide adequate land for anticipated demands, in a pattern which allows a mixture of uses; and
- Goal # 7—To ensure that the land use plan and transportation plan mutually support each other.

It is the Planning staff's professional opinion that the rezoning petition for Conditional Use-Office and Institutional zoning, the stated proposed use, and the permissible range of uses would be consistent with the Land Use Plan, and are reasonable, and appropriate for the area.

Required Statement of Consistency with the Land Use Plan, Reasonableness, and Public Interest

North Carolina General Statute 153A-341 and Section 19-21-6 (C) of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance require that the Planning Board provides the Board of Commissioners with a statement of whether or not the proposed rezoning petition is consistent with the Land Use Plan, reasonable, and otherwise advances the public health, safety, and general welfare.

The petitioner has provided several statements indicating (1) why they believe that the proposed rezoning and subsequent use is a public necessity, and (2) explaining its impact on the surrounding neighborhood and adjacent properties. They have also provided statements of (3) how the rezoning complies with the Land Use Plan; (4) how the rezoning benefits the adjacent and surrounding properties and (5) otherwise advances the public health, safety and general welfare.

Two-Step Conditional Use Rezoning Process

The Wake County Unified Development Ordinance establishes a two-step conditional use rezoning process. The first step is to obtain a conditional use rezoning from the Board of Commissioners. The second step requires that the Wake County Planning Board review and process a Planned Compliance Permit (PCP) for most uses (although some commercial uses could be approved administratively by staff if they were less than 2,500 square feet in size).

The petitioner has stated that the purpose of the rezoning is to permit the construction of "an access road connection to the Wake Tech campus along US 401" that will "improve internal infrastructure and circulation, allowing a safer and more efficient ingress and egress for students, faculty, and visitors.

A General Use Permit would be processed administratively by the Planning staff for nonresidential uses of less than 2,500 square feet (except for those with gas sales) after demonstration of full compliance with all applicable regulations and standards. The stated access road would be an accessory use to the existing community college and therefore would be approvable administratively by staff.

Input from the Town of Fuquay-Varina

As part of the Wake County Planning staff's review of any rezoning request, a copy of the petition is forwarded to the relevant municipality who's Urban Services Area that the subject property lies within. The subject lots are classified as the Town of Fuquay-Varina's Short-Range Urban Services Area (SRUSA). A copy of the petition materials was sent to the Fuquay-Varina planning staff, but they have not provided any courtesy review comments on this rezoning petition.

However during another rezoning case (in 2016) for other lots on Daffodil Drive, the town's planning staff indicated that they do not object to the rezoning petition, but had requested that Wake Tech Community College provide a sewer easement across another portion of the campus. The petitioner, and representatives of the community college, met with the town's planning and public utilities staffs to discuss the location and alignment of the requested sewer easement. It is our understanding that the town is agreeable to having the sewer easement located on the western side of the drainageway that runs through the eastern portion of the main campus where there is an existing sewer pump station.

Input from Neighboring Property Owners

As per our normal process, the Planning staff mailed out letters to all property owners within 1,000 feet of the subject property and posted a public meeting notice sign at the subject properties on Daffodil Drive. In response to those efforts to solicit neighborhood feedback, the Planning staff has received no phone calls or e-mails.

The petitioner held a neighborhood meeting on Wednesday, October 4, 2017 to discuss the requested rezoning and the stated proposed access road. Please see the attached materials related to the neighborhood meeting. It is our understanding that no one attended this meeting, or called, or e-mailed the petitioner to inquire about the rezoning or the subsequent use.

Utilities

The subject property is classified as being in the Town of Fuquay-Varina's Short-Range Urban Services Area (SRUSA). The Wake County Land Use Plan defines SRUSAs as areas within the county's jurisdiction that are intended to be urbanized—probably within the next ten years. The Wake Tech main campus is currently served by Town of Fuquay-Varina water and sewer lines. As noted above in the "Input from the Town of Fuquay-Varina" section, the town had previously requested the provision of a sewer easement on the western side of the drainageway that runs through the eastern portion of the main campus. The petitioner has been working with the town's planning and public utilities staffs on the location and alignment of the requested sewer easement.

