

MINUTES
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
JULY 6, 2011
REGULAR MEETING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Crawford (Chair), Eno Township Representative; Larry Wright (Vice-Chair), At-Large, Cedar Grove Township; Alan Campbell, Cedar Grove Township Representative; Buddy Hartley, Little River Township Representative; Lisa Stuckey, Chapel Hill Township Representative; Mark Marcoplos, At-Large, Bingham Township; Andrea Rohrbacher, At-Large Chapel Hill Township; Peter Hallenbeck, Cheeks Township Representative; Maxecine Mitchell, At-Large Bingham Township; Rachel Hawkins, Hillsborough Township Representative;

MEMBERS ABSENT: Judith Wegner, Bingham Township Representative; Johnny Randall, At-Large Chapel Hill Township;

STAFF PRESENT: Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor; Perdita Holtz, Planning Systems Coordinator; Glenn Bowles, Planner II; Tina Love, Administrative Assistant II

OTHERS PRESENT: Frank Lloyd, Janet Lloyd, Chad Abbott, Susan Levy

Documents handed out by staff: Water System Basics submitted by Pete Hallenbeck

Visuals used during meeting: Tinnin Woods Site Plan Map and area map

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Brian Crawford: Good Evening,

AGENDA ITEM 2: INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a) Next Regular Planning Board Meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 3, 2011
- b) Planning Calendar for July and August

AGENDA ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Brian Crawford: Are there any additions to the minutes?

MOTION made by Larry Wright to approve the June 1, 2011 minutes. Seconded by Lisa Stuckey.

VOTE: Unanimous

AGENDA ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 5: PUBLIC CHARGE

Introduction to the Public Charge

The Board of County Commissioners, under the authority of North Carolina General Statute, appoints the Orange County Planning Board (OCPB) to uphold the written land development laws of the County. The general purpose of OCPB is to guide and accomplish coordinated and harmonious development. OCPB shall do so in a manner which considers the present and future needs of its citizens and businesses through efficient and responsive process that contributes to and promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the overall County. The OCPB will make every effort to uphold a vision of responsive governance and quality public services during our deliberations, decisions, and recommendations.

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118

PUBLIC CHARGE

The Planning Board pledges to the citizens of Orange County its respect. The Board asks its citizens to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Board and with fellow citizens. At any time, should any member of the Board or any citizen fail to observe this public charge, the Chair will ask the offending member to leave the meeting until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair will recess the meeting until such time that a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.

AGENDA ITEM 6: CHAIR COMMENTS

Brian Crawford: I will waive comments.

(in order to give extra time for interested citizens to arrive for Items 7 and 8 the Planning Board heard items 9 and 10 first)

AGENDA ITEM 9: UPDATE ON WORK PLAN ITEMS: To receive an update on Work Plan items completed, in process, and planned in regards to small area plan implementation and economic development initiatives.
Presenter: Perdita Holtz, Planner III

Perdita Holtz: Brian asked use to do an update on the economic development initiatives work that has occurred over the last several months and what we have been working on now and what we see for the near future. There was a brief discussion last year at the November 2010 dinner meeting of the BOCC. The purpose of that discussion was to talk about the focus areas; the areas that the Planning Board will focus their work on in 2011. In November of last year, there was also discussion about the work plan the Planning Board was submitting to the BOCC for their annual retreat in January. All of those things are attached as Attachment 1. Page 173 contains the Planning Board economic development related work. There were three main things identified for 2011. First, the UDO was completed and adopted and then Land Use Plan and Zoning text and map amendments. There is more upcoming work. Then there was Design Standards for the Efland Core Mixed Use Area which refers to the Efland Village. Pages 175 through 179 is a chart we keep up to date. These are the synopsis of the recommendations contained in the three small area plans: Efland Mebane, the Eno Economic Development District, and the NC 57 Speedway. The red text is the updates.

Larry Wright: Historically when we hold quarterly public hearings, there are those who want to put in those storage units to rent and the zoning doesn't permit that, is this going to take care of that?

