



TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES
PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

5375 N. Virginia Dare Trail, Southern Shores, NC 27949

Phone 252-261-2394 / Fax 252-255-0876

www.southernshores-nc.gov

PITTS CENTER

Monday, March 18, 2024 at 5:00 PM

MINUTES

1 **Call Meeting to Order**

2 Pledge of Allegiance

3

4 **Present**

5 Chairperson Ward

6 Vice Chairperson Tony DiBernardo

7 Planning Board Member Lawler

8 Planning Board Member McClendon

9 Planning Board Member (alternate #1) Michael Zehner

10 Planning Board Member (alternate#2) Charlie Reis

11

12 **Approval of Agenda**

13 **Motion** made by Vice Chairperson DiBernardo to approve the agenda as presented, Seconded by

14 Chairperson Ward. The motion passed unanimously. The motion passed unanimously.

15

16 **Approval of Minutes – December 18, 2023**

17 **Motion** made by Chairperson Ward to approve the minutes as amended, Seconded by Vice Chairperson

18 DiBernardo. The motion passed unanimously.

19

20 **Public Comment**

21 None

22

23 **Old Business**

24 ZTA-23-05, Zoning Text Amendment application submitted by the Town of Southern Shores to amend

25 Town Code Sections 36-57, 36-202(d)(2), 36-203(d)(2), 36-204(d)(2), 36-205(d)(2), and 36-206(d)(2) to

26 amend the Town's current lot width requirements by amending the definitions of building setback line

27 and lot width and by establishing new measuring points for lot width

28

29 Planning Director Haskett presented the staff's latest draft of ZTA-23-05 for consideration. He stated,

30 Town staff is now proposing to amend the Town's minimum lot width requirements in all of the

31 residential zoning districts by amending the definition of "building setback line" in Section 36-57 by

32 defining the building setback line as a line parallel to or concentric with the front lot line instead of the

33 street right-of-way and by removing "minimum". The proposed amendments also include another new

34 definition of "lot width" in Section 36-57 which is the width of a lot at the required building setback line

35 measured at right angles to the rear lot line. Lastly, the proposed amendments include amendments to

36 Sections 36-202(d)(2), 36-203(d)(2), 36-204(d)(2), 36-205(d)(2), and 36-206(d)(2) that reestablish the

37 building setback line as the measuring point for lot width and establishes that the building setback line is

38 measured 25 feet from the front lot line, or the point where the lot is 100 feet wide, whichever distance
39 is closer to the front lot line.

40

41 Planning Director Haskett walked the board through the language as it pertained to an example of a cul
42 de sac lot, showing where the lot becomes 100 ft wide that would be the building set back line.

43

44 Planning Board Member McClendon asked a question from page 2, line 27 “for all other Lots the building
45 setback line shall be established 25 ft from the front line”, does that mean that all houses have to be
46 built based on 25 ft from the front line. Planning Director Haskett explained that the yard setback
47 requirement is a minimum distance 25 ft, this is saying that the building setback line where it has to be
48 100 feet wide shall be at 100 but the house can be anywhere within the building window of 25 on the
49 front and rear and 15 on the sides.

50

51 Chairperson Ward read a portion of his correspondence letter to Planning Director Haskett which read
52 as, I believe when we started this process as directed by Town Council the objective was and still should
53 be how to minimize reconfiguration of non-conforming adjacent lots to other Lots under the same
54 ownership per section 36 132(2)(a-e) that could possibly result in flag Lots or other irregular non-
55 conforming Lots. Our focus should be on this situation rather than existing Standalone lots that are
56 legally non-conforming but are absolutely entitled to be developed. He further stated that the cul de sac
57 lot is a prime example of a standalone lot.

58

59 Planning Director Haskett stated the staff’s main purpose was to make this ordinance or lot width
60 requirement less ambiguous.

61

62 Planning Board Member McClendon asked if it is the intention of preventing lots from being developed
63 as flag lots. Chairperson Ward stated he did not know if it was the board’s intention or not.

64

65 Planning Board Member felt a lot size of 20,000 square feet should be sufficient and he is comfortable
66 with the language as it was before this was brought to the board. He stated, there are very few lots that
67 are left that could be re-subdivided and still meet the criteria that we're talking about. This is reactive
68 and not necessarily better.

69

70 Chairperson Ward stated that we are trying to eliminate the development of smaller lots under same
71 ownership. All that non-conforming language was put into place, which is solid language. The question is
72 what do we want to do as far as lot width goes?

