



Chatham County, NC

Meeting Minutes

Board of Commissioners

Monday, October 21, 2024

2:00 PM

Historic Courthouse Courtroom

Work Session - 2:00 PM - Historic Courthouse Courtroom

Present: 4 - Chair Mike Dasher, Commissioner David Delaney, Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores and Commissioner Katie Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Karen Howard

ADJUSTMENTS AND APPROVAL OF WORK SESSION AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Gomez Flores, seconded by Commissioner Kenlan, that the work session agenda be approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

The following individuals spoke:

James Coplan

My name is James Coplan, and I live in Chatham County. I oppose this application for several reasons. Here, I will limit myself to the threat posed by this application to the rural nature of Chatham County. Summit is Out of Scale: Equally important as barns or fields, our historic rural churches - many of which date from the 1800s - form an integral component of what makes Chatham. With a sanctuary of 88,400 square feet - over one and a half times larger than a football field - and a projected congregation of 2,400, Summit would simply be out of scale with the surrounding community. With an annual budget in excess of \$50 million and a goal of "planting 1000 churches," Summit functions as much like a corporate conglomerate as a house of worship. If the applicant were a secular entity of similar scale - for example, a sports franchise seeking to build a 1,200-seat stadium - would we deem it a good fit for this location? Summit would not primarily serve Chatham residents. According to the applicant's letter of September 19, 2014 (p3, last paragraph), the initial cohort of 800 parishioners - "approximately 15%" of whom are residents of Chatham County - would be drawn from Summit's to-be-decommissioned "transient" campus in Chapel Hill. Where will the additional 1,600 parishioners come from, and how will this affect the mix of Chatham-to out-of-county parishioners? This depends in part on where Summit puts its recruiting efforts. Given the population size imbalance between Chatham and Orange County, the proportion of the congregation comprised of Chatham residents would most likely remain the same or shrink further over time. Summit currently maintains another "transient" campus in West Cary. The proposed Chatham site ("+" on map) is ideally situated to absorb those parishioners - which would further dilute the percent of

Chatham residents at the Chatham campus. Finally (and, logically, given Summit's proclaimed expansionist aims) Summit could launch an aggressive recruitment campaign within Chatham County, at the risk of depleting existing rural churches of parishioners. In my opinion, the most likely outcome is that Chatham County would experience the worst of both worlds: The composition of Summit remains dominated by out-of-county residents, and our existing rural churches suffer a significant decline in membership, but numerically too small to appreciably move the needle at Summit in terms of congregational composition. Where do the residents of Chatham County stand on this proposal? Prior to the Planning Board hearing 10/1/24 I reviewed all of the posts to the "Public Comments" section of the Chatham County web site. Of the 31 households (25%) in favor, 28 identified themselves as members (27) or parents of a member (1); Of the 91 households (75%) opposed, none were Summit members. In sum, there has been no groundswell of public support from Chatham residents for this application, other than by parishioners of Summit. Selected comments: In Favor: We have been Summit church members since 2015. We pray this is a go! We would be thrilled to attend a campus that was closer to our home, rather than traveling over 20 minutes to the nearest location. Opposed: We are also people of faith and regularly attend worship [but] ministries this size are a form of "Big Business." It will be detrimental to our quality of life, deprive the county of much needed taxes, and serve thousands of people who don't even live here. Traffic would be equivalent to having a sports facility in the middle of a residential area. Approval of this request will create a predictable traffic hazard that will lead to serious injuries or even deaths. A few years ago, I had a medical emergency that required an ambulance, and every minute counted. The EMTs were able to get me to the hospital in time, and if they had not, I might not be here today. The residents of Briar Chapel and Farrington Village need to pass through this area to access grocery stores, medical services, shopping, and downtown Chapel Hill. There is no alternative route. A large facility such as this could back up traffic for miles and it won't just be on Sunday. As a retired Realtor, I can assure you that isolating these two communities will cause a drop in property values. If this becomes a reality, I personally will sell & move. Summary: Chatham County will best be served by retaining the Conditional District-Compact Community designation, and seeking a project that will fill the need for multi-use, family- and small business-friendly enterprise in this section of county. Thank you for your time and attention.

Bonnie McCarthy

Good afternoon, my name is Bonnie McCarthy and I live at 73 Tyner Loop Circle in Briar Chapel. I am here to oppose the mega church proposed building on 15-501. As a retired Vice President in the government bond department at Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, I would like to direct my comments to the economic impact of the proposal. To begin, consider several existing commercial properties in this area that contribute vital revenue to our community. As illustrated on the handout, nearby commercial establishments collectively generate a substantial annual tax revenue of almost \$500,000.00 from approximately fifty acres of land. This is the area equal in size to the proposed church grounds. This potential revenue is critical for current and future services that our community relies upon and over a ten year period could represent up to five million dollars of lost revenue if the church is built. Furthermore, Chatham County's revenue is overly dependent upon the taxing of residential properties. According to Phillip Thompson from the Economic Development Corporation, 90% of Chatham County's tax revenue comes from residential property and the remaining 10% from commercial. As we strive to cultivate a balanced economic ecosystem, mixed-use communities or additional commercial properties would be far more beneficial. Likewise, job creation stemming from commercial development far outstrips any minimal economic impact from the potential church

project. Moreover, our community has expressed the need for housing including affordable housing. Setting aside commercial development, the proposed site also offers an opportunity to address this need. Building new homes or mixed-use spaces encourage not only family growth but also economic stability. By using this property to enhance housing options, we can add further to our tax base while meeting the demands of current and future residents. In conclusion, while the proposal for a mega church at this location may come from a positive place, it belongs somewhere else. Its economic impact on Chatham County will be detrimental. Beside losing tax revenue and incurring increased public safety costs of fire, police and ambulance services, we also overlook an opportunity to address pressing housing needs. I urge you to consider the broader implications of this proposal and advocate for sustainable development that truly benefits our community. Thank you for your attention.

Barbara Falotico

Good afternoon. My name is Barbara Falotico. I have been a ten year resident in Chatham County, 45 Post Oak road. I'm here to voice my opposition to the rezoning request for Summit Church. I'm addressing concerns about the proposed 88,000 Square Foot Church directly off the corridor of 15501 specifically around crash frequency. Most of my remarks will be based upon data from the North Carolina Department of Transportation statistics, a map of crash frequency by intersection crash incidents were collected from 2019 to 2023. Allow me to share some crash numbers near the proposed summit campus that will be located between Briar Chapel, Parkway, Vickers Road, and Lister Road. The crash frequency at Briar Chapel Parkway, Vickers Road was 29 total crashes. The crash frequency for Lister Road was 37 total crashes. These are already high risk intersections on 15,501 Mann's Chapel road, and 15501 had the 3rd highest crash frequency in Chatham County, with 45 total crashes. It is presently the 3rd worst intersection in Chatham county south of the proposed Summit campus. We have Village Way in Fearington Village with 31 crashes, and Mount Gilead Road had 43 crashes. These statistics are actually deflated because of the 2020 pandemic shutdown, yet they are at least double other intersection. Crash rates on the 15501 from the Chatham County line to highway 64. What will the dangers be if the summit rezoning application is approved? Summit Church anticipates 1,200 members per Sunday service. There will be at least 2 services over 900 cars at peak time, and that's on Sundays. What other major events will summit sponsor that will draw similar or higher car volumes. We don't know what will the crash incidents become when massive car volumes have to navigate the U-turns necessary to enter or exit the 2 driveways directly off of 15,501. If the summit proposal is approved, a mammoth structure generating hundreds of car trips, will be built in the most dangerous section of our 15,501 corridor. This is a critical north-south corridor that we rely upon for our safety. I urge that you deny the rezoning request by Summit Church.