Perdita Holtz: Not necessarily. The whole REDA concept on page 176 of the NC 57 Speedway Plan, depending on how that gets implemented, that could take care of that issue to some extent. On Attachment 2, there are three items proposed for the August Public Hearing. We weren't able to get the legal ad done according to agenda schedules but we will work with the manager, chair, and vice-chair over the summer on the legal ad. On June 21, the BOCC approved moving forward with the three items. One will be a UDO text amendment to ensure connectivity between parcels, a UDO text amendment to uncouple class two kennels and riding stables as a use, and a UDO text amendment to update the definition of Commercial Industrial Transition Activity Node. For the August 23 BOCC regular meeting, we are expecting to bring an Access Management Plan for the Efland Commercial Industrial Transition Node area. For the November Public Hearing, we have a UDO text amendment to address some of the economic development issues and processes and standards. We are expected to have drafts ready for a Planning Board Ordinance Review Committee meeting in October. A second item is additional land use map amendments for the Efland area. It would become a mixed use land use classification which would be a new land use classification. Also, in the Efland area, expansion of the 10 year transition land use category to north of McGowan Creek. The third item is the Efland Design Guidelines discussed earlier.

Brian Crawford: I ask staff to do this because we are at the year's midpoint. Often, we have had these meetings and we never take a pause to see how well that meeting went, we are doing, what we should be doing, and if we are short in any way, so the Planning Board can come up with methods to accomplish what we have established. That is particularly important because of the small area plans. In some ways we could push the agenda because we want to get the small area plan areas ready for economic development faster; helping the BOCC see that we really want to push these small area plans. Maybe in the next month, we can see if we can push items on the small area plan agenda that make them more economic development friendly. One thing I would like to do is see if the Planning Board can help move that process along. I may appoint a couple of you to be a part of a small sub committee to see if there is anything we can do to push the small area plans.

119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176

AGENDA ITEM 10: COMMITTEE/ADVISORY BOARD REPORTS

a) Board of Adjustment

Larry Wright: We met on the 13th and there was a modification of a special use permit for A-1-11 Camp Retreat Center submitted by the Maple View Dairy. They wanted to modify this permit to hold fundraisers and rent out their building. We granted the permit to rent the facility and hold up to 12 outdoor events with some amplification per year. At this time, they do not have an alcohol permit and there are very minimal facilities for food preparation. It is more of a fundraiser place.

Brian Crawford: For the public to rent out for fundraiser?

Larry Wright: Prior people who did it were Orange County Staff, Duke, etc. They had a variety of fundraisers for greyhound rescue, etc.

Brian Crawford: Anyone against it?

Larry Wright: Yes.

Brian Crawford: There was controversy?

Michael Harvey: There was opposition because of the noise and over the notion that local residents felt they were told one thing by the applicant and then the applicant did something totally different. There was no basis for denial.

b) Orange Unified Transportation

Alan Campbell: I was unable to attend the OUTBoard meeting.

c) Efland-Mebane Small Area Plan Implementation Focus Group

Brian Crawford: The Efland-Mebane Small Area Plan group is not meeting right now.

AGENDA ITEM 7: CLASS A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MONTESSORI SCHOOL: To make a recommendation to the BOCC on an application submitted by the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Hillsborough to allow for development of a Montessori School at their existing church facility located at the intersection of Lawrence Road and Old NC Highway 10, as heard at the May 23, 2011 quarterly public hearing.

Presenter: Michael Harvey, Planner III

Michael Harvey: The individuals that will be operating the school are in the audience. Their engineer will be here. I will briefly summarize the abstract. There were several questions and comments during the quarterly public hearing that I will discuss if necessary.

Brian Crawford: Have there been any other comments from the meeting date until today?

Michael Harvey: No other than what was entered into the public record.

Brian Crawford: Were there any objections on the recommendation conditions by the applicant?

Michael Harvey: No.

Brian Crawford: Are there any questions from the Planning Board for staff?

Larry Wright: With respect to the provision of food for lunch, has that been addressed by the applicant?

Michael Harvey: I will defer to the applicant for that answer.

177 Larry Wright: On page 34, recommended condition number 2, how much wiggle room is there if you had adverse weather for the
178 parents to pick their children up?
179

180 Michael Harvey: Condition number 2 deals with the hours of operation for the school. From my standpoint, if there is that
181 situation I don't see the alteration in hours that as a violation. All we are saying is that normal classroom operations will occur as
182 proposed by the applicant. You may want to propose modifications to our recommended language that would say the operation
183 of the school should occur from 8:30 to 3:30 Monday through Friday unless other factors deem necessary.
184

185 Brian Crawford: We could make it with consistent with the Orange County Public Schools inclement weather plan with respect to
186 operating hours.
187

