

Amy H. Cannon
County Manager

Tracy Jackson
Assistant County Manager



Rawls Howard
Director

David Moon
Deputy Director

Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

MINUTES

January 21, 2021

Members Present

Mrs. Diane Wheatley – Chairman
Mr. Stan Crumpler – Vice-Chair
Mr. Carl Manning
Mr. Mark Williams - Remote
Mr. Thomas Lloyd
Mrs. Susan Moody
Mrs. Jami McLaughlin – Remote
Mr. Jordan Stewart – Remote
Mr. Gary Burton

Members Absent

Ms. Kasandra Herbert

Others Present

Mrs. Betty Lynd
Mr. Rawls Howard
Mrs. Laverne Howard
Mr. Rick Moorefield
County Attorney
Ms. Annie Melvin

I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mrs. Wheatley delivered the invocation and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF / ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

Mrs. Lynd advised the Board that Case P21-01 would be moved from Consent Items to Contested Items.

Mr. Burton made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to approve the agenda with the adjustments. Unanimous approval.

III. PUBLIC HEARING WITHDRAWAL / DEFERRAL

P21-02. REZONING OF 1.53+/- ACRES FROM R40A RESIDENTIAL TO R30 RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF THE INTERSECTION OF SR 2252 (CHICKEN FOOT ROAD) & MCCALL ROAD, SUBMITTED BY H & S INVESTMENTS OF NC, LLC (OWNERS) AND TIM EVANS (AGENT). **ON HOLD INDEFINATELY, APPLICANT REQUESTED**

P21-05: REZONING OF 72.80+/- ACRES FROM R6A RESIDENTIAL, RR RURAL RESIDENTIAL, R10 RESIDENTIAL AND M(P) PLANNED INDUSTRIAL TO R6A RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ODELL ROAD AND WEST OF NC 87 (N BRAGG BLVD), SUBMITTED BY VICTORIA MCLEOD (POWER OF ATTORNEY) ON BEHALF OF ELMA S. SMITH (OWNER) AND MICHAEL BLAKLEY ON BEHALF OF DRAFTING AND DESIGN SERVICES, INC. (AGENT). (COUNTY & SPRING LAKE) **DEFERRED TO FEBRUARY 16, 2021**

Mrs. Moody made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lloyd to approve the deferrals. Unanimous approval.

IV. ABSTENTIONS BY BOARD MEMBERS

There were none



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17, 2020

Mr. Burton made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crumpler to approve the minutes as submitted. Unanimous approval.

VI. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

Chair Wheatley read the welcome and rules of procedures.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING CONSENT ITEMS

REZONING CASES

- A. **P20-63.** REZONING OF 1.00+/- ACRES FROM M(P) PLANNED INDUSTRIAL TO R30 RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST SIDE OF SR 2212 (DOC BENNETT ROAD), NORTH OF INTERSTATE 95, SUBMITTED BY GERALD D. AND JAMES S. PONE (OWNERS).

In Case P20-63, the Planning & Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from M(P) Planned Industrial to R30 Residential and finds the request consistent with the South Central Land Use Plan (2015) designation of "Airport Oriented Uses". The "Airport Oriented Uses" designation is meant to protect the Airport from unwanted encroachment, protect human life and allow for further expansion. The site will be limited to a single-family dwelling unit or a similar residential use and would be less density/people on site than potential nonresidential uses. Approval of the request is also reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with existing zoning and land uses to the north and the site has access to public water.

In Case P20-63, Vice-Chair Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to recommend approval of the rezoning request from M(P) Planned Industrial to R30 Residential and finds the request consistent with the South Central Land Use Plan (2015) designation of "Airport Oriented Uses". The "Airport Oriented Uses" designation is meant to protect the Airport from unwanted encroachment, protect human life and allow for further expansion. The site will be limited to a single-family dwelling unit or a similar residential use and would be less density/people on site than potential nonresidential uses. Approval of the request is also reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with existing zoning and land uses to the north and the site has access to public water. Unanimous approval.

- B. **P21-04.** REZONING OF 1.50+/- ACRES FROM C2(P) PLANNED SERVICE AND RETAIL/CZ CONDITIONAL ZONING FOR TRADES CONTRACTOR ACTIVITIES TO C2(P) PLANNED SERVICE AND RETAIL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST SIDE OF SR 1243 (US HWY 301 SOUTH), NORTH OF SR 1126 (BROOKLYN CIRCLE), SUBMITTED BY AUGUSTIN ALVAREZ ON BEHALF OF AJD, LLC (OWNER) AND GEORGE M. ROSE (AGENT).