Nick Robinson

Good afternoon, Commissioners, staff and county attorney. My name is Nick Robinson Practice law here in Pittsboro, 128, Hillsboro Street, Pittsboro, 27312. I just wanted to make a couple of quick remarks regarding the UDO under review. As I mentioned at your last meeting. We think there are a few clarifications that need to be made, and I understand, from looking at the convey site, where all of the public comments are aggregated, that there's over 300 different comments regarding the UDO. And so I just wanted to take a quick second here to highlight the 3 things that we're concerned about and ask that you give them due consideration today in your conversation, and in ultimately in your resolution of the UDO. The 1st one is very important, which is to the extent. There's going to be a delayed, effective date of the UDO. We do think it is best, and applicants will need an affirmative resolution from the Board making it clear

that if there are to be any legislative rezoning applications between now or the time of adoption of UDO, and when the delayed effective date kicks in that those applications would be processed in accordance with the existing system in due course, in accordance with the current practice. And the reason why that's imperative is that. And it's imperative that you make a definitive statement about it is that it might not be obvious to you all, but it costs several hundreds of thousands of dollars for an applicant to put together a full legislative rezoning package sometimes, particularly when it includes an environmental impact assessment and a traffic impact assessment. And so before they spend that kind of money on an application, they need to know that it's going to be processed through the system. So we would request that you, as you did in the Moncure situation, you make an affirmative, adopt a resolution that will make that clear to people. Before they come in the other 2 items. One of them is just. We think that the current definition in the UDO of net land area will not work for compact residential zones, because it requires you to deduct before you calculate density. It requires you to deduct significant percentages from the gross acreage of your tract. You have to deduct the open space requirement, then you have to deduct riparian buffers, and then you have to deduct other perimeter buffers. By the time you knock that number down and calculate density. Most likely you're going to wind up on most sites with a density that is not conducive to units, 2 units per acre, but more like one unit per acre. So you're not going to be getting what you want. The current compact communities ordinance allows 2 units per gross acre on the tract. And that's what we suggest. You just carve that out of your net land area definition just for compact residential zones. And then the last one would be how to calculate the open space density. How much extra density do you get when you give more density than the minimum? And it's 1 unit, I think, per extra acre right now, and we would suggest that if you want to really incentivize that it would be more like 3 units for single family, and 6 units for multifamily. Thanks.

BOARD PRIORITIES

24-5567

Vote to adopt the 2024 Chatham County Farmland Protection Plan and the 2025-2028 Farmland Protection Blueprint; vote to approve the FY 2025 CAPD Trust Fund schedule and budget

Attachments: [Farmland Preservation Program Update Fall 24](#)
 [2025-2028 Farmland Protection Blueprint current](#)
 [Farmland Protection Plan 2024 Final](#)

Farmland Preservation Coordinator Andrew Waters presented the Chatham Farmland Preservation Program Update Fall 2024 to the Board of Commissioners.

Waters gave a brief history of the Chatham County Farmland Protection Plan which included:

- *First update since 2009.*
- *Prepared by the Lois Britt Agribusiness Center of the University of Mount Olive*
- *18 "Action Steps" with Implementation Recommendations*
- *Develop Sustained and Committed Funding for Farmland Preservation*
- *Build Support for Farmland Preservation and Agribusiness Development*
- *Support Resiliency Initiatives*
- *Support Equity & Inclusion Initiatives*
- *Support Regional Agricultural Leadership*
- *Staff is requesting motion to adopt the 2024 Chatham County Farmland Protection Plan.*

Waters shared the Chatham County Cost of Community Services Study Findings. For each \$1 of revenue received from each land use: Residential land costs \$1.18 in public services, commercial and industrial lands cost \$0.29 in public services, and Agricultural land and forestland costs \$0.35 in public services.

Waters stated that the survey included ninety-seven Agricultural Producers, ten Agribusiness, and two-hundred and eighteen non-farm residents. Survey feedback supported by one-on-one interviews. 65% of farm producers need a farm transition plan; 78% expressed interest in programming on farm transition. 100% of non-farm residents feel Chatham County should play an active role in preserving farms and forests. Interviews reveal non-farm residents are concerned about losing the rural culture and environment of Chatham County.

Waters shared the Farmland Preservation Blueprint (2025-2028) which included:

- *Short-term program priorities selected from Farmland Protection Plan*
- *Develop sustained and committed funding*
- *Coordinate farmland preservation outreach & education*
- *Strengthen Farmland Preservation Policy*
- *Strategic Farmland Preservation Mapping*
- *Emphasize equity & inclusion initiatives*

Waters shared the Chatham Agricultural Preservation & Development Trust Fund FY 2025 Grant Application Schedule:

Water shared a list of the Agricultural Advisory Board and a list of upcoming events.

The Board of Commissioners thanked Waters for the update on the program.

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that 2024 Chatham County Farmland Protection Plan was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

Vote to adopt the 2025-2028 Farmland Protection Blueprint

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the 2025-2028 Farmland Protection Blueprint was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

Vote to approve the FY 2025 CAPD Trust Fund schedule and budget

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the FY 2025 CAPD Trust Fund schedule and budget was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5589](#)

Receive a presentation from NC Cooperative Extension Family & Consumer Sciences

Attachments: [NCCE Family & Consumer Sciences Presentation](#)

Family & Consumer Sciences Representative Tara Gregory updated the Board of Commissioners on the program including local foods, nutrition and health, food preparation, and preservation and safety.

Gregory highlighted opportunities and programming including the herb symposium, the Community Food Council, food preparation, preservation and safety home food preservation, and kitchen creators summer camp.

The Board of Commissioners thanked Gregory for the update.

This Agenda Item was received and filed.

[24-5593](#)

Review and discuss public input and Planning Board recommendations on the Unified Development Ordinance and facilitate discussion to offer guidance for the final draft

Attachments: [UDO Presentation 10-21-2024](#)
[UDO Public Comments](#)

Assistant Planning Director Chance Mullis and consultants had a lengthy review and question and answer session with the Board of Commissioners. The conversation included Recode Chatham Konveio comment overview, the Planning Board UDO recommendation, and discussion and direction.

Mullis and the consultants will bring back more information to the next meeting.

This Agenda Item was received and filed.

End of Work Session

RECESS

The Board of Commissioners recessed until 6:00pm.

Regular Session - 6:00 PM - Historic Courthouse Courtroom

Present: 4 - Chair Mike Dasher, Commissioner David Delaney, Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores and Commissioner Katie Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Karen Howard

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dasher called the meeting to order at 6:02pm.