188 Larry Wright: When I was connected with the school district, they went through a mock evening class that parents attended like
189 a school day. Would that be affected if they brought students in?
190

191 Michael Harvey: Like an open house?
192

193 Larry Wright: Yes.
194

195 Michael Harvey: No, because this condition is getting at the operation of the school, specifically classroom operations. If the
196 school had a meeting after hours, I don't think this condition, even as worded, would preclude such an event because meetings
197 can still be held at the church.
198

199 Larry Wright: I asked because I wanted to make sure that if there is a neighbor that would want to take issue with this type of
200 activity that there were these types of discussions occurring during the application review process.
201

202 Michael Harvey: The Planning Board may want to recommend that condition number 2 be modified to say actual school
203 operations from a teaching perspective will occur from this time to this time and the building can be utilized for non-school
204 functions, meetings, parent teacher conferences at reasonable hours and add language about the inclement weather policy as
205 suggested by the chair.
206

207 Brian Crawford: Will staff make a note of that.
208

209 Michael Harvey: That needs to be in your recommendation.
210

211 Brian Crawford: Any other questions from the Planning Board?
212

213 Frank Lloyd: My wife and I are the co-owners of the school and you ask about the meals. Our kids will bring their own lunches.
214 There is a microwave in case someone needs something heated up. We will not be cooking meals on site. The trash will be
215 taken care of by the existing waste contractor for the church. Does that answer what you want?
216

217 Larry Wright: Thank you very much.
218

219 Brian Crawford: Would anyone like to make a motion?
220

221 **MOTION** made by Larry Wright to endorse staff's recommendations on page 34 items 1 through 10 with one modification on
222 number 2 to clarify that the school schedule will be from 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM when classes will be held but it would conform with
223 the Orange County Public Schools Implementation Weather Plan.
224

225 Lisa Stuckey: A friendly amendment could be that the school may hold open houses and parent teacher conferences outside of
226 the 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM timeframe.
227

228 Michael Harvey: A clarification. As part of your motion, are you making the affirmative finding of staff's findings as articulated on
229 pages 1 through 33 with respect to compliance with the various elements of the special use permit application submittal and that
230 the evidence submitted justifies the issuance of the permit.
231

232 **MOTION** made by Larry Wright to endorse staff's recommendations on pages 1 through 33 with regard to the issuance of the
233 permit and the recommended conditions contained on page 34 items 1 through 10 with one modification on number 2 to clarify
234 that the school schedule will be from 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM when classes will be held but it would conform with the Orange County

235 Public Schools Implementation Weather Plan and that open houses and other similar meetings can be held outside of regular
236 school hours. Alan Campbell seconded

237
238 VOTE: Unanimous

239
240
241 AGENDA ITEM 8: CONDITIONAL USE DISTRICT (CLASS A SUP) PROPOSING TO REZONE A TRACT OF LAND OFF OF TINNIN ROAD
242 TO ALLOW FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 28 LOT SUBDIVISION: To make a recommendation to the BOCC on
243 an application submitted by Habitat for Humanity to rezone 8.984 acres of land from Rural Residential
244 (R-1) to High Intensity Residential Conditional Use (R-8-CU) in order to develop a 28-lot major
245 subdivision, as heard at the May 23, 2011 quarterly public hearing.
246 Presenter: Michael Harvey, Planner III

247
248 Michael Harvey: As you are aware this item was presented at the May 23, 2011 Quarterly Public Hearing. From staff's
249 standpoint the major areas of concern needing further review and discussion are the required size of the water and sewer lines.
250 As you might recall the applicant proposes an 8 inch water and sewer line while staff has recommended a condition requiring
251 a 12 inch water and sewer line along Tinnin Road. A second area of concern was a recommended condition requiring the
252 applicant to tie into an existing water line within the Richmond Hills subdivision to create a looped water system. The installation
253 of sidewalks was brought up during the public hearing. Another question posed was who would be responsible for paying for
254 existing water customers to tie onto the new water line. A final area of discussion was a recommendation by County
255 Commissioners to re-orient the proposed three lots on the northeastern portion of the project to protect identified wetlands
256 denoted on the site plan.

257
258 Alan Campbell: With respect to the utility lines, is it just on this one area of concern for staff?

259
260 Michael Harvey: We have recommended 12 inch line along Tinnin Road with the rest of the development served by 8 inch lines.
261 The applicant believes that the proposed 8 inch line is sufficient and has respectfully asked staff to re-evaluate our condition.