73

74 Planning Director Haskett stated there is some confusion between setback line and yard setback and he
75 is open to changing the term *building setback line* to something else. Call it what it is, lot width line or
76 something to that effect. It also has multiple definitions which add to the confusion, one definition in
77 subdivision ordinance and the other in the zoning ordinance.

78

79 Planning Director Haskett asked the board if they would be agreeable to creating a new term with
80 respect to lot width.

81

82 Planning Board Member Zehner asked what the minimum frontage requirement is. Planning Director
83 Haskett answered the minimum standard is 30 ft.

84

85 Planning Board Member Zehner recommended using either *setback* or *yard* for structures, not both. He
86 stated the only reason you would usually have the yard provision is for exemptions for what can be in
87 the yard, but you could easily just say that these are exempt or not subject to a setback or subject to a
88 lesser setback. Just define what a building setback is, front and side and rear building setbacks and how
89 the lot width relates to those is different but is simplified.
90
91 Planning Board Member Lawler asked how you define the front lot line. Planning Director Haskett stated
92 the zoning ordinance defines it as the line separating said lot from that street which is designated as the
93 front street on the building permit certificate of occupancy or Subdivision plat that is the front lot line.
94
95 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo asked why we would change the terminology that is being used in the
96 surveys that are being submitted with applications. Why not match the same terminology that is being
97 submitted.
98
99 Chairperson Ward felt the building setback line in both the subdivision section and general zoning
100 section needed to be the same definition. He further stated that he still maintains the board is talking
101 about how we treat lots that have the potential to be recombined and or subdivided.
102
103 Planning Board Member McClendon agreed with Vice Chairperson DiBernardo in keeping the same
104 terminology. If the term building setback line is used, then it should be identified with the term MBSL
105 utilized by surveyors.
106
107 Planning Director Haskett asked the board what they thought about using the term Lot Width Line,
108 rather than Setback Line.
109
110 Planning Board Member Zehner stated the minimum building setback line front is 25 feet or where the
111 lot meets the minimum lot width required (100 ft). The minimum building setback line of the front
112 would be reset to whatever the distance the lot meets the minimum lot width.
113
114 Chairperson Ward asked if a lot didn't come to 100 feet until nearly the rear of the parcel, where would
115 that fall in this ordinance. Planning Director Haskett stated if it was a proposed lot, it wouldn't be able to
116 be approved and if it was an existing lot, it would be non-conforming.
117
118 Chairperson Ward stated he felt the main purpose of the discussion is trying to limit what you can do at
119 the subdivision and recombination situations and was not concerned with the lots that are non-
120 conforming legally.
121
122 Planning Board Member Zehner asked what the objective is. Chairperson Ward stated it was to minimize
123 small lots.
124
125 Planning Board Member Zehner stated the ordinance already does that by stating the minimum lot size.
126
127 Planning Board Member McClendon felt that if a property owner wanted to subdivide their lot and each
128 divided parcel was a minimum of 20,000 sq. feet then the property owner should be allowed.
129
130 Planning Board Members McClendon and Zehner both were not concerned with flag lots if the minimum
131 lot size was met.
132

133 Planning Board Member McClendon stated if a parcel meets the minimum width requirement, the 30 ft.
134 access requirement along with the minimum 20,000 sq. foot lot size, then they should be allowed to
135 develop it. He stated in his mind the 20,000 minimum square foot size is low density.

136
137 Chairperson Ward stated he would think many residents would not agree with McClendon's low-density
138 explanation and would like to see bigger lots. Planning Board Member McClendon stated people may
139 prefer that, but the truth is several smaller lots were platted in Southern Shores and it just happens they
140 have same ownership, what if they weren't owned by the same owner.

141
142 Chairperson Ward felt the Land Use spirit is that of homes on large lots. The town has made a real
143 concerted effort to go in that direction and that is why the non-conforming lot language was put
144 together and an ordinance created. If there is some subdivision as a byproduct of recombination, then
145 that the lot might not be a rectangle.

146
147 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo requested the board focus on today's agenda item and move forward. The
148 board is focusing too much on some rare situations.

149
150 Chairperson Ward recommended building setback line definition mirror each other in both the zoning
151 and subdivision sections.

152
153 Planning Director Haskett stated to make it clearer, building setback line or minimum building setback
154 line should be for structures and add another term for width of lots.