In Case P21-04, the Planning & Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from C2(P) Planned Service and Retail/CZ Conditional Zoning to C2(P) Planned Service and Retail and finds the request consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) designation of "Heavy Commercial". The "Heavy Commercial" designation allows for uses that provide for the shopping needs of the immediate



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

neighborhood, community, region, and the traveling public. Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with surrounding existing zoning and land uses.

In Case P21-04, Vice-Chair Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to recommend approval of the rezoning request from C2(P) Planned Service and Retail/CZ Conditional Zoning to C2(P) Planned Service and Retail and finds the request consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) designation of "Heavy Commercial". The "Heavy Commercial" designation allows for uses that provide for the shopping needs of the immediate neighborhood, community, region, and the traveling public. Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with surrounding existing zoning and land uses. Unanimous approval.

- C. **P21-06.** REZONING OF 0.47+/- ACRES FROM O&I(P) PLANNED OFFICE AND INSTITUTIONAL TO C1(P) PLANNED LOCAL BUSINESS OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 3533 NORTH MAIN STREET, SUBMITTED BY RONNIE GODBOLT ON BEHALF OF WORD OF TRUTH MINISTRY (OWNER) AND DEBRA E. JOAS (AGENT). (HOPE MILLS)

In Case P21-06, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning from O&I(P) Planned Office and Institutional to C1(P) Planned Local Business and find: a. The approval is an amendment to the adopted current Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b. The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the parcel meets the location criteria for "Light Commercial" as defined in the Land Use Policies Plan (2009) and the parcel was previously developed as a nonresidential use; c. And this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning on the N Main Street corridor and existing land uses.

In Case P21-06, Vice-Chair Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to recommend approval of the rezoning from O&I(P) Planned Office and Institutional to C1(P) Planned Local Business and find: a. The approval is an amendment to the adopted current Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) map; and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request; b. The following change in conditions was considered in amending the zoning ordinance (zoning map) to meet the development needs of the community: the parcel meets the location criteria for "Light Commercial" as defined in the Land Use Policies Plan (2009) and the parcel was previously developed as a nonresidential use; c. And this rezoning approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the district requested is in harmony with surrounding zoning on the N Main Street corridor and existing land uses. Unanimous approval.

- D. **P21-07.** REZONING OF 4.26+/- ACRES FROM C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL TO RR RURAL RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF SR 1842 (SHELTON BEARD ROAD) AND SR 1006 (MAXWELL ROAD), SUBMITTED BY NICHOLAS S. HARRELL (OWNER) & JAMES C. LONG JR. (AGENT).

In Case P21-07, the Planning & Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from C(P) Planned Commercial to RR Rural Residential and finds the request consistent with the Stedman Land Use Plan (2020) designation of "Suburban Density Residential" as it requires that any lot with this designation to be at least 20,000 square feet. Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with surrounding existing land uses and zoning.



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

In Case P21-07, Vice-Chair Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to recommend approval of the rezoning request from C(P) Planned Commercial to RR Rural Residential and finds the request consistent with the Stedman Land Use Plan (2020) designation of "Suburban Density Residential" as it requires that any lot with this designation to be at least 20,000 square feet. Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with surrounding existing land uses and zoning. Unanimous approval.

CONDITIONAL ZONING CASE

- E. **P20-51. REZONING OF 0.64+/- ACRES FROM R6A RESIDENTIAL TO C(P) PLANNED COMMERCIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST SIDE OF THE INTERSECTION OF NC 59 (S MAIN STREET) AND SR 3352 (BETSY ROSS DRIVE), SUBMITTED BY FREDRICK L. WALLACE (OWNER). (APPLICANT HAS REVISED REQUEST TO C2(P) PLANNED SERVICE AND RETAIL/CZ CONDITIONAL ZONING FOR MOTOR VEHICLE SALES**

In Case P20-51, the Planning & Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from R6A Residential to C2(P)/CZ Conditional Zoning for motor vehicle sales and finds the request consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) designation of "Mixed Use Development" as it allows for a mixture of residential, office and institutional uses as well as generally light commercial uses. C2(P) is designated as "light commercial" within the Land Use Policies Plan (2009). Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it will restrict the property to one permitted use, the property is located at a newly renovated interchange, and the request is in harmony with non-residential zoning in the surrounding area.