262
263 Larry Wright: I have a problem that is the only sidewalk proposed for this project. According to the Comprehensive Plan,
264 Chapters 4 and 9, developments are encouraged to have sidewalks. My issue is that you have the connector way over to the left
265 and then a path there. This essentially pushes children to the streets or to lead a sedentary in their house.

266
267 Michael Harvey: The applicant is proposing additional POSA access points though the open space connecting to existing trail
268 systems to the west. As you will note from the site plan there are POSA access points allowing for access from the eastern
269 portion of the project to the western project boundary line where existing trails can be accessed. The Planning Board reserves
270 its right to have to recommend additional sidewalks or recommend additional POSA access points.

271
272 Brian Crawford: What does the term POSA stand for and where is it referred in the Ordinance?

273
274 Michael Harvey: I am drawing a blank on what it stands for ...

275
276 Perdita Holtz: It stands for pedestrian open space access.

277
278 Larry Wright: How many vehicles will be coming through here?

279
280 Michael Harvey: I believe the applicant's testimony...

281
282 Larry Wright: The DOT said the average is 16 per household.

283
284 Michael Harvey: I believe the applicant said approximately 300 to 400 vehicles would be accessing the area during their May 23,
285 2011 Public Hearing testimony.

286
287 Larry Wright: My issue is that this is a lot of traffic and we should encourage people and children to get out, away from indoor
288 sedentary lives, out of doors, off the streets and people should be able to walk laps, not in the street competing with vehicles. I
289 understand the connectors but there isn't any here. In chapters 4 and 9 in the Comprehensive Plan, I would like to make a
290 recommendation to the BOCC...a development is a development...I think we should get the children out and the people should
291 be able to walk the laps here. I think we should push for more sidewalks.

292

293 Lisa Stuckey: I think there are seven lots that front on school house road and I don't see how those kids...it seems the internal
294 paths will be unlikely to be used by them to get to school. I remember like 268 vehicular trips being talked about during the
295 public hearing ...I wonder if there is an easement will it ever be built.

296
297 Larry Wright: Event if they go over to the Efland Cedar Grove playground, they will be walking in the road.

298
299 Maxecine Mitchell: Who is going to pay for all these sidewalks?
300

301 Michael Harvey: The applicant has been made aware of these issues and over suggestions that the project have sidewalks
302 installed within various roadways including School House Road and the B roadway designated on the site plan. The purpose of
303 this meeting is for you to have this type of discussion with the applicant and allow them to respond. I am hearing that you would
304 like more sidewalks within the development.
305

306 Brian Crawford: Larry, I think you are right; I just don't want to bring these up as a motion. I know sidewalks are very expensive.
307 I know Habitat and their budget is tight. Sidewalks are a great idea but we need to clue the BOCC if there is any way to help
308 make this happen, we would encourage them to do so. Or maybe come up with a better system.
309

310 Michael Harvey: On page 52, the question posed by Commissioner Jacobs was, does the public entity need to have any kind of
311 easement to put in sidewalks and would it be prudent to reserve that easement now and not require any sidewalks to be built.
312

313 Habitat's answer to that question was sidewalks were not a problem but we can't pay for them and our future homeowners
314 association cannot bear the perpetual maintenance and upkeep responsibility. I think it is fair to say the majority of the
315 conditions staff has recommended to the applicant, they have responded favorably to. What staff is looking for is are there any
316 other conditions you as the Planning Board would like to see imposed or addressed by the applicant so they can provide the
317 necessary response and allow you to make a recommendation.
318

319 Pete Hallenbeck: Since we are focused on sidewalks. In the Efland area small plan meetings, sidewalks are something people
320 want. On most nights when you drive down US 70, you have a very good chance of seeing someone walking down the road and
321 it is just a matter of time before someone gets hit. One thing I am not clear on is are we talking about requiring the developer to
322 put in and install concrete sidewalks now or having space allocated that will be part of the plan so you don't have utilities sitting
323 where you would like a sidewalk.
324

