



**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2022 – 7:00 P.M.
WEDDINGTON TOWN HALL
MINUTES
PAGE 1 OF 3**

1. Call to Order

Chairman Ed Goscicki called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Determination of Quorum

Quorum was determined with Chairman Ed Goscicki, Vice Chairman Travis Manning, Board members Jen Conway, Gordon Howard, Jim Vivian, and Chris Faulk all present. Board member Manish Mittal was absent.

Staff: Town Planning Robert Tefft, Town Administrator/Clerk Karen Dewey

Visitors: Gayle Butler, Bill Deter

3. Conflict of Interest Statement: *In accordance with the state government ethics act, it is the duty of every Board member to avoid conflicts of interest. Does any Board member have any known conflict of interest with respect to any matters on the agenda? If so, please identify the conflict and refrain from any participation in the matter involved.*

Chairman Goscicki read the conflict of interest statement. No Board members had a conflict of interest.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. September 26, 2022 Planning Board Meeting

Motion: Board member Howard made a motion to approve the September 26, 2022 Regular Planning Board Meeting minutes as presented.
Second: Vice Chairman Manning
Vote: The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

5. Old Business

No Old Business to discuss

6. New Business

A. Discussion and Recommendation of Text Amendment to Section D-917D, Supplemental Requirements for Certain Uses; Section D-919, Temporary Structures and Uses; and Appendix 1, Definitions, of the Town of Weddington Unified Development Ordinance

Mr. Tefft presented the staff report and gave detail of the changes: The proposed text amendment provides for a complete overhaul of the existing provisions. The structure of this section has been changed from a single list of all possible standards to a subdivided list that will facilitate easier access to standards that may or may not be applicable to individual proposals. Many of the existing standards, aside from their relocation, remain generally unchanged or have only been changed to provide for consistent phrasing and terminology.

- While it was previously implied that accessory uses and structures were not to be located between the principal building and the road, it is now clearly stated.
- While accessory structures were previously allowed to match the height of the principal building, they are now limited to the lesser of 12 feet in height or the height of the principal building. There is an exception to this standard requiring two feet of additional setback for every one foot of additional height.
- Added a standard allowing for piers or docks when the lot is adjoining a body of water.
- Added a standard requiring accessory structures have consistent external materials as the principal building.
- Added a standard allowing for underground accessory structures.
- Added specific provisions concerning detached garages and solar panels.
- Added a standard requiring above-ground swimming pools to meet principal structure setbacks.
- Removed the standard requiring accessory uses and structures to have construction features that are residential in nature or character. This standard was determined to be ambiguous and in conflict with G.S. 160D-702(b).
- Removed the standard differentiating between the size of accessory structures on small and large lots. No distinction will exist given the size of the lot – only the relative size of the principal building will govern the size of the accessory structure.
- Removed the standard explicitly requiring compliance with the Code of Ordinances. Compliance with the Code of Ordinances is already required for all development, uses, etc. in all instances.
- Removed the standard regulating the size of accessory family dwellings separately from the size of all other accessory structure types as there was no apparent need for this distinction.
- Removed the standard requiring accessory family dwellings to retain a single-family appearance from the street. This standard was determined to be ambiguous and in conflict with G.S. 160D-702(b).

Section D-919, Temporary Structures and Uses:

The proposed text amendment will relocate existing language from Section D-917D.M.9 into the list of permissible temporary structures and uses. This language provided for the occupancy of a travel trailer, recreational vehicle, or licensed motor vehicle as an assessor family dwelling for no more than 30 days per calendar year. While this language could seem appropriate in its current location given that this is where accessory family dwellings are regulated, it is determined to be more appropriate that this language be located amongst the other temporary structures and uses that provide the appropriate framework for its regulation. It is noted that, aside from its relocation, the language being added to this section has not been altered from its current form.

Appendix 2, Submittal Requirements:

The proposed text amendment will relocate existing language from Section D-917D.M.10 into the existing definition for accessory family dwellings. Essentially, Section D-917D.M.10 already consisted of the current full definition of accessory family dwellings but included additional language that was not a part of the codified definition. This amendment adds that additional language to the codified definition. It is noted that, aside from its relocation, the language being added to this definition has not been altered from its current form.

Mr. Tefft explained that the 2-foot added setback for every foot over the 12-foot height limit is to act as mitigation for very tall structures that may be close to the property line.

The Planning Board discussed the accessory structure height requirements and side yard pool setbacks. The board agreed to continue discussion after staff revision of text amendment.

7. Update from Town Planner and Report from the October Town Council Meeting

Mr. Tefft reported: Council reviewed and approved the submittal requirement text amendment at their October meeting. He has received inquiries about the Hunt property on the north side of Ennis Road and a 19-acre parcel on the east side of Providence Road for 15 dwelling units and keeping the existing house. It will be zoned R-40 or RCD. Board member Manning asked why a developer would come to speak at a council meeting as Cambridge properties did? Board member Vivian asked if the developer was aware of the zoning in Weddington when they brought in the proposed project. Mr. Tefft responded that the developer was aware and that preapplication presentations to council are helpful in gauging the interest of the proposal.

8. Board member Comments

Chairman Goscicki commented on the Cambridge properties preapplication presentation to council. He expressed that he believes that it is the Planning Board role to review those proposals.

9. Adjournment

Motion: Board member Conway made a motion to adjourn the October 24, 2022 Regular Planning Board meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Vote: The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Approved:

January 23, 2023

Ed Goscicki, Chairman

Karen Dewey

Karen Dewey, Town Administrator/Clerk