In Case P20-51, Vice-Chair Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Manning to recommend approval of the rezoning request from R6A Residential to C2(P)/CZ Conditional Zoning for motor vehicle sales and finds the request consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan (2013) designation of "Mixed Use Development" as it allows for a mixture of residential, office and institutional uses as well as generally light commercial uses. C2(P) is designated as "light commercial" within the Land Use Policies Plan (2009). Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it will restrict the property to one permitted use, the property is located at a newly renovated interchange, and the request is in harmony with non-residential zoning in the surrounding area. Unanimous approval.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING CONTESTED ITEMS

REZONING CASE

- F. **P20-47. REZONING OF 22.28+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO RR RURAL RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST AND SOUTHEAST QUADRANTS OF THE INTERSECTION OF SR 2028 (AVA ROAD) & SR 2027 (BEAVER DAM ROAD), SUBMITTED BY CARIN A. BUNCE (OWNER).**

Mrs. Lynd presented the photos and case information.

In Case P20-47, the Planning & Inspections staff recommends denial of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural to RR Rural Residential and find the request not consistent with the Stedman (2020) and Southeast Cumberland (2016) Land Use Plans which designates this parcel as "Agricultural" and "Farmland" respectively. Both designations encourage the preservation of farmland and rural character while only supporting higher densities if compatible with the surrounding neighborhood uses. Denial of the request is

Amy H. Cannon
County Manager

Tracy Jackson
Assistant County Manager



Rawls Howard
Director

David Moon
Deputy Director

Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

reasonable and in the public interest as the surrounding area is predominantly zoned A1 Agricultural and the subject property lacks access to public water and sewer that could support a higher density.

Mr. Lloyd asked if staff made any alternate zoning recommendations to the applicant.

Mrs. Lynd said not formally, the surrounding zoning is A1, R40 would be the threshold that staff would be comfortable with but felt it best for the Board to make that decision.

Mr. Lloyd asked if the Commissioner's sent it back to the Planning Board to consider that?

Mr. Howard stated that he thought they sent it back because the applicant was not present at the Planning Board meeting and when they showed up at the Commissioner's meeting, he acknowledged the fact that he was not at the Planning Board meeting and could not express his thoughts. So, the Commissioner's sent it back so he could speak directly to the Planning Board.

Mr. Manning asked if the applicant had any support with him at the Commissioner's meeting.

Mr. Howard stated that he did not see anyone speak on behalf of the case.

Mrs. Lynd said that it was just the applicant at the Commissioner's meeting.

Mr. Lloyd asked if the lots across the street from the subject property were two acre lots.

Mrs. Lynd said they were not two acre lots.

Mrs. Lynd read the applicants comment into the record. See attached.

Mr. Burton asked if this was in the Gen X contamination area.

Mrs. Lynd said she could not confirm that.

Mr. Lloyd asked if there was a map of the area.

Mrs. Lynd said all the information that would be available on that would be held by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

Public comment period closed.

Mr. Lloyd said like roads, schools are reactionary, they will not divulge information to do planning and will not work in future planning. Part of the reason for that is if people find out where a school is going it could inflate the price of the land. Most of the schools throughout the County have met or exceeded capacity.

Mrs. Lynd said she is not an expert, but that happens often. Mrs. Lynd also said that she has invited the planning people from the school system to possibly come speak next month to the Board but has not received a response yet.

Mrs. Moody made a motion seconded by Mr. Williams to follow the staff's recommendation

Mr. Lloyd made a substitute motion to approve R40A north of Ava Street, there were no seconds, the motion failed.



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

In Case P20-47, Mrs. Moody made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams to recommend denial of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural to RR Rural Residential and find the request not consistent with the Stedman (2020) and Southeast Cumberland (2016) Land Use Plans which designates this parcel as “Agricultural” and “Farmland” respectively. Both designations encourage the preservation of farmland and rural character while only supporting higher densities if compatible with the surrounding neighborhood uses. Denial of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the surrounding area is predominantly zoned A1 Agricultural and the subject property lacks access to public water and sewer that could support a higher density. The motion passed with Mr. Lloyd and Mrs. McLaughlin voting in opposition.

- G. **P21-03. REZONING OF 2.06+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO R40A RESIDENTIAL OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 6524 CEDAR OAKS CIRCLE, SUBMITTED BY VICKI LISZEWSKI (OWNER) & CLAYTON HOMES (AGENT).**

Mrs. Lynd presented the photos and case information.

In Case P21-03, the Planning and Inspections staff recommends denial of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40A Residential and find the request is not consistent with the South Central Land Use Plan (2015) which calls for “Low Density Residential” at this location. The “Low Density Residential” area designation allows for a density of 2.2 to 6 units/acre, however, the plan desires only stick-built homes. Staff further finds that denial of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the R40A district is not in harmony with the surrounding zoning and existing land uses.

Mrs. Lynd said that there were no public comments submitted for this case.

Mr. Crumpler asked to see the land use map again, Mr. Crumpler said it looked like there was a mobile home park already.