This coordination with the Town of Fuquay-Varina is consistent with the Wake County Land Use Plan's Goal # 2, which calls for the encouragement of growth close to municipalities, to take advantage of existing and planned infrastructure, such as transportation, water and sewer facilities. The requested rezoning, and the stated proposed access road that is in support of the community college, are consistent with the Regional Activity Center designation as set forth in the Wake County Land Use Plan.

Environmental Issues

There are no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulatory floodplains, Wake County flood hazard soils, protected/buffered drainageways, or regulatory wetlands on, or in close proximity to, the subject properties.

Transportation Plan

Fayetteville Road/US 401 is designated as a major thoroughfare in the Wake County 2025 Transportation Plan and the accompanying Corridor Profiles booklet. The existing right-of-way of 150 feet already complies with the prescribed width; therefore no additional right-of-way dedication will be required if and when these lots are developed. The existing four-lane cross-section with a grassed median is proposed to be widened to a six-lane cross-section with a median and left-turn lanes, as needed, at driveways and intersections.

There is a possibility that the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) may require a turn lane or other roadway improvement during their review of the subsequent site plan for development (e.g.—the stated proposed access road) on the subject properties. Any roadway improvements and/or driveway permits will have to be coordinated with, and approved by NCDOT, during the site plan review process.

Traffic Volumes

No Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) figures are available for Daffodil Drive because it is a local dead-end public road or for Tech Road because it is a private road for the majority of its length around the campus (only the first 500 feet between US 401 and Daffodil Drive is a public road).

The 2015 AADT counts available from NCDOT for Fayetteville Road/US 401 is 32,100 vehicles per day at a point just south of Ten Ten Road (about three-fourths of a mile north of the Wake Tech campus). The Wake County 2025 Transportation Plan and the accompanying Corridor Profiles booklet state that the current design capacity of this roadway is 31,500 vehicles per day, so the roadway is operating slightly over its design capacity. [Please note that the stated purposed access road is not anticipated to generate any additional traffic to the community college.]

While the traffic volume is slightly over the stated design capacity of this roadway, a majority of that traffic appears to correspond with the AM and PM peak hours of commuting traffic (i.e.—6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM respectively).

Accident Report

No accident report figures are available for Daffodil Drive because it is a local dead-end public road or for Tech Road because it is a private road for the majority of its length around the campus (only the first 500 feet between US 401 and Daffodil Drive is a public road).

NCDOT's Traffic Engineering Accident Analysis System report for the 5-year period from September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2017 indicated that there have been 132 accidents along the 0.761-mile section of Fayetteville Road/US 401 between Industry Drive and Donny Brook Road. During that five-year period there were 42 accidents (31.8% of those 132 accidents) that occurred at the intersection of Chandler Ridge Circle/Wake Tech Way with Fayetteville Road/US 401. There were another 37 (28%) that occurred at, or in close proximity to, the intersection of Tech Road with Fayetteville Road/US 401, and 21 accidents (15.9%) that occurred at the intersection of Donny Brook Road/Old McCullers Road with Fayetteville Road/US 401. Together these three intersections represent over three-fourths (75.7%) of the accidents that occurred during this five-year time period along this 0.761-mile section of highway.

Traffic Impact Analysis

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required by the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance, for any development, that generates more than 1,000 trips per day, or more than 100 peak-hour trips, as determined by the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual for specified proposed uses. Any required TIA must be submitted during the site plan approval process. The petitioner indicated (and documented) that they had a meeting with representatives of the NCDOT on October 31, 2014 to discuss possible road improvements and were advised by the NCDOT District Engineer's Office that they would not require a TIA since no additional traffic is being generated. Therefore, for these reasons, Wake County Planning staff is not requiring a TIA as part of the rezoning petition, but reserves the right to require one as part of the subsequent development if warranted by Sec. 15-12 of the Wake County.