155
156 Planning Director Haskett stated he appreciated the conversation and the feedback received to this
157 point and could ask the board if they are in favor of not in favor of flag lots, or no minimum lot width,
158 but really would like to get a sense of whether the board would recommend approval or disapproval of
159 what is in front of them. Also, would the board like to see something different that would allow any lot if
160 you had 20,000 sq. feet?

161
162 Chairperson Ward did not feel comfortable recommending the ZTA in this current form to go to Town
163 Council.

164
165 Planning Board Member McClendon's opinion was to keep the 30 feet wide requirement at the street,
166 20,000 square foot lot, but the rest of it including lot widths he did not have a strong opinion about.

167
168 Planning Board Member Zehner asked who initiated the text amendment and what is the goal. Planning
169 Director Haskett stated staff initiated the text amendment with the goal of making it clearer. What is
170 current is clear but very strict.

171
172 Chairperson Ward would like to have more time to work with the ZTA and stated not having the 100 ft
173 wide requirement runs against the grain.

174
175 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo stated MBSL should be added under the definition to make it consistent.

176
177 Chairperson Ward recommended at a minimum that the ordinance says a lot has got to be 100 feet at
178 some point on a newly subdivided lot and by the way it's got to be 20,000 square feet minimum. Vice
179 Chairperson DiBernardo agreed for a newly subdivided lot.

180

181 Planning Board Member Zehner stated that most municipalities have a minimum lot width requirement
182 in order to create some regularity on the dimensions of lots so that you have this rectangular grid layout
183 where all of the houses are set back almost equidistant and where they're set back the lots are
184 approximately consistent.

185
186 Chairperson Ward stated for simplicity you've got to hit the 100 feet at some point., without it you
187 cannot subdivide.

188
189 Planning Director Haskett stated that we have recommended previously and what we have right now is
190 that it would have to maintain 100 feet after it gets to that point, without this there could be some very
191 irregular shaped lots.

192
193 Planning Board Member McClendon stated you are going to have irregular shaped lots with subdividing.
194 Over the years different sections of Southern Shores was platted by different people and at different
195 times and there are lots of irregular funny shaped lots. He stated the 20,000 square feet keeps Southern
196 Shores in the low-density business.

197
198 Chairperson Ward added the 100 ft which has always been there should be maintained.

199
200 Planning Board Director Haskett polled the board, we agree that we want the same definition of building
201 set back line or something similar whatever that term may be yeah as long as they're consistent in
202 zoning and subdivision. The board members agreed.

203
204 Planning Director Haskett asked, should we create a new term for lot width and not use building set
205 back line. Planning Board Member Zehner disagreed as he felt there was some relationship between the
206 two.

207
208 Planning Director Haskett asked if the lot needed to be 100 ft. wide at some point. Planning Board
209 Members McClendon and Zehner, and Vice Chairperson DiBernardo opposed. Planning Board Member
210 Zehner stated the point the goal needs to be defined.

211
212 Chairperson Ward asked Planning Board Member McClendon if he was comfortable with the lot being
213 less than 100 ft as long as the lot size was 20,000. Planning Board Member McClendon answered yes in
214 the case of a subdivision. Both Zehner and DiBernardo stated they need to know the goal behind the
215 100 ft. and were not comfortable agreeing to it without knowing the goal.

216
217 Chairperson Ward stated he would like to keep the 100 ft. lot width requirement for subdivisions,
218 regardless of where on the parcel it reaches the 100 ft.

219
220 Planning Director Haskett stated at this point staff will amend the ZTA so that building setback line is
221 changed to lot width line in this proposed definition, everything else stays the same in that section.
222 Section 36-22 would be amended to eliminate for lots that front a cul de sac the building setback line
223 shall be established 25 ft from the front lot line or the point where the lot is 100 ft whichever distance is
224 closer to the front lot line and get rid of for all other Lots the building setback line should be established
225 25 feet from the front lot line. The board was not in consensus.

226

227 **MOTION:** Hearing the need for further discussions and consideration, Chairperson Ward moved to
228 not approve ZTA-23-05 this evening, Seconded by Vice Chairperson DiBernardo. The motion passed
229 unanimously.

230

231 After the motion Planning Board Member McClendon added that singling out cul-de-sac is pretty
232 arbitrary in his mind because there are many streets that have very sharp curves on them and they
233 create a very similar pie-shaped lot, obviously narrow on the outside of the curve and very wide on the
234 inside of the curve, and to make this irregular thing specific to cul de sacs doesn't seem appropriate.