INVOCATION and PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Dasher began the meeting with a moment of silence, then lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADJUSTMENTS AND APPROVAL OF REGULAR SESSION AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the work session agenda was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the consent agenda was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5568](#)

Vote to approve the February 7, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes

Attachments: [2-7-2022 Minutes Draft as of 9-26-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the February 7, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5569](#)

Vote to approve the February 21, 2022 Minutes

Attachments: [2-21-2022 Minutes Draft as of 9-27-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Gomez Flores, that the February 21, 2022 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5579](#)

Vote to approve the March 21, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes

Attachments: [3-21-2022 Minutes Draft as of 10-3-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Gomez Flores, that the March 21, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5590](#)

Vote to approve the April 4, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes

Attachments: [4-4-2022 Minutes Draft as of 10-8-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the April 4, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5591](#)

Vote to approve the April 18, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes

Attachments: [4-18-2024 Minutes Draft as of 10-8-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the April 18, 2022 Work and Regular Session Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5381](#)

Vote to approve the January 10, 2023 - January 12, 2023 Retreat Minutes

Attachments: [1-10-2023 to 1-12-2023 Minutes Draft - Retreat](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the January 10, 2023 - January 12, 2023 Retreat Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5565](#)

Vote to appoint Kathryn Beckerdite and Michelle Sroka to the Agricultural Advisory Board for three-year terms expiring on June 30, 2027

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to appoint Kathryn Beckerdite and

Michelle Sroka to the Agricultural Advisory Board for three-year terms expiring on June 30, 2027. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5585](#)

Vote to adopt the Northeast Park Dam Repair Project Ordinance

Attachments: [Project Ordinance Northeast District Park Dam](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the Northeast Park Dam Repair Project Ordinance was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5582](#)

Vote to approve Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Amendments

Attachments: [Budget Amendment 2024-2025 Oct 21](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to approve the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Amendments as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5575](#)

Vote to approve Tax Releases and Refunds

Attachments: [September 2024 Release and Refund Report](#)
[September 2024 NCVTS Pending Refund Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to approve the Tax Releases and Refunds as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5581](#)

Vote to accept \$89,240 in HRSA grant funds through Piedmont Health Services to establish a doula collaborative

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to accept \$89,240 in HRSA grant funds through Piedmont Health Services to establish a doula collaborative. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5539](#)

Vote to approve the Chatham County Secondary Employment Policy

Attachments: [Secondary Employment Policy DRAFT](#)
[Approval for Secondary Employment](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to approve the Chatham County Secondary Employment Policy as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5578](#)

Vote to approve the contract with Mark III for benefits brokerage services for three years at \$35,000 per year

Attachments: [Mark III Brokerage contract 10-21-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the contract with Mark III for benefits brokerage services for three years at \$35,000 per year was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5588](#)

Vote to authorize the County Manager to negotiate and approve the professional services agreement with Freese and Nichols for the Northeast District Park Dam

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to authorize the County Manager to negotiate and approve the professional services agreement with Freese and Nichols for the Northeast District Park Dam. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5576](#)

Vote to approve the Subscription Service Agreement for Open Beds through Bamboo Health for the Department of Social Services

Attachments: [Bamboo Health Service Agreement 10-21-2024](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Gomez Flores, that the Subscription Service Agreement for Open Beds through

Bamboo Health for the Department of Social Services be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5550](#)

Vote to approve the naming of two (2) private roads listed as Ambika Landing and Shellbark Lane in Chatham County

Attachments: [Ambika Landing Petition](#)
[Ambika Landing map](#)
[Ambika Landing area map](#)
[Shellbark Lane Petition](#)
[Shellbark Lane map](#)
[Shellbark Lane area map](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that this the naming of two (2) private roads listed as Ambika Landing and Shellbark Lane in Chatham County was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5571](#)

Vote to approve a request by K. Luke Turner, P.E. on behalf of David Weekley Homes for subdivision **First Plat** review of **Hamlet's Forest Subdivision**, consisting of 47 lots on 118.76 acres, located off Hamlets Chapel Road (SR-1525), parcels 1806, 2035, & 95989

Attachments: [More information from the Planning department website](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to approve a request by K. Luke Turner, P.E. on behalf of David Weekley Homes for subdivision First Plat review of Hamlet's Forest Subdivision, consisting of 47 lots on 118.76 acres, located off Hamlets Chapel Road (SR-1525), parcels 1806, 2035, & 95989. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

[24-5572](#)

Vote to approve a request by Mark Ashness, P.E. on behalf of SRE NC Landco, LLC for subdivision **Preliminary Plat** review and approval of **Parks at Meadowview Phases 2-4**, consisting of 453 lots on 261.23 acres, located off Parks Meadow Drive (SR-1680), parcels 61935, 10893, 89726

Attachments: [More information from the Planning department website](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, to approve a request by Mark Ashness, P.E. on behalf of SRE NC Landco, LLC for subdivision Preliminary Plat review and approval of Parks at Meadowview Phases 2-4, consisting of 453 lots on 261.23 acres, located off Parks Meadow Drive (SR-1680), parcels 61935, 10893, 89726. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

End of Consent Agenda

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

[24-5580](#)

Vote to adopt a resolution honoring Carolina Tiger Rescue's 50th Anniversary

Attachments: [Resolution for the Carolina Tiger 50th Anniversary 10-21-2024](#)

Chair Dasher read aloud a resolution honoring Carolina Tiger Rescue's 50th Anniversary.

A motion was made by Chair Mike Dasher, seconded by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, that this 24-50 Resolution honoring Carolina Tiger Rescue's 50th Anniversary was adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Stephanie Powell

My name is Stephanie Powell. I live in Chatham County. I am opposed to the Summit Church request for rezoning. I urge you to be critical of the traffic information provided by Summit. Three examples: First, In Summit's Clarifications Letter dated September 19, 2024, Summit attempts to compare the daily weekday and then weekly trips generated by Summit with certain other developments. This is a false analogy and simply an attempt to mask the critical issue - which is that Summit's approximate 3,000 trips every Sunday tips the scales and will occur not throughout Sunday at an even pace but will occur in surges, unlike the other cited developments. The surges will result in enormous problems all along the 15-501 corridor, many of which are or will be addressed by other speakers. Second, Summit's Traffic Impact Analysis reflects that the level of service in intersections and at turnarounds are often C and D with several others at E and F. Level A is the best scenario and level F represents a breakdown. The intersection of Poplar Street and Hidden Oaks is an F, making it extremely difficult to move out of the development. Some turnarounds are level E. This is not a pretty picture. Moreover, the anticipated future additional traffic from Chapel Hill and any increased traffic from Summit's property (as I will later discuss) will push the calculated areas into greater levels of delay, adding to the already lengthy and dangerous wait times. Third, there are too many unknown subjective variables to be assured the trips calculated in the TIA will remain the same after rezoning. The

Summit project is unlike most uses - for example, trips for a use such as an apartment building are calculated based on specific independent variables such as the number of units and number of bedrooms in each unit. These variables are specific and the trips will not change in the future because of the nature of the building. Conversely, it is impossible to predict at this time what can and will occur on a fifty acre tract with an 88,400 square building, 1200 square foot auditorium and a future building - whether by new activities, increase in frequency of activities or expansion of use on any day or night of the week, including Sundays. The data at this time simply does not and cannot take these variables into account. Think in terms of: Additional services on weekdays, Sunday and evenings. Services on Christmas, Easter and other like observances. Weddings, funerals, baptisms. Festivals and indoor and outdoor concerts, plays, films. Regional events and retreats. Additional classes and Bible studies. And on and on. Remember - after the rezoning the County will have no control over the property. And, of course, none of this is or can be reflected in the TIA. Unfortunately, the County does not have a traffic specialist to dig deeply into the traffic information submitted by an applicant and perform a critical review on behalf of the County and its residents. Nor does the NCDOT take specific characteristics of the community into account. This review falls to members of the public and to you as County Commissioners. We appreciate the work we know it will take for you to analyze the information provided by Summit. Thank you for your time.