Mrs. Lynd said that would be considered a mobile home subdivision because it is one home for each lot.

Chair Wheatley said if everybody in there decides they want the same thing, you now have a much larger area with these homes on it, and this is in Grays Creek so now we have contaminated water.

Mr. Lloyd said that he felt it would be spot zoning.

Mrs. Lynd stated it would be a donut hole of R40A inside of the neighborhood.

Mr. Manning asked why staff denied the request.

Mrs. Lynd said it was a combination of things. It's on well and septic, it's already a developed subdivision, it's not a publicly maintained road, this would allow a second dwelling unit on the lot and could set a precedent for the neighborhood.

Mr. Burton said he was familiar with this road and it was petitioned to be entered into the system, but it can't be because it wasn't constructed to NC Department of Transportation (NC DOT) standards.

Mrs. Lynd said that if the road cannot be maintained by NC DOT, it must be maintained by the property owners, and it is required to be on the plats and deeds that are created for these lots.



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

In Case P21-03, Mr. Lloyd made a motion, seconded by Mr. Burton to recommend denial of the rezoning from A1 Agricultural to R40A Residential and find the request is not consistent with the South Central Land Use Plan (2015) which calls for "Low Density Residential" at this location. The "Low Density Residential" area designation allows for a density of 2.2 to 6 units/acre, however, the plan desires only stick-built homes. The board further finds that denial of the request is reasonable and in the public interest because the R40A district is not in harmony with the surrounding zoning and existing land uses. Unanimous approval.

- H. **P21-01. REZONING OF 30.10+/- ACRES FROM A1 AGRICULTURAL TO R40 RESIDENTIAL/CZ CONDITIONAL ZONING FOR A 26 LOT ZERO LOT LINE SUBDIVISION OR TO A MORE RESTRICTIVE ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 2647 & 2673 WADE STEDMAN ROAD, SUBMITTED BY JAMES S. & BEVERLY L. FISHER (OWNERS) & BEN STOUT (AGENT).**

Mrs. Lynd presented the photos and case information.

In Case P21-01, the Planning & Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural to R40 Residential/CZ Conditional Zoning for a 26 lot zero lot line subdivision and finds the request consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan which calls for "Rural Areas" and the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) designation of "Rural Density Residential" as it requires that any lot within this designation to be at least 20,000 square feet. Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in harmony with surrounding existing land uses, zoning, and lot sizes.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the applicant was not doing zero lot line for lot size.

Mrs. Lynd said that was correct. At the acreage amount, taking out fifteen percent to account for right-of-way, he would have been allowed twenty-seven lots and he has asked for twenty-six with the common area and the smallest lot size is .92 acres.

Mr. Lloyd said that he read the many emails that were sent, drainage is one of the issues, and believed the applicant had a storm water permit as part of the record.

Mrs. Lynd said she did have a public comment by the applicant that will be read into the record.

Mr. Lloyd asked if the retention ponds were shown up near Wade Stedman Road.

Mrs. Lynd said yes, and that he could use common area as a retention pond.

Public comment period opened.

Mrs. Lynd read the public comments into the record and included the addresses of those who provided that information and entered the petitions and other relevant documents that were submitted. Please see attached.

Mr. Lloyd asked since so many of the comments referenced no land use plan for Bethany, is not half of this development in an Eastover Land Use Plan where it is two and a half years old.

Mrs. Lynd responded the subject property is covered by two land use plans, technically there is land use plan for the entire subject property. The Eastover Plan covers the west side which was done in 2018 and the east side is governed by the 2030 plan. There's just not a small detailed area plan.

Amy H. Cannon
County Manager

Tracy Jackson
Assistant County Manager



Rawls Howard
Director

David Moon
Deputy Director

Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

Mr. Lloyd said that the small, detailed area plan of Eastover does address the western portion of this property.

Mrs. Lynd said that was correct.

Chair Wheatley asked why there was discussion about Bethany needing a land use plan.

Mrs. Lynd said that the Bethany Plan is currently in drafting with staff and public input and it would include the part that is currently covered by the 2030 plan.

Mrs. Lynd continued reading the comments.

Public comment period closed.

Mr. Lloyd talked about the drawbridge effect when people move into an area and populate it and don't want it to grow anymore, he pointed out a subdivision on the map, over sixty lots, and the lots were approved in 2000 and are less than two acres, he pointed out another development that had been approved within the last few years. He also noted that a lot of the addresses that came from the comments and were on the petitions were coming from people who are against the request and are living in the subdivisions that he pointed out and are living on lots that are smaller than two acre lots. He said he just wanted to point that out. He also noted that some of the addresses on the petitions, are more than two miles away from the subject property.