325 Part of what brings my focus on that is thinking back on my days at Perdue and they made these beautiful open areas with
326 crisscross patterns and the students ignored that and pretty soon you see what the natural flow or pattern is; that is why I
327 wondered if you required this development to allocate space for the sidewalk and put grass and it is a problem for another day, to
328 see the wear patterns are, are people willing to go through the cul-de-sac and use the POSA or go down a school house road
329 and walk to a school. It is very hard to plan how people will walk through an area. Engineering loves the idea of saying what if
330 you know where the sidewalks are all around the roads and had that area allocated and preserved. That also solves some of the
331 financial problem. It is an interesting area for all the development in Efland. Efland is this bizarre entity in the County where it is
332 like a County town. It is not incorporated. I think the ability to set aside space now and later when we know more about how the
333 area will be and where we want to put in sidewalks, it is appropriate to approach the County because in many ways the County is
334 the one directing this area.
335

336 Andrea Rohrbacher: I need a little more education about POSA and the surface materials they use.
337

338 Michael Harvey: Right now, the applicant is proposing a mulch trail system. The ordinance does not mandate it be universally
339 accessible to non-pedestrian foot traffic including handicap access or establish a base material that has to be used. It could be
340 wood or concrete as an example. There are practical issues with that. Perpetual maintenance and cost issues will always come
341 up as well as impervious surface concerns. This Board could make suggestions.
342

343 Lisa Stuckey: There are sidewalks in the Phoenix Place, how was that accomplished.
344

345 Susan Levy: The Phoenix Place project is in the Town of Chapel Hill's jurisdiction. Habitat does apply for monies available
346 through the County. We will do the same thing but there is less of it now. We like the way Phoenix Place looks and we have
347 tried to model this after it. I am concerned about the homeowners association being responsible.
348

349 Maxecine Mitchell: I live in a Habitat neighborhood and we don't have sidewalks so most of have kids say in the yards and play.
350 I have been there 15 yeas and no child has ever been hit. I don't know if people would be able to afford the maintenance. I don't
351 want to add any extra financial burden to them.

352
353 Pete Hallenbeck: Related to the sidewalks. It is specified as being five feet. If you take a field and mow a five foot path over the
354 course it becomes a six inch path. Is there a wider area to be mowed? Or is it just the five foot area. You usually have to
355 maintain an area on each side.
356
357 Michael Harvey: I think you will find the POSA will be maintained by the homeowners association. It will not be in lot meaning
358 that it will be its own property owned and maintained by the proposed homeowners association.
359
360 Pete Hallenbeck: We expect the homeowners to deal with that.
361
362 Michael Harvey: If the Board would like to add language about the maintenance of the POSA that is not unreasonable but
363 typically yes local homeowners associations would be responsible for maintaining the area.
364
365 Pete Hallenbeck: I'm happy saying if there is a general understanding to mow a little more on each side.
366
367 Michael Harvey: That is generally how it is handled.
368
369 Brian Crawford: While we are still on POSA sidewalk issues, can it be part of our recommendation that we highly encourage
370 sidewalks but we request the BOCC to maintain the sidewalks as part of our recommendation.
371
372 Buddy Hartley: Are you going to ask the BOCC to support sidewalks for another development?
373
374 Brian Crawford: We do it on a case by case basis.
375
376 Alan Campbell: To me, the notion of reserving space but not have construction because with the budget issues, it would not be
377 expected for the County to commit to additional funds.
378
379 Brian Crawford: Reserving space literally means on this project it won't happen.
380
381 Michael Harvey: The applicant suggested that if there are sidewalks they be located within the right of way. The concern as
382 expressed by the applicant is they can't accept or afford the perpetual maintenance responsibility for the sidewalks.
383
384 Brian Crawford: According to Larry's point, part of the Comprehensive Plan was sidewalks so we would encourage any project
385 to have sidewalks but who will maintain it. We are asking the BOCC to consider maintaining them in the future.
386
387 Lisa Stuckey: These roads are being developed to lead to other roads with more traffic.
388
389 Brian Crawford: In the past, the County has had funds set aside for this sort of thing. It may be in a more financially rich time,
390 the County may be able to make that happen.
391
392 Larry Wright: Chapter 4 of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan emphasizes importance of Affordable Housing while Chapter 9
393 stresses installing sidewalks within new developments, rendering them walkable. For the BOCC, they want Affordable Housing,
394 we see there is connectivity here and it would be nice to have people off the streets where they would not have to go around a
395 bicycle.
396
397 Pete Hallenbeck: I support preserving the space and telling the BOCC they have to fund this. It is unlikely these roads that
398 extend north...That area flattens out and it is swampy. This road won't go for miles with a lot of traffic.
399
400 Michael Harvey: Staff has come up with a list of conditions that the applicant has no issue with. They would like to be able to
401 respond to.
402
403 Brian Crawford: They are coming back to us in August with responses from today.
404
405 Michael Harvey: Yes. Also with some comments on conditions staff has recommended and Mr. Hallenbeck submitted a
406 memorandum to as well and any other conditions this Board has. There has already been talk in the BOCC of posting signs in
407 terms of the ownership and maintenance of the pedestrian points, the potential and future stub out connectivity of the roads,
408 which they are willing to do. The big issues appear to be; the reconfiguration of these lots on the eastern portion of the project,
409 the sidewalk issue, the looping issue, the size of the utility lines.
410