Howard Fifer

My name is Howard Pfeiffer. I'm a resident of Chatham County. I'm here to speak in opposition to the rezoning application by the Summit Church, Chatham campus developers, which I understand will be before you in December. I take this opportunity to speak about wastewater issues which this project, situated in the Lake Jordan protected watershed area would create. It is important for you to consider that. This problem, which is because applicants are going to be doing this with them with what they asked for in the rezoning, in other words, as set forth in their clarification of September 17th, they admit that there is no working plan to treat wastewater created by their project. They flat out, say that. admitting they present no working plan, or in their words, the quote, treatment and disposal system has not been finalized. Lake Jordan, the primary source of drinking water for your constituents, is left unprotected and unaddressed by this application. To use this parcel of land as a Mega development. They do not provide meaningful information concerning the amount of sewage they anticipate. Their project will produce, and indeed they cannot, because they do not identify the use or size of the proposed future building, also requested as part of this proposal to rezone. In addition to their acknowledged failure to provide an actual plan to meet present or future needs. Consider what they suggest as the amount of wastewater sewage they currently do anticipate. They use the phrase, 3,000 gallons of estimated flow per day, but that number does not reflect peak actually usage on Sundays. Rather it is a number that considers non-usage on other days, and then divides weekly usage by 7. They have submitted a request to rezone to develop a project within the lake. Jordan protected watershed area without a plan to prevent wastewater from adversely impacting the county water supply. This is a request the planning board unanimously voted to reject any further requests by the applicant to change or modify the request. Before the December meeting with the Commissioners. Is procedurally impermissible. It was not something that was before the board and not subject to public comment. It would make a mockery of regular rules of procedure to sidestep and avoid oversight and review this developer's request. Request. Rezoning should be held to the highest standard to protect the water supply relied on by an enormous portion of this county's population.

Whitney Schmidt

Thank you for supporting the Health & Equity Assessment completed last November as part of the UDO process. As you know, this assessment found several areas of the county to be at risk of nutritional deficits because of lack of access to fresh, healthy foods, primarily in the southwest part of the county. As the Board considers the application for rezoning from the Dollar General Store just north of Highway 87 and Castle Rock Farm Road, the neighbors in the Hadley community would like for you to consider that this corporate entity has a pattern of development nationwide, targeting rural areas with citizens or travelers that have low aggregate household income, the same rough parameter that is indicative of nutritional insecurity. Even as their revenue continues to shrink, this corporate giant is pushing their expansion goal of a store ever 5-7 miles across our countryside. I urge you to reflect on Dollar General's record as a whole, and specifically regarding the corporation's claims on food security versus the reality of the harm these stores cause to the communities in which they proliferate. While Dollar General claims to help bridge access gaps in areas with lack of food security, this claim requires more examination. Dollar General spokeswoman, Crystal Ghassemi, told the Wall Street Journal that the retailer "isn't and never intended to be a grocery store." Even so, they're monopolizing the grocery market in some communities all the same. In stores that sell produce, the selection is limited, often at the end of its shelf life, and sourced from a warehouse hundreds of miles away – when we have over 1100 local farms in this county that grow fresh produce year round. The largest portion of sales at Dollar General stores are shelf stable snacks, candy, and sodas. I have included a working paper entitled "The Impact of Dollar Store Expansion on Local Market Structure and Food Access." I'll allow the Board to digest this report and jump to the conclusion: Dollar Stores decrease access to healthy foods, increase reliance on processed, shelf stable foods, and leave our communities worse than they found them. We invite the Board to work with us to find other solutions. I have included strategies that other communities have used, including communities in North Carolina, where our legislature is particularly restrictive as to what we can and cannot do to execute our own vision. Let's find a way to encourage neighborhood stores that source produce locally and in abundance, community gathering spaces that increase access to quality goods for rural areas and build strong intra-village ties that underpin the ethos of our county and the vision the Board had for our community as the UDO evolved.

Valerie Proffitt

Yes, to everything you just said I, this will be quick. I'd used to ride bicycle around the county before I got so old, and it occurred to me when I heard about the Dollar general moving in that I had seen a lot of dollar generals, so I wanted to see if we were really having if people were losing access to a resource that may be a value to them, or if we really have enough dollar generals. I live on Whitesmith Road, about 3 and a half miles from Silk Hope. From my house, 10.9 miles 15 minutes, to Eli Whitney Dollar General, Pittsboro, and 11.9 miles 14 minutes Siler City. I think we've got pretty good access to Dollar General and I think my husband and I moved here 35 years ago from Granville County because Raleigh was coming up Route 50 and taking up our farm. We love being someplace where there's open land and farms, and the chickens and the goats and the cows outnumber the people, and people still make the living off of the land. It's going to be. I think something that other people will value coming to visit. Even if they don't live here. It's a resource that's disappearing, and once it's gone, it's gone. You know, cement has a way of hanging around, so I don't think we need another dollar general. I think we've got them. Thank you.

Melissa Frey

Hello Commissioners. Thank you for your time tonight and for the many hours working

on all the issues that face our beloved Chatham County. I'm here with several neighbors this evening regarding the Dollar General rezoning proposal at Hwy 87 and Castle Rock Farm Rd in Hadley Township that you are likely at least informally aware of at this point. My goal is to start the commenting by simply being sure we are all clear what land is in question. Many people, including the recent on-site DOT surveyor, are looking at the wrong site. Ronald Vaughn owns the parcel being considered for the Dollar General (#0068537) currently zoned R-1, residential. This is a fully wooded lot adjacent to the Piedmont Farm Refuge to the north and adjacent to another Vaughn parcel to the south. This lot to the south is where the old country store and detail shop currently is and is the one being mistaken for the proposed Dollar General site. This old store lot (parcel #0010810) has contaminated soil from when it was a gas station and is currently zoned light industrial. All other property at the intersection and surrounding area is zoned R-1, residential. Chatham Park Gateway LLC owns 17 acre parcel behind proposed DG site with an easement to highway 87 (parcel #0067585) and an adjacent 8 acres to the north (parcel #0010806). On the southwest corner of the intersection is a forty acre parcel (#0066998) owned by Chatham Group Property, LLC. On the Future Land Use and Conservation Plan map of the county, this intersection is designated as a "crossroads community," as is 87 and Silk Hope Gum Springs Road with its small engine repair shop and Jones Ferry and Crawford Dairy with its little country convenience store. Although we cannot find a dimensional definition of crossroads community or a number of commercial establishments allowed, clearly none of these 3 way intersections and their surrounding areas would be served well or have their rural/agricultural nature preserved with the addition of any kind of chain or franchise store. In fact to the extent that any county document does currently define "crossroads community", the UDO states that they are: Smaller than villages, these communities are within rural areas and typically have a minimal amount of retail and institutional uses. Mix of uses include single-family residential, some agriculture support services, limited supporting retail, and institutional uses. A Dollar General or any store of its kind is not "minimal or limited amount of retail" nor is it supportive of agricultural activities. We are also concerned about the precedent setting nature of rezoning in this area with corporate land owners already near this intersection seemingly intent on capitalizing on zoning changes. Do they know something the residents of the area don't? Do they know how large a "crossroads community" is? Given these points, and the nature of this ambiguous time between being guided by the Land Use Plan of 2017 and full implementation of the UDO that is still in need of key definitions, that the most appropriate response to the Dollar General rezoning proposal is NO. We are, however, interested in discussions with county officials and land owner Ronald Vaughn about what could be done to clean up and repurpose the original commercial parcel at that intersection that is currently zoned light industrial for a use that is of the size and nature and appearance to actually serve our rural community. A small, locally-owned general store/farm stand or firehouse substation (which would make the whole area safer and dramatically reduce homeowner's insurance premiums) are just a couple of ideas. Thank you for your consideration.