235

236

Chairperson Ward called for a five-minute recess 6:21 pm

237

meeting recessed at 6:25 pm

238

239 **New Business**

240 ZTA-24-02, a Zoning Text Amendment application submitted by the Town of Southern Shores to amend
241 Town Code Section 36-171 to amend the Town's lot disturbance/stormwater management permit
242 requirements by establishing that a lot disturbance/stormwater management permit is required to
243 remove trees greater than 6 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground, within a front,
244 side or rear yard (setback) on any unimproved lot in the general commercial zoning district and the
245 penalty for not obtaining a lot disturbance/stormwater management permit to remove trees greater
246 than 6 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground, within a front, side or rear yard
247 (setback) on any unimproved lot in the general commercial zoning district

248

249 The staff report read as, at the February 6, 2024, Town Council meeting, the Town Council directed
250 Town Staff to draft Town Code amendments to modernize the Town Code. At the March 12, 2024, Town
251 Council meeting, the Town Council adopted ZTA-24-01 (with revisions) which included amendments to
252 Chapter 24, Planning and several sections in Chapter 36, Zoning. The initial draft of ZTA-24-01 included
253 amendments to Section 36-171, Lot Disturbance and Stormwater Management which were withdrawn
254 by Town Staff prior to February 21, 2024, Planning Board meeting. Town Staff is now proposing similar
255 amendments to Section 36-171, Lot Disturbance and Stormwater Management which if approved,
256 would do the following:

257

258 • Establish that a Lot Disturbance/Stormwater Management Permit is required to remove trees greater
259 than 6 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground, within a front, side or rear yard
260 (setback) on any unimproved lot in the general commercial zoning district.

261

262 • Establish the penalty for not obtaining a Lot Disturbance/Stormwater Management Permit to remove
263 trees greater than 6 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground, within a front, side or
264 rear yard (setback) on any unimproved lot in the general commercial zoning district.

265

266 O It would be an offense for any person to remove a tree greater than 6 inches in diameter,
267 measured at 4.5 feet above the ground within a front, side or rear yard (setback) on any
268 unimproved lot within the general commercial zoning district without first obtaining a Lot
269 Disturbance/Stormwater Management Permit.

270

271 O It would be an offense for a property owner to employ, authorize or direct any third person or
272 entity to remove a tree greater than 6 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the
273 ground within a front, side or rear yard (setback) on any unimproved lot within the general

274 commercial zoning district without first obtaining a Lot Disturbance/Stormwater Management
275 Permit.

276

277 O A separate offense shall be deemed to have been committed for each tree greater than 6
278 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground within a front, side or rear yard
279 (setback) on any unimproved lot within the general commercial zoning district that is removed
280 without first obtaining a Lot Disturbance/Stormwater Management Permit.

281

282 O When a tree greater than 6 inches in diameter, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground within
283 a front, side or rear yard (setback) on any unimproved lot within the general commercial zoning
284 district is removed without first obtaining a Lot Disturbance/Stormwater Management Permit, a
285 warning citation would be issued to the offender allowing 30 days to abate the violation. A
286 replacement tree similar in size would be required to abate the violation. If the violation is not
287 abated within 30 days, the offender would be subject to a civil penalty in accordance with Town
288 Code Section 1-6(d).

289

290 The Town's currently adopted Land Use Plan contains the following Policy that is applicable to the
291 proposed ZTA:

292

293 • Policy 2: The community values and the Town will continue to comply with the founder's original
294 vision for Southern Shores: a low-density residential community comprised of single-family dwellings on
295 large lots (served by a small commercial district for convenience shopping and services located at the
296 southern end of the Town. This blueprint for land use naturally protects environmental resources and
297 fragile areas by limiting development and growth.

298

299 • Policy 26: Promote open space, tree protection, and natural vegetation diversity.

300

301 O Action Item 26-b Encourage lot preparation methods that preserve natural vegetation and
302 minimize clear cutting.

303

304 RECOMMENDATION

305 Town Staff has determined that the proposed amendments are consistent with the Town's currently
306 adopted Land Use Plan and Town Staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend approval of
307 the application to the Town Council.

308

309 Planning Board Member Lawler asked what size is proposed to be replanted if cut. Planning Director
310 Haskett stated similar in size to what was cut or similar in size to the potential growth size.

