

## Caswell County Planning Board Meeting

July 24, 2018

Members Present: Russell Johnston, Chairman, Michael Poteat, Vice-Chairman, Jason Daniel, Don Swann, Keith Blalock, Matthew Hoagland, Planner, Bryan Miller, County Manager, and Ashley Kirby, Administrative Assistant recorded the minutes.

Members Absent: Ray Shaffner, Steve Harris, Ron Richmond, and William Carter.

### Call to Order

Mr. Johnston called the July 24, 2018 planning board meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Miller introduced the new planner Matthew Hoagland for The Caswell County Planning Department. The board welcomed Mr. Hoagland.

### Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Poteat made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Swann. The motion carried unanimously.

### Public Comments

There were no public comments.

### New Business

#### *Proposed Watershed Stream Buffer Area Variance*

Mr. Hoagland stated that he had recently visited the new proposed subdivision and noted that instead of a proposed 20 parcel subdivision, the Kirby's are proposing a 10 parcel plan. He added that this seems to be much more conducive to development in the area. He also stated that North Carolina's buffer area requirements are for a 30-foot boundary from the waterfront and that this request would not encroach upon that. Thus, this would be a variance from the county's stream buffer requirements, not a minor variance into the state's mandated area. He also stated that Mr. Kirby has already applied for a Watershed Protection Permit. Finally, he advised the board that since this request dealt with a watershed issue, they would need to preside over this variance request as The Watershed Review Board as stipulated in Article 10 of the UDO.

Mr. Johnston asked if there were any objections and without any he advised the board that they are now presiding as the Watershed Review Board. He opened the floor to Mr. and Mrs. Kirby.

Mr. Kirby stated that previous owners suggested a 20 lot parcel, but after looking at the layout the subdivision he felt that it would be over-crowded and take away from other property owners' enjoyment of the lake. Kirby stated that he is requesting from the board for a variance for a 50ft setback for three of the lots and for the six-month variance to be extended for three years, this will allow time to sell the lots and for future owners to build homes upon them.

Mr. Johnston stated that the board approved the initial preliminary map at the last board meeting which consisted of eight lots, and now asked if they needed approval for lots 8-10. And far as setbacks, he asked Mr. Kirby what exactly was he requesting.

Mr. Kirby stated that with the previous 8 lots had some issues with septic systems and had to reshape lots due to the terrain and due to the sight soil and water evaluations. Also on lot 2 there will be a place for a community garden and lot 9-10 have been separated because of the pier access.

Mr. Johnston questioned if he was requesting a 50ft setback from the water. Mr. Kirby replied yes, from the edge of the water to the building site for lots 7, 9, and 10.

Mr. Hoagland stated that the UDO stipulates 30 feet of undisturbed shoreline and then a 50 feet vegetation setback. This would be a variance to those measurements.

Mr. Kirby stated lots 9 and 10 would have a common drive way and there could be a small property line change before the final plat is approved.

Mr. Johnston questioned if Mr. Kirby was requesting a three-year extension. Mr. Kirby replied yes.

Mr. Hoagland also noted that the UDO requires paved road access to new subdivisions of at least 9 plots. However, since there are two lots already served by a paved road then we may be able to overlook that requirement. He asked if the Kirby's had any questions about the access roads they'd like to present to the board. Mrs. Kirby replied no, its states in the UDO if you go over 9 lots then you have to pave the roads, but lots 1 and 2 will be using Flintridge Road for access. Mr. Hoagland agreed with that interpretation.

Mr. Johnston questioned if Flintridge Road is a state maintained road. Mr. Kirby replied yes.

Mr. Hoagland stated that he did not think it would be an issue since two of the lots are going to use a state maintained road for access.

Mr. Johnston questioned if they needed extra time to propone road construction standard. Mr. Kirby replied no.

Mr. Johnston questioned about the 3 year variance. Mr. Kirby replied yes, he was asking for a three-year variance setback for lots 7, 9, and 10.

Mr. Blalock recommended every one to visit the lake and the building site. That in the past the board has extended variances, and that he did not have an issue with extending this one.

Mr. Daniel wondered about the amount these lots might sell for. Mr. Kirby replied possibly \$125,000-\$175,000. Mr. Daniel questioned do they have a standard setup for space. Mrs. Kirby replied yes, there will be a road maintenance agreement, a home owners' association, and other rules and stipulations.

Mr. Blalock motioned to approve a revision to the initial preliminary plat for lots 1-10 with an amendment for lots 7, 9, 10 for 50ft setbacks, an extension for 3 years, seconded by Mr. Daniel. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Johnston closed their session as The Watershed Review Board.

#### Adjournment

At 1:26 p.m. Mr. Swann motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Daniel. The motion carried unanimously.