William Cummings

Good evening, folks. Nice to be here in this historic room, and I want to thank the Commissioners for their public service. I'm going to speak to a matter that's dear to my heart, and some of my neighbors have already shared perspectives I share. But I need to preface my remarks briefly with another issue. That's a little bit more immediate, a little more urgent. I've long been an election official and a worker in the Board of Elections. In the last four days preceding today I worked well, setting up and then running four days at the Ag center early voting site, and I had the unfortunate occurrence of working. As you know, we've had a record turnout and we all had to really pitch in and do our jobs for six hours without a break standing up, and hundreds and

hundreds of our neighbors and citizens here came in to vote. I didn't have a break that whole six hours, and as soon as my shift changed I went up to use the bathroom. I said I wanted to speak about a matter of my heart about the dollar store. But this was a matter of close to my bladder and I got apprehended in the lobby by the manager of the Ag Center who said I couldn't use the bathroom. I had my official thing, I guess. Technically I was an employee of the county in the BOE that day, identifying me as a election official. And I said, What are you talking about? I said, I've been standing up all day. I've got to pee. I'm going in there, and she said, you can't go in there. You all can't use the bathroom. I was under the impression this was a public building. We paid for it, we built it. What do you tell me? I can't go to the bathroom, she said. You can't use it. We put porta potties out for you way on the other side of the parking lot. You know, more than one hundred yards away from the entrance to the polling place, and I said, Well, I'm sorry I said. I'm going to go to the bathroom. You can call the sheriff if you want, and I'm going to do it anyway, because this is our building. And other people told me that throughout the days I worked that. Where's the bathroom? They had blocked access. I came and had a good meeting, and I commend the deputy or the assistant county manager for listening to me. Pandora was good, but I worked yesterday and the day before, and I saw no change in the policy, so I urge the Commissioners to investigate this, to talk to the deputy or assistant county manager and get to that. And I believe I'm entitled to apology for that, as our other election workers. We know in the climate of today. Election workers are under assault all over the country and threatened right this could be in the county attorney may wish to comment. This could be suppression of votes and election interference as far as I'm concerned. If you can't use the bathroom. Okay, but let's get to that, and I hope you'll fix that problem soon. Now. second, my neighbors tell you this is a Trojan horse on 87. Hadley is where I live fifty-two years I lived in Chatham and I went back and reviewed our bicentennial history of the county for maybe the 5th time in my time. Here. This is a stake in the heart of Hadley. It's a Trojan horse. The report was seriously flawed. I read it this afternoon. I was there. I'm the only one identified as a member of the public, and I'll stop there and let my colleagues continue. But please take another look at this. We don't need to rush into this, a UDO is not ready. We need a moratorium on this type of development. Thanks and I hope you'll do something about the election, because it's affecting. We'll find out.

James Coplan

My name is James Coplan, and I reside in Chatham County. I oppose this application for several reasons. Here I will restrict my comments to traffic analysis. The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted by the applicant is grossly incorrect, and at odds with their supplemental clarification letter of 9/9/24. It also fails to address potential and predictable future growth. The "supplemental clarification letter" (p. 3, last paragraph) states that "approximately 15%" of parishioners will be from Chatham County. The remaining 85% will be from Orange, where the to-be-decommissioned "transient" campus is located, or other counties to the north of Chatham. Arriving parishioners from Orange County (85% of the total) are shown in red. Some will come straight down 15-501; others may opt to turn right at Manns Chapel Road and cut through the center of Briar Chapel. All must then make a U-turn or left turn onto 15-501 North. This will result in backup in both directions on 15-501 at Briar Chapel Parkway / Vickers Road, including, most crucially, the turning bin on 501 South, with overflow into the high-speed lane. The remaining 15% of parishioners (shown in blue) will be from Chatham County: arriving either directly up 15-501, or by turning right onto 15-501 from Jack Bennet Road. Contrary to the applicant's "clarification letter" of 9/19/2024, the Traffic Impact Analysis submitted by the applicant assumes that 40% of the "ingress traffic" will have to make a U-turn from South- to Northbound at Briar Chapel Parkway / Vickers Road (marked "A" in this screen shot of the TIA), 15% will be arriving via a

right turn onto 15-501 North from Jack Bennet Road ("B"), 35% ("C") will be approaching the campus from 15-501 Northbound below Jack Bennet Road, and 10% will be approaching via Briar Chapel Parkway ("D"). However, these estimates are all incorrect. The applicant's "Supplemental clarification letter" of 9/19/24 states (p3, last paragraph) that "approximately 15%" of the attendees of the "transient" campus in Chapel Hill are residents of Chatham County. In other words, "B + C" should be 15%, not 50%. The TIA more than triples the proportion of Chatham residents. Likewise, the TIA understates the arrivals ("ingress") from Orange and other counties to the north of Chatham. As per the Supplemental Clarification Letter, "A + D" in their schematic must add up to at least 85%, not 50% (The TIA does not state whether "D" represents parishioners who reside in Briar Chapel and points west, or parishioners from Chapel Hill who have detoured through Briar Chapel and emerged onto BC Parkway.) This is a critical error, because this near doubling of the volume of turning traffic at the intersection of BC Parkway and 15-501 raises the risk of overflow in the turning bin in the southbound lanes of 15-501 S. above Briar Chapel Parkway proportionately. Adjusting the timing of the lights or manual control by police to ease the cross traffic will cause slowdown in the northbound lanes of 15-501 below BC Parkway / Vickers Road – a major problem for first responders (the fire house on 15-501 opposite the entrance to Fearrington Village, for example – off the bottom of the applicant's map). The same understatement of the proportion of southbound arrivals falsely mitigates the potential for backup at Manns Chapel Road (Figure 2). Similar mischief occurs at Manns Chapel Road as Chatham parishioners departing the first service cut across the path of Orange parishioners arriving for the second service. Figure 2. Departing Chatham parishioners need to make a U-turn or Left turn at Manns Chapel Road, cutting directly across arriving Orange parishioners, creating traffic backup in both directions on 15-501, and increasing the temptation for southbound parishioners from Chapel Hill to take a "shortcut" by turning right onto Manns Chapel Road and cutting through Briar Chapel. Children are at play on Sunday mornings on these normally quiet residential streets. Future growth: The proposed campus in Chatham County is strategically situated to absorb parishioners presently served by Summit's transient campus in West Cary. If this were to happen, it would generate a massive increase in traffic on Lystra Road and concomitant cross-traffic impeding southbound flow on 15-501. Finally: The applicant states there will be two Sunday morning worship services. However, their Capitol Hill campus holds three Sunday services, Thursday evening services, and a host of other activities. Many of these activities will occur during ordinary working hours, and/or rush hour on 15-501. If this sounds like a recipe for disaster, you would be right. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Ester Thyssen

I would like to speak for the preservation of the rural and natural character of Chatham County, which is a primary goal laid out in the comprehensive plan. The current rezoning application on behalf of Summit Church for the non-commercial development of 3 large parcels along the east side of 15-501 should be rejected on these parcels. The community plan intends to reconfigure the environment, remove significant concentrations of trees, tear up and rearrange the topography and significantly altered the view sheds along 15-501, and I brought my figures with me. You can see the wooded area that would be developed and here you can see the area denuded of trees. When the development takes place over here. I show you that same area again and you can see how the campus. The proposed campus, would take all of that space. What we want to note here is that the view shed would be completely demolished, we would have over an 1,100 feet long, clear view of the built establishment, including the open area that is, the excavated basin for storm water, more parking and a new open field also from areas that were completely wooded prior. And so the topography of the area would be completely changed. In addition, there is a large children's play area

planned near the power lines which can create a lot of hazard in addition to radiation. But children playing in the area is hazardous anyway. In addition, community inbox recently built commercial sites along 15-501 that preserved only narrow strips of natural tree lines close to the 15-501 corridor were badly executed. View sheds should not set precedence, and allow the proposed destruction of remaining forested land along the 15-501 corridor allowing the further decimation of the natural tree cover and the destruction of natural view sheds to the extent and in the configuration proposed should be denied. Thank you.