311

312 Planning Board Member McClendon asked for confirmation if they pertained to an existing commercial
313 property owner if they want to have a tree taken down. Planning Director Haskett answered it applies if
314 the lot is vacant and if the tree is in a side, front or rear setback. If the lot is not vacant then they are not
315 required to get a lot disturbance permit and they may remove the tree.

316

317 Planning Board Member Zehner stated that the replanting requirement may not accomplish anything if
318 the tree is removed before it goes through site plan review. He inquired if the town could require the
319 applicant to replant if they were found in violation of not obtaining a permit during the site plan review.
320 Planning Director Haskett stated he felt the applicant could be forced to replant trees if the applicant
321 removed the trees during the site plan review.

322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369

Planning Board Member Zehner recommended asking the town attorney whether or not there's any ability to put a provision in there that says violation shall be taken into account or tree removal taken into account during site plan review. He stated with the planting requirement you're not going to get them to plant the same size tree and you don't necessarily want them to either, and anything over six inches is going to be challenging from a survivability standpoint.

Chairperson Ward inquired what the offence was for removing a tree. Planning Director Haskett answered a warning citation with 30 days to abate the violation and if it's not abated then the fine could be up to \$500 each day it continues to exist.

Vice Chairperson DiBernardo stated when a similar ordinance was brought before a previous Planning Board, they approved the language with, if the property owner cut down a large tree you must replace it on a 1:1 ratio with a tree at least 4 feet high or a replacement at a smaller height with a 2:1 ratio. He recommended having some regulations in place ahead of time.

Chairperson Ward stated there have been three versions of the ordinance and the current version does not include residential, and he would like to know why only a draft pertaining to commercial only is being considered. He stated he understands why one portion was being pulled out, the portion where a survey would require showing every tree 6 inches in diameter but is questioning why the first provision is being pulled out. Planning Director Haskett answered staff agreed it was quite a burden to have someone hire a surveyor and show all trees greater than six inches in diameter, measuring four and a half feet above the ground and had that removed, with respect to just applying it to commercial districts in light of a recent special use permit application the town went through it became apparent to staff that there are concerns with buffers with respect to vacant lots and adjoining property and this is a way to encourage retention of trees inside and rear setback areas, that's why it is commercial only.

Chairperson Ward stated all districts could be left in. Planning Director Haskett stated the same answer applies and the board can recommend residential use.

Chairperson Ward read section 36-171 from the original ZTA (not the version on the agenda) starting with line 6.

subject to the requirements of GS 16d if applicable in all Town zoning districts no grading filling topography alteration or removal of any tree greater than 6 inches in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above the ground on any unimproved lot or demolition and clearing of improved property nor any man-made change....

Chairperson Ward felt the ZTA should certainly have some allowance to restrict cutting trees down in residential area without getting a lot disturbance permit and that this stated language would be the proper language to be included. He recommended adding residential to the ZTA. He stated he was trying to avoid having residential lots clear cut and then not being developed on for a number of years.

Planning Board Member Zehner stated this would not stop someone from clear cutting a lot. Planning Director Haskett stated that is correct, the property owner would need just need to obtain a permit first.

Planning Board Member Zehner recommended for commercial it be expanded to any tree removal, regardless of size.

370 Planning Director Haskett stated with this version one of the reasons for commercial is because buffers
371 are in some cases required and buffers can retain existing vegetation, so this is a way to try to
372 encourage retaining existing vegetation. In residential when you have single family dwelling there's no
373 buffer required.

374
375 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo agreed with adding residential as he has been advocating for it since 2007
376 and recommends maintaining the trees to lessen the water runoff. He also recommended as a
377 compromise to at least add residential areas that buffer commercial.

378
379 Chairperson Ward was adamant about including residential, as written in the original and second
380 version.

381
382 Planning Board Member Lawler stated that you have to take into consideration that trees are not just an
383 aesthetic you see but there is a storm water function that they are providing, and the town should not
384 allow that infrastructure to go without being evaluated.

385
386 Chairperson Ward questioned how you regulate taking trees down when some people just do not want
387 them, and it is their property rights.

388
389 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo stated we are talking about undeveloped lots.

390
391 Planning Board Member Zehner was fine having residential regulations according to a six-inch diameter
392 for undeveloped lots but felt all trees should be considered for commercial.

393
394 Chairperson Ward was amenable to having residential and commercial broken out separate but wants a
395 regulation which covers all districts.