411 Brian Crawford: We would like the applicant to consider the discussion about the sidewalk.

412
413 Chad Abbott: My name is Chad Abbot from Summit Engineering, the engineering consultant for the applicant. The County can
414 essentially put a sidewalk where they want because we are saying there is a 50 foot right of way that DOT will agree with the
415 County to put a sidewalk in the right of way. The County will enter into a two part encroachment agreement with DOT such that
416 the applicant, the applicant doesn't need to reserve a space because there is a 50 foot right of way and we a saying that any
417 sidewalk to be put in would be there. We wouldn't reserve an extra five foot along the lots because typically it is put in the right
418 of way.....If there needs to be additional construction easements where maybe the topography should be flattened out more,
419 then I don't think that would be a problem, we would say we would reserve a five foot temporary construction easement for the
420 sidewalks for a time when they are put in. The debate about the decision requirement the applicant to reserve a space is really
421 not we were moving in the direction of. We were saying that typically if a sidewalk is place for any subdivision, it is put in the
422 right of way. When it is in the right of way, they have no say about it, it is between the County and DOT.

423
424 Brian Crawford: It sounds like the Board has come up with a suggestion and part of your response for the August meeting
425 addresses our suggestions. We ask for this preservation but you have a better solution to meet that.

426
427 Chad Abbott: Prior to my responses, I want to make sure that what I was envisioning was that you were saying that was not
428 what you had in mind.

429
430 Pete Hallenbeck: What is the road width?

431
432 Michael Harvey: It is 27 feet back to back.

433
434 Pete Hallenbeck: Is there on street parking?

435
436 Michael Harvey: No.

437
438 Pete Hallenbeck: So there is plenty of room. It sounds like simply because you can't build in the right of way space allocated
439 then everything we are discussing comes down to encouraging the BOCC to ...

440
441 Michael Harvey: To enter into a two part agreement with DOT.

442
443 Brian Crawford: The next is the sewer item. Have we finished the discussion on that?

444
445 Michael Harvey: The applicant will bring some information back. The short of it is there is disagreement over the size of the line.
446 Staff has indicated they would like to see the water and sewer in Tinnin Road going up to the recommended 12 inch line. The
447 applicant respectively disagrees with that assessment and will be providing information from OAWS saying that an eight inch line
448 will be responsible and address future connectivity and fire flow, fire prevention and since all the homes will have in house
449 sprinkler systems, the eight inch line will handle all that.

450
451 That is the only current disconnect we have with the applicant. We have stipulated that if the BOCC and even the Orange
452 Alamance Water Sewer says the eight inch line then there is no basis for the condition and we will revise our condition.

453
454 Pete Hallenbeck: What is the diameter of the cul-de-sac? I know there has been some discussion about what diameter should a
455 cul-de-sac be and there was some concerned that every five feet was too narrow and being something bigger was going to
456 get...and I am approaching this from a standpoint of what do you do when you have a 32 foot long fire truck trying to turn around
457 in a 35 foot cul-de-sac.

458
459 Chad Abbott: They were designed to DOT standards.

460
461 Pete Hallenbeck: At this point, I would be willing to leave this as this matter needs to be reviewed by the fire marshal and make
462 sure you can take a fire truck used in the district down into the cul-de-sac and turn about without going back and forth.

463
464 Michael Harvey: My recollection is that it is 45 feet and there is correspondence in Attachment 6 from the fire marshal saying
465 that was acceptable.

466
467 Pete Hallenbeck: On page 46, item a, number 3, existing customers being allowed to tap onto the main at \$650.00 each. What I
468 am not clear on, would that be customers who are currently not connected who wish to tap on?