Michael Akridge

So my name is Michael Acreage. I'm here to talk to about 87, and Castle Rock Farm Road and the Dollar General Store. I am a retired United Nations police officer. I was born and raised in Chatham County, probably one of only a couple of people here that I know that actually are. Even though I do, I am opponent proponent for change and growth. I'm probably one of the few that there is one of the minority that is actually from Chatham, that who do want to see change and growth. but not in this manner, even though I don't like traffic, which it will incur it will offer us better services and better shopping if we can provide. It is thought out, well planned and measured against our population and other businesses in our area. I know from firsthand experience what it is like to have everything developed around you. I grew up on old Lyster Road before that there was any Cole Park Plaza, State employees Credit Union or UNC parking lot on the corner, and at the time when Cole Park was developed. It was a welcome change to the residents, because it shortened the distance for grocery shopping, because the closest we could actually get to was Eastgate and Chapel Hill, and that's when 15-501 was two lanes or we came all the way to Pittsboro on two lanes. When I bought a place of my own, I decided to build on Castle Rock Farm Road. My hope was that I would spend the rest of my days on the west side of Hall River without it being built up too fast. This area has been a well kept secret for many years until Chapel Ridge and the parks were built. I do support both of the subdivisions, and have made many new friends with both areas in both areas, and it is also nice to have a world class golf course nearby. I don't even golf, but my family from out of state loves to come here and golf. I devoutly oppose the building of a dollar general, or any cheap discount store at the corner of Highway 87, and Castle Rock. Unsightly lights, traffic and safety issues for the public and for the workers that are employed by that organization are just a few of my reasons why the current owner, Mr. Vaughn, has said he is doing this because he cares for the community, but to this day I can't find one person who supports a Dollar General being put on that lot. I can find many who do oppose it. The current land use plan does not define how big our community crossroads is intended to be property that surrounds this parcel has already been purchased by other developers, and if you allow this parcel to be rezoned for this kind of business, this will set a precedence for other developers to follow further, encouraging, aggressive, not well thought out development ruining the rural nature. We all moved in this area, for the project does not seem to have been evaluated properly by any government organization regarding traffic, safety, wildlife, or the neighbors and the community as a whole. We should take our time and take a measured, well thought out plan for community for the community to move forward. The owner, MR. Vaughn, has asked for suggestions for that parcel of land. I suggest to sell it to the county at cost, so a badly needed volunteer fire department can be put in place for the Hadley Township. This offers the best solution with minimal impact to the surrounding residents while providing a life saving service that is long overdue for the community, and I would like to thank the Board for the work on the UDO and encourage you to continue your measured approach to growth protection and in on our rural counties areas. Thank you

Tiffany Stuflick

Good evening, everyone. I'm going change up the topic a little bit. I presented this to the Planning Board back in August, and I actually got a few surprise looks. So I thought I'd bring it here. I live in Chapel Ridge. Please know that I'm all for the growth and development of Chatham County. As a private resident I volunteer and advocate very strongly for a better eco-balanced living situation in our community, affordable living and high density. Housing is necessary for progression, but it does not have to come at the expense of the uninformed. I'm going to use the parks at Meadowview as an example. I'm going to focus primarily on developer responsibility. The Aqua Water Company and the 700 plus homes that are breaking ground soon a little background. Our neighborhood has the most expensive water in the State of North Carolina. We pay \$23.71 per 1,000 gallons of water, and the rest of Chatham County pays 3 to \$7 per 1,000 gallons of water. There are months that my water bill meets or exceeds \$300 a month, and that's for an average family of four. And it's not because we have leaky faucets or drippy toilets that is the average in the neighborhood and they're anticipating the prices. Going up with tax increases. Only twice last year was my water bill less than my electric bill. We didn't know this moving into the house, and we really wish somebody had informed us ahead of time. Additionally, we could not afford the estimated \$17,000 to filtration system for our homes, so we pay over a hundred dollars a month for drinking water. This is a concern, because if some of those homes are advertised as affordable living for families, or are designated as affordable housing for the county. The Utility Bill should be considered. Families on fixed incomes are not prepared to pay as much in taxes and utilities as they are in rent and mortgage. I feel that the developer should be held responsible for informing all home buyers of water costs and the Hall River water concerns before purchase. Equally as important. We, the residents, have no oversight to ensure that Aqua and the developers are not pushing their expenses onto us, your constituents through their Billings. As I said, I'm all for the growth and development of chap. County, and I do understand and believe in high density and affordable living, but I also believe in full disclosure. Full disclosure should be a requirement, especially in this situation. I believe that the rights and considerations of incoming residents should be just as important as the current ones. We cannot succeed as a county by setting people up from failure for the start. Thank you for your time.

James Shamp

I'm Jim Shamp. I recently retired from the North Carolina Biotechnology Center, one of the nation's most successful economic development organizations. Chatham currently has 38 of our life science firms providing jobs and tax revenue. But I'm here representing myself, my family, and my neighbors, as a 35-year resident of the Triangle, the latter portion of which I've enjoyed as a Chatham County renter, homeowner and taxpayer. Based on my professional experience I am concerned that some of Chatham's most important and valuable real estate could be squandered with a single bad decision to rezone these parcels for Summit Church that are properly zoned Conditional District-Compact Community (CD-CC). A comprehensive fiscal impact study done for the Town of Davidson four years ago shows that Summit Church's attempted rezoning to this kind of "institutional" land use is the only type of zoning that results in a net fiscal deficit. The Plan Chatham document agrees with this. Bottom line: This proposed rezoning is a bummer for Chatham. This site is perfectly located and already zoned to become a much-needed affordable housing community that could be especially attractive to young families in Chatham County. For example, it's a great location for some of the 1,800 people who will be working at the new five-billion-dollar Wolfspeed factory in Siler City. Chatham has an opportunity here to brighten its global spotlight by turning that 30 miles into a redefinition of commuting via creative transportation alternatives. Consider, for example, a county

incentive to developers to provide express electric van and/or electric bus service to and from this and other Chatham communities and the Wolfspeed factory (ideally subsidized/supported by Wolfspeed). Park-and-ride lots, perhaps. The commute vehicles could provide valuable “schmooze time” for riders to exchange ideas and/or pull out their “whatever” technology to communicate, start their workday or start new enterprises. The opportunity here is amazing. And rest assured Disney’s Chatham team, and others, will also find it titillating if we pitch it well. This centralized location also provides balance to these commuting households via the community’s proximity to Pittsboro, the Research Triangle area and its many possibilities for education, employment, recreation and more. Please maximize the value of this beautiful “driveway” between our Pittsboro and Chapel Hill front doors, and reject this rezoning idea. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lenore Braford

Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Lenore Braford, and I am a resident of Chatham County, living adjacent to the proposed Dollar General development site, just north of the land on Highway 87. I am also the Founder and Executive Director of Piedmont Farm Animal Refuge, a nonprofit animal sanctuary also situated directly north of the proposed store. I am deeply concerned about the potential impact of this rezoning decision. First and foremost, there are significant traffic safety concerns. Our staff, volunteers, and visitors regularly travel this route, and the increased traffic from such a commercial enterprise could pose serious risks to their safety. Additionally, the noise and light pollution generated by a retail store of this nature would be disruptive, not only to our operations but also to the well-being of the rescued animals in our care, many of whom are highly sensitive to environmental changes. As a committed Chatham County resident who has lived here for more than 12 years, I am also personally opposed to this rezoning. My decision to purchase land in this area was based on its peaceful, rural atmosphere, a quality that makes this region a special place to live. I believe we have a responsibility to protect and preserve the natural beauty and tranquility of Chatham County, ensuring that our landscapes, native wildlife, and plant life are safeguarded for future generations. Moreover, I cherish the ability to gaze at a night sky unmarred by commercial light pollution, something that is becoming increasingly rare in today’s world. This proposed development threatens to erode these cherished qualities of our county. Finally, while the proposed Dollar General is certainly unwanted, it is also unnecessary for our community. From its proposed location, you can travel just 10 minutes north to Burlington or 10 minutes south to Pittsboro, where these stores already exist. I urge you to remain true to the values that have long defined Chatham County: responsible stewardship of our natural environment and preservation of our rural character. Please consider the long-term consequences of this decision and vote in alignment with both the wishes of your constituents and the principles of preserving the unique nature of our community. Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Cathy Holt