396
397 Planning Board Member McClendon stated he can see having to remove trees from the permissible
398 building area but not touch the setback areas.

399
400 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo asked Planning Director Haskett what would be more efficient, to go with
401 combining the residential and commercial or separate the two. Planning Director Haskett stated
402 whatever the board recommends. If the board would like both then the reference to the general
403 commercial zoning district would need to be removed (page 3, line 30 of ZTA 24-02)

404
405 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo stated in earlier versions the tree was always 10 or 12 inches in diameter
406 and there may be pushback with the lower circumference.

407
408 Chairperson Ward stated all applications for a lot disturbance and storm water management permit shall
409 be accompanied by a survey and preliminary site plan prepared by a state licensed professional surveyor
410 for all districts and asked what prevents an owner from cutting trees and then not developing the
411 property for several years. Planning Director Haskett answered nothing changes about what they have to
412 submit for a lot disturbance in storm water management permit including they don't have to show any
413 trees on said survey. Also, nothing will prevent someone from obtaining a lot disturbance storm water
414 management permit and removing the trees and not developing it for 10 years.

415
416 Chairperson Ward asked what the criteria is for a lot disturbance permit. Planning Director Haskett
417 answered a survey that shows spot elevations in reference to mean sea level throughout the lot.

418

419 Chairperson Ward suggested also requiring a preliminary site plan be submitted with the lot disturbance
420 permit, this would show the property owner is more serious about developing the lot and not just
421 removing vegetation and having it undeveloped for years. He would even like to tie a time limit with the
422 lot disturbance and building permit requirement.

423

424 Planning Board Member Zehner stated that this is challenging.

425

426 Planning Board Member Charlie Reis stated presumably what's going on is that people are clearing the
427 lot to increase the value of the unbuilt lot.

428

429 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo suggested regulating it so nothing can be removed in the setbacks, perhaps
430 until construction starts.

431

432 Chairperson Ward would like preliminary site plan required too. He stated there needs to be a way to
433 move people towards not cutting trees until they are ready to build.

434

435 Planning Board Member Zehner stated if Chairperson Ward's recommendations cannot be achieved
436 within this ZTA then maybe the board should move this ZTA along as stipulated subject to commercial
437 only and he made that motion.

438

439 Planning Board Member Zehner stated he thinks this is serving a purpose.

440

441 Planning Board Member McClendon stated he would like to add there is a high interest in residential and
442 he doesn't think the board is ready for it tonight.

443

444 Chairperson Ward would like to see both residential and commercial approved together as he felt
445 residential would get pushed to the side.

446

447 Planning Board Member Zehner stated his rationale is the agenda for tonight's meeting where ZTA 24-02
448 is described for the public's benefit speaks about commercial only, it doesn't talk about this being
449 something for other districts and he believes it would be appropriate to only address what has been
450 advertised. Planning Board Member McClendon agreed.

451

452 Chairperson Ward thought it should be readvertised for both residential and commercial and brought
453 back.

454

455 Vice Chairperson Ward asked what properties would primarily be affected by this. Planning Director
456 Haskett stated properties owned by the Stone Family and Saga.

457 **MOTION: Planning Board Member Zehner moved to recommend approval of ZTA 24 as presented with**
458 **the only change is to correct a typo on page two line 30 an underlined "or", Seconded by Planning**
459 **Board Member McClendon. The motion passed 4-1; opposed by Chairperson Ward**

460

461 **By consensus, the Planning Board recommended that these requirements should apply to the**
462 **residential district.**

463

464 **Public Comment**

465 None

466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489

Planning Board Member Comments

Planning Board Member Zehner stated Dare County is holding Affordable Task Force Meetings and requested to add talks to the Planning Board's May agenda; talk about how we as a town intend to address housing and housing affordability within Town relative to that Initiative.

Vice Chairperson DiBernardo recommended adding the commercial design standards to a future agenda.

Chairperson Ward would also like to add PUD's and regulating accessory dwelling unit language.

Planning Board Member McClendon announced the Coastal Studies Institute will be holding an Open House on Saturday, April 20th.

Announcements

Planning Director Haskett announced the next meeting will be April 15, 2024.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Vice Chairperson DiBernardo, Seconded by Chairperson Ward. The time was 7:30 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

ATTEST:



Andy Ward, Chairperson



Respectfully submitted,



Sheila Kane, Town Clerk