Planning Staff Findings

1. The proposed Conditional Use-Office and Institutional rezoning, the stated proposed use, and the permissible range of uses are consistent with the Land Use Plan's designation of this area as a Regional Activity Center and are reasonable and appropriate for the area.
2. More specifically, the Regional Activity Center allows for large-scale urban land uses that are served by major thoroughfares and municipal water and sewer and that provide for a primary job base.
3. The proposed rezoning complies with four stated goals of the Land Use Plan
4. The proposed use is not anticipated to generate any new traffic to the site, but is intended to improve circulation, safety, and user experience.
5. A detailed site plan must be approved by the appropriate Wake County entity prior to future development on the subject properties to ensure compliance with all applicable regulations.
6. The Town of Fuquay-Varina's planning staff had previously indicated that they did not object to a similar rezoning petition for other lots on Daffodil Drive.
7. The Wake County Planning staff has received no objections from the surrounding property owners or the general public.

Planning Staff Recommendation

The Planning staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the attached drafted statements of (1) consistency with the Land Use Plan, reasonableness, and public interest, and (2) recommendation of approval of the rezoning petition as presented.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chairman Swanstrom opened public hearing.

Charlie Yokley with the McAdams Company representing the client addressed the Board in favor of the petition. Mr. Yokley stated that the goal for the use of the property is infrastructure improvements and the zoning would be consistent with the rest of the campus. He showed that the rezoning would provide additional access to the property that would be needed in the future.

Chairman Swanstrom closed the public hearing.

Mr. Wells asked if the rezoning was necessary to complete the needed infrastructure. Mr. Lankford stated that it was needed in order to develop the roads as needed. Once the zoning is in place the lots would be combined with the existing campus making it one property and the roads would then become an accessory use.

Mr. Barron complimented staff on a well written report and stated he supports the request.

Mr. Van Dyk asked if the remaining 2 lots to the North would be rezoned. Mr. Lankford showed that the lots in question were not part of the request and were not needed at this time and stated that there is pending construction from the future 540 that may impact the north property. Mr. Van Dyk asked if a site plan would be required for development if the rezoning were granted. Mr. Lankford confirmed that a site plan would be required for a parking lot or any of the other approved uses for the new zoning.

Mr. Jason Barron moved to recommend that the Wake County Board of Commissioners adopt the written recommendation as found in the staff report regarding Land Use Plan consistency, reasonableness, and public interest. Motion was seconded by Mr. Van Dyk and carried unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Ashley Foxx moved in the matter of ZP-896-17 that the Planning Board offers the Wake County Board of Commissioners a recommendation for approval of the zoning request as presented. Motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Maiorano and passed unanimously (7-0).

6. Staff Announcement

Tim Maloney announced that the Park Director would not be able to present the Greenways and Parks Plan per the agenda. Mr. Swanstrom called for a motion to modify the agenda and as such, Mr. Wayne Maiorano made a motion to amend. Mr. Wells seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

7. Wake County 20-Year Comprehensive Affordable Housing Plan

Ms. Alicia Arnold presented the 20-year comprehensive affordable housing plan that was recently approved by the Board of Commissioners. Ms. Arnold's staff is now working on implementation strategies for the rest of FY18 and asked that the Board share the plan with others to help get the message out that affordable housing is needed in Wake County.

Mr. Swanstrom commented about the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and that it would be good to have an alignment with the affordable housing, transit and other adopted policies. Sharon Peterson confirmed that staff was working on an RFP to select a qualified vendor.

8. Committee Reports – None.

9. Staff Reports

Sharon Peterson reported that staff presented the GLUE committee a status update on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan progress and they did stress the importance of the alignment of affordable housing, transit, and other associated land use policies.

Steven Finn reported that development trends continue to be active. Related to the Affordable Housing presentation in 2013 the UDO was amended to allow accessory (Granny flats)

Chairman's Report

Mr. Swanstrom polled the Board members on their interest in using IPADs at future Board meetings. There was no opposition.

Mr. Wells thanked staff for the examples of Comprehensive plans from other jurisdictions and asked for an update on requested transportation maps.

Having no further announcements the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.



**REGULAR MEETING
WAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
November 1, 2017**

**Alan Swanstrom declared the regular meeting
of the Wake County Planning Board for
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 adjourned at 4:15 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alan Swanstrom", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

**Alan Swanstrom
Wake County Planning Board**