Please show your wisdom and your vision for keeping Chatham County growing but growing responsibly. We are counting on each of you commissioners to guide our county in this way. I copied what I’m putting below, but I believe every word of it: The re-zoning proposal to build a Dollar General Store at the intersection Route 87 and Castle Rock Farm Road is alarming, and a test to our county’s ability to grow responsibly. We recognize the value of commerce and growth, and that responsible development requires thoughtful planning that aligns with our values and vision for Chatham County. Statistically, the introduction of discount stores, and specifically Dollar General brand stores leads to economic decline in a region, higher crime rates, lower property values, and food deserts (Please see our Resources section for more on

these facts) Our landscapes, our farmlands, our locally-owned businesses, and ultimately, our community depend on forward thinking wisdom in planning. While our current goal is to urge the relevant authorities to reconsider approving the construction of the Dollar General Store at the proposed location, our long term goal is to assist the community at large in ensuring our shared vision is implemented for future generations to enjoy.

Joy Hewett

Dear Chatham County Commissioners, Preserving Chatham's rural character (and Pittsboro's ETJ) requires rejecting rezoning proposals that undermine it. Zoning protects residents, farms, wildlife habitat, and woodlands as it accommodates commercial interests in areas reserved for business. In order to provide a measure of safety and security for all in planning their lives or businesses, people need to be able to trust government to provide good regulations and keep those commitments. Pittsboro has an important responsibility in protecting the rural character of the land surrounding it, and preserving the scenic beauty so many enjoy as the town grows. Chatham county has a responsibility to protect our natural areas and farm land as well. Rezoning agricultural and residential areas for the interests of developers jeopardizes the lifestyles of long time members of the community as well as those moving in to neighborhoods expecting them to remain protected. Recent rezoning threats to areas like X Campbell Road at Hwy 87, the woods on Alston Chapel Road, the hillside along Buckner Clark Road, and woods near a farm animal sanctuary for a Dollar General on Hwy 87 show how fragile the Chatham Comprehensive Land Use Plan of 2017 might be if people who do not live in those neighborhoods can persuade town boards, county commissioners, and their planning staffs to change the zoning and pull the rug out from under neighbors and their communities. We have plenty of development already approved for building homes, apartments and mixed use sectors. We need the benefits of well protected watersheds for the Haw, the Rocky, and the Deep Rivers. We need to preserve the rural character of country roads where sheep, goats, cows and horses can still be a familiar and comforting sight. We need woods and contiguous natural areas for wild life habitat and corridors. Zoning is supposed to protect us. If Pittsboro rezones to suit developers against the wishes and concerns of long time residents, how can rural areas remain safe? If Chatham county rezones areas for outside development interests, how can it foster healthy communities and preserve the rural character so many of us cherish? Dozens of us have spoken at town and county meetings, written letters, participated on boards urging you to protect our environment for the good of all. I've been writing and speaking for tree ordinances, better conservation of our natural heritage areas, and protection of our environment to mitigate against climate change for nearly 15 years as board members and staff come and go. I thank those of you who have tried hard to help with substantial contributions for the common good. Your hard work is appreciated. This is one final plea to all of you not to rezone any more residential and agricultural areas. It is time to heed the concerns of those who have chosen Chatham county to live peacefully, raise families, or grow farms and stop rezoning our countryside and woods for random development.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[24-5592](#)

Hold a public hearing to receive public comment on the draft of the Chatham County 2025 revaluation Schedule of Values

Chair Dasher opened the public hearing to receive public comment on the draft Chatham County 2025 revaluation Schedule of Values.

Tax Administrator Jenny Williams stated that N.C. General Statute 105-317(c)

mandates notice of the receipt and adoption by the Board of County Commissioners of either or both the true value and present-use value schedules, standards, and rules and notice of a property owner's right to comment on and contest the schedules, standards, and rules. Upon receipt of the proposed schedules, standards, and rules, the Board of Commissioners shall publish a statement in a newspaper having general circulation in the county stating the following:

a. That the proposed schedules, standards, and rules to be used in appraising real property in the county have been submitted to the Board of County Commissioners and are available for public inspection in the Assessor's office; and

b. The time and place of a public hearing on the proposed schedules, standards, and rules that shall be held by the Board of County Commissioners at least seven days before adopting the final schedules, standards, and rules.

No one signed up to speak.

Chair Dasher closed the public hearing.

This Agenda Item was received and filed

[24-5574](#)

A legislative public hearing requested by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners to consider amendments to the Chatham County Subdivision Regulations; specifically, sections 2.3, 5.2, and 7.7 to amend language related to Concept Plan reviews and approvals

Attachments: [More information from the Planning department website](#)

Planner II Hunter Glenn stated during the frequent discussions about the upcoming UDO adoption and implementation many potential applicants, as well as staff, have started to consider the implications of permit choice and vested rights on projects submitted under the old county zoning and subdivision regulations. According to Chapter 160D and G.S. 143-755 if an applicant submits a permit application for any type of development and a rule or ordinance is amended between the time the application was submitted and a permit decision is made, the applicant may choose which adopted version of the rule or ordinance will apply to their permit and use of the building, structure, or use indicated in the permit application. The rule is broad and applies to any permit that would be issued by a state or local government.

Glenn stated that Planning staff has made an in-depth analysis of the subdivision process during the UDO process and found a need to adjust the language and process regarding concept plan submittals. Concept Plan is the first step in the major subdivision process. Applicants generally have a conceptual layout and have done some environmental work to show the site conditions. The concern for staff is developers using the concept plan submittal for permit choice and creating a perpetual vested right. In theory, a developer could draw up a quick site plan, do some preliminary soil tests, talk to the neighbors, and then submit their concept plan application. It could then take years before the developer submits a first plat submittal. In the meantime, there may be new, more stringent, regulations in place for the tracts in question; but the developer can choose to be regulated under the older ordinance.

Glenn stated that State statute allows for applicants to choose, and this right has not affected the process much in Chatham County. However, after the UDO is adopted, there will be questions about which set of regulations are more beneficial to developers. Applicants may choose to submit a hastily prepared concept plan to "save

their place” under the old subdivision regulations. Planning staff has heard from some developers and land use attorneys that they are considering this option. For that reason, staff suggest adding a time limit to the concept plan submittal. There is a time limit on every other part of the process to maintain efficiency.

Glenn stated that the proposed process change would place a six (6) month time limit between submittal of a concept plan review and the submittal of a First Plat application. This rule would apply to concept plans submitted after the adoption of the UDO, but before the effective date. The intent of the procedural change is only to maintain the efficacy of the current regulations and ensure the effectiveness of the new UDO. Planning Staff and the UDO consultants have discussed the six-month time limit and believe it is adequate for developers. Much of the work related to the concept plan is generally done before submittal and is also work needed for the First Plat as well. The concept plan process would not be changed in any other way. The process for a concept plan starts with a pre-application or pre-concept meeting, then the applicant is supposed to do their preliminary environmental work and make necessary changes to the plan. The next step is a mandatory neighborhood meeting. Followed by the technical review committee meeting and eventual First Plat submittal. The time limit clock would start after the pre-concept meeting, but before the community meeting.