469

470 Michael Harvey: Those are existing customers that will be tapping back into the new line. There is still a tap fee that will have to
471 be paid.
472
473 Pete Hallenbeck: They could stay on the old line.
474
475 Michael Harvey: I am going to let the applicant speak to it. There is correspondence in Attachment 4 with Orange Alamance on
476 this matter.
477
478 Pete Hallenbeck: It seems wrong to me that a construction project comes through and someone who had water service that
479 worked is suddenly required to pay more and not really getting anything they didn't have before. I was hoping that was for new
480 customers and if they are already connected that those people be allowed to connect in if they are forced off where they are.
481
482 Michael Harvey: It is technically for new customers and for any new tap on to the new line so that would include those other
483 residences.
484
485 Brian Crawford: So they are going to pay that new fee? Is there increase in the cost of the water service as a result?
486
487 Chad Abbott: I think OWASA has indicated some different things to staff and to the applicant. The letter I have seen is the total
488 of \$650.00 is for the additional lots, which is \$150.00 for something and \$400.00 for something else. It was talking about the new
489 lots. One was an impact fee and one was a tap fee. Impact fee is your initial fee to hook up and tap fee covers the cost of
490 actually tying into the line.
491
492 I have talked to OWASA and this is the difference in what they told me and what they told staff. They told me they would not
493 take the three inch line away or require it to be taken out of service; the existing customers could still use that line. Because of
494 the way the economy, charging people money, we will just leave it in place. I ask what if an existing customer wanted to hook up
495 to the line, would the fees be assessed. He said I think there would be a tap fee but I don't want to say what it would be.
496
497 Pete Hallenbeck: It sounds like if you are currently getting water, nothing about this project will require you to have to pay an
498 additional tap fee.
499
500 Chad Abbott: They will not require you to pay an additional fee.
501
502 Larry Wright: This three inch line, what happens if that line ruptures, will they still maintain that line?
503
504 Chad Abbott: OWAS is still the owner of that line so they are required to.
505
506 Pete Hallenbeck: This business of requiring either a 12 inch lines or 8 inch lines misses the point of the debate in my opinion.
507 One thing I find interesting is we are still trying to define a water system by saying what size the pipe is when what we should be
508 doing is defining a water system by the available flow, the hydrant. What is maximum amount of water you can get without
509 putting the line in peril, taking the pressure to less that 20 psi? That magic number is 1,000 gallons per minute. When the
510 system first goes into service you may want that number a little higher, about 1,100 or 1,200.
511
512 It is easier to specify a size, you can build, you met the size and whatever flow you get, you get. Some of these questions can
513 be resolved. One thing that strikes me is that designing a system from that perspective saying that we can design an eight inch
514 line going up School House Road if we tie in then the loop system does better. Instead of trying to have the discussion of the
515 size of the line, look at the entire system with objectives of the available fire flow, being in the 1,100 to 1,200 gallon range and
516 then try to use that to figure out how best to do it with the understanding the loop system is a good thing to have for fire
517 protection and could allow the a smaller pipe to be used, maybe a 10 inch line.
518
519 If you look at the Richmond Hill Subdivision and you go to a hydrant at the end of that and you flow 550 gallons per minute,
520 which would be a typical start up flow, that system pressure goes down to 20 psi. The houses in Richmond Hills have a sprinkler
521 system and that system is normally going to run at 70 psi when there is a fire. You pull up in a fire truck and take that last
522 hydrant and take the pressure down to 20 that sprinkler flow is greatly reduced. The point of the sprinkler flow is called life
523 safety; the other thing is you have sprinkler flows that are designed to put out the fire which is a much higher flow. This loop has
524 the advantage of taking the Richmond Hills Subdivision and giving it a higher flow rate which is a good idea because some of
525 those hydrants are flowing right at 600 which is the minimum. It makes it safer, you have a fire, someone is trapped they can't
526 get to and sprinkler is the only thing protecting them, you are drawing the system pressure down, putting them in peril. I am
527 delighted we are seeing the fire flow begin considered more in this subdivision and I think that can also be a situation where the
528 County could kick in a little bit of money to encourage looping.

529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542

Designed by available fire flow, you may find that some of the pipe diameters being suggested reduced that may hip you fund the looping and the BOCC may want to consider contributing some money to make the entire system better.

Lisa Stuckey: On page 84, fourth paragraph, I think there might be a typo.

Michael Harvey: Staff is clear on the additional information and additional conditions responses you are asking for.

AGENDA ITEM 11: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Larry Wright made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Buddy Hartley.

VOTE: Unanimous

Brian Crawford, Chair