Glenn stated that the time limit affects both permit choice and vested rights. Having a deadline on concept plans may not limit the amount of applications submitted for concept plan review but will set establish an expiration date. The applicant can choose either regulation, but they will just need submit their First Plat in a timely manner. Once the First Plat application is submitted then the concept plan has been completed, and the applicant will be deemed to have a vested right.

Glenn stated that the permit choice and vested rights are closely related, but notably different in a few ways. One applies before the permit is approved and one applies after the permit is approved. In the case of vested rights, the developer already has a valid permit and are allowed to continue development in accordance with the approved permit even if rules are subsequently changed. If the developer wants to have a vested right, they will need to submit the First Plat application within six months of the concept plan submittal. This will only apply to concept plans submitted after the UDO adoption, but before the effective date. Permit choice applies to a broad range of “development[s]” “development permits,” and “land development regulations,” as defined at G.S. 143-755. Notably, the development permits are administrative and quasi-judicial permits; legislative zoning decisions do not trigger permit choice. Therefore, most of our rezoning applications are not applicable.

Glenn shared the following:

“Development” is defined as any of the following:

- 1. The construction, erection, alteration, enlargement, renovation, substantial repair, movement to another site, or demolition of any structure.*
- 2. Excavation, grading, filling, clearing, or alteration of land.*
- 3. The subdivision of land as defined in G.S. 160D-802.*
- 4. The initiation of substantial change in the use of land or the intensity of the use of land.*

“Development permit” is defined as an administrative or quasi-judicial development approval, including any of the following:

- 1. Zoning permits.*
- 2. Site plan approvals.*
- 3. Special use permits.*

4. Variances.
5. Certificates of appropriateness.
6. Plat approvals.
7. Development agreements.
8. Building permits.
9. Subdivision of land.
10. State agency permits for development.
11. Driveway permits.
12. Erosion and sedimentation control permits.
13. Sign permit.

"Land development regulation" is defined as any "State statute, rule, or regulation, or local ordinance affecting the development or use of real property, including any of the following:"

1. Unified development ordinance.
2. Zoning regulation, including zoning maps.
3. Subdivision regulation.
4. Erosion and sedimentation control regulation.
5. Floodplain or flood damage prevention regulation.
6. Mountain ridge protection regulation.
7. Stormwater control regulation.
8. Wireless telecommunication facility regulation.
9. Historic preservation or landmark regulation.
10. Housing code.

Glenn stated that there is not a direct mention of a concept plan as a "Development Permit," but based on consultation with the County Attorney, it was determined that the intent of the concept plan step is the same as a permit. There is an application and a fee with review by planning staff.

No one signed up to speak.

This Agenda Item was referred to the Planning Board.

BOARD PRIORITIES

24-5600

Vote to approve a resolution approving an Interlocal Agreement to merge the County's water system with the City of Sanford

Attachments: [Water System Merger Presentation 10-21-2024](#)
[Resolution Approving Merger Agreement with City of Sanford 10-21-2024](#)
[Utility Merger Agreement with City of Sanford 10-21-2024](#)

Chair Dasher stated that the Board of Commissioners was going to hold off on voting on this agenda item until the full board is present, but asked County Manager Dan LaMontagne to present an update.

LaMontagne shared highlights of the merger agreement. LaMontagne stated that this would transfer all responsibility for setting rates and operating the system. Tri River will consult with the County before any rate increase and at least annually. Water and sewer system standards and policies shall be applied in the County to the same extent and in the same manner as applied to other customers of the Sanford Utility System. Solicit input from the County on current and future Utility Services needs of the County.

Provide for the current and future needs of the County for water and sewer services.

LaMontagne stated that the Chatham County UDO will control development, assistance to the towns will help preserve the rural character, and ongoing collaboration between Sanford and Chatham on needs and improvements.

LaMontagne shared a list of a few specific projects and use funds that have been identified in the agreement.

LaMontagne reviewed items that will change including Water bills will come from TriRiver Water instead of Chatham County, the 10% increase water rates previously planned for July 1st will go into effect March 1st, System Development Fees (SDF) for new connections will increase March 1st from \$5,000 for a typical residential single-family home, to \$8,000. SDF study completed recently recommended \$8,616, account number will change, if the County drafts a customer's checking or savings account via automatic bank draft, that information will automatically transfer, and if you use the County in your records or online banking, you will need to update the payee to TriRiver Water.

LaMontagne shared changes for employees including the City shall make an offer of employment to all employees of the County who are employed as of the effective date, offers of employment shall be no less than their current salary and shall include benefits and perquisites substantially equal to those of current City employees in similar positions, leave accumulation shall be calculated with length of service to the County credited as length of service with the City, transferred employees shall have the right to participate in all City employee benefit programs on equal terms with other City employees, and any person offered employment with the City shall retain previously accrued sick leave and vacation leave.

LaMontagne shared and reviewed a map of the existing Chatham County water system.

The Board of Commissioners discussed the merger and asked questions of staff.

This Resolution was tabled until November 4, 2024.

[24-5607](#)

Vote to approve an ordinance adopting water System Development Fees effective March 1, 2025

Attachments: [Ordinance Adopting the System Development Fees 10-21-24](#)

This agenda item was moved to the November 4, 2024 Board of Commissioner's agenda.

This Ordinance was tabled until November 4, 2024.

[24-5606](#)

Vote to approve an amendment to water rates effective March 1, 2025

Attachments: [2024 Water Rates and Fees](#)
 [March 1 2025 Water Rates and Fees proposed](#)

This agenda item was moved to the November 4, 2024 Board of Commissioner's agenda.

This Agenda Item was tabled until November 4, 2024.

[24-5586](#)

Receive the quarterly update on American Rescue Plan Act Funds

Attachments: [ARPA Quarterly Update 10.21.24](#)

Budget and Management Analyst Will Curvin presented a ARPA quarterly update to the Board of Commissioners. The update included details of the allocation, obligation deadline, projects and expenditures.

The Board of Commissioners thanked Curvin for the update.

This Agenda Item was received and filed.

[24-5583](#)

Receive the Fiscal Year 2025 First Quarter Budget Update

Attachments: [FY25 1st Quarter Budget Update](#)

Budget Director Darrel Butts presented the Fiscal Year 2025 First Quarter Budget update to the Board of Commissioners. The update included expenditures, revenues, sales tax, and article 46 sales tax.

The Board of Commissioners thanked Butts for the update.

This Agenda Item was received and filed.

[24-5584](#)

Receive information on the Human Services Non-Profit funding process and discuss desired funding level for FY2026

Attachments: [Human Services Non-Profit Funding October 21 2024](#)

This item was moved to the November 4, 2024 Board of Commissioner's agenda.

This Agenda Item was tabled until November 4, 2024.

CLERK'S REPORT

Clerk to the Board Jenifer Johnson reminded the Board of Commissioners of the Town of Pittsboro joint meeting on Monday.

MANAGER'S REPORT

County Manager Dan LaMontagne reminded the Board of Commissioners of the Oak View open house and that five of the legislative goals that the Board submitted made it through the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners steering committee process.

COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Commissioner Kenlan stated that she attended the State of Chatham event, and the County Manager presented. She also attended the Home Builders event.

Commissioner Gomez-Flores stated that he attends the Board of Health meeting and shared an update on new services at Chatham Hospital.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Katie Kenlan, seconded by Commissioner Franklin Gomez Flores, that the meeting was adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chair Dasher, Commissioner Delaney, Commissioner Gomez Flores, and Commissioner Kenlan

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Howard