Mr. Stewart said the Bethany area is all interconnected as far as four miles away, it all bottlenecks into the same areas to get to Fayetteville. Mr. Jordan thinks this request is more thought out than the last plan and that the applicant is trying to do everything just right. With the fact that there is overwhelming opposition maybe the board should table or reconsider the request until a later date.

Mr. Crumpler asked if it is known why the applicant is asking for a conditional zoning.

Mrs. Lynd said she thought it was because they wanted to have the ability to negotiate.

Mr. Crumpler asked if the roads built to service this subdivision would be built to DOT standards.

Mrs. Lynd said they have been submitted as public right-of-way so they will have to build them to DOT standards and have petitioned to DOT to accept maintenance of them.

Mr. Crumpler said that a lot of the complaints they heard were about water runoff. He is a little concerned that they are building a retention pond in the front of one and leaving open at the back of the other section because it's obviously too wet to build on and asked if DEQ is on board with this retention pond, and if the retention pond gets full where is the water going.

Mrs. Lynd responded that the applicant submitted the Notice of Intent for his construction of his stormwater and stated that it would be in the areas labeled CA1. As part of their conditions, they will have to provide proof of any stormwater management plan.

Chair Wheatley said that other issues that come up later will be who is going to take care of the retention ponds.

Amy H. Cannon
County Manager

Tracy Jackson
Assistant County Manager



Rawls Howard
Director

David Moon
Deputy Director

Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

Mrs. Lynd said that because they are doing common area, they will have to have a homeowner's association.

Mr. Crumpler said that he was concerned about creating a possible civil matter where later adjoining neighbors will have to sue to get relief from what may be created from this, because now there will be twenty-six driveways and roofs where water will run off.

Mr. Lloyd said that most municipalities have their own stormwater ordinances for the very reasons Mr. Crumpler mentioned and the State does Phase II stormwater for the rural areas and they will have to be permitted for that and this was, towns have a few more problems because there is a lot more impervious surface and we have to rely on the State, just like we have to rely on them for the road network. Mr. Lloyd said he was pretty sure that DEQ reviewed and approved their stormwater, he called and asked the developer about that. Mr. Lloyd said this is plan compliant to a plan that was done two and a half years ago that had very little participation, which is usually what happens.

Mr. Crumpler said he had concerns about that many septic tanks in the area and asked if the applicant submitted soil evaluations.

Mrs. Lynd said as part of the requirements for approval he would have to get wastewater approval from the Health Department.

Mr. Lloyd brought up the difficulties with this type of meeting and not having engineers or the applicant present and having to speculate.

Chair Wheatley asked if it was possible to defer the case.

Mr. Howard read a section of the ordinance on policies for meetings and when a vote is made.

Mr. Moorefield said he thought it would be legal for the Board to recess this case to a date certain to have people present. The Board of Commissioners has been very particular about affording people the right to be heard.

The Board asked Mr. Stewart, as the Stedman Representative, what his feelings were on this case.

Mr. Stewart said that his feelings have been reflected in the opposition's comments, that is what he has been contacted with. This board has been reliant on plans, the Bethany Plan is underway, he thinks if the public had input on the Bethany Plan, they would designate this as A1 or farmland. Farmland can be timber, livestock, etc. Mr. Stewart suggested that most of the input the board would get would be to leave everything A1 and is onboard with Mr. Lloyd's comments that people do not welcome development even when it's done responsibly. The plan and the developer in this case seem to be doing everything responsibly.

In Case P21-01, Mrs. Moody made a recommendation, seconded by Mr. Lloyd to recommend approval of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural to R40 Residential/CZ Conditional Zoning for a 26 lot zero lot line subdivision and finds the request consistent with the 2030 Growth Vision Plan which calls for "Rural Areas" and the Eastover Land Use Plan (2018) designation of "Rural Density Residential" as it requires that any lot within this designation to be at least 20,000 square feet. Approval of the request is reasonable and in the public interest as the district requested is in

Amy H. Cannon
County Manager

Tracy Jackson
Assistant County Manager



Rawls Howard
Director

David Moon
Deputy Director

Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

harmony with surrounding existing land uses, zoning, and lot sizes. The motion failed with Mr. Williams, Mr. Burton, Mr. Stewart, Chair Wheatley, and Vice-Chair Crumpler voting in opposition. The request was deemed to have a denial recommendation.

IX. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Mrs. McLaughlin advised the Board that the Nominations Committee nominated Vice-Chair Crumpler for Chairman and Mr. Thomas Lloyd as Vice-Chair to finish the term of the departing Chair Wheatley. This will be presented at the February Planning Board meeting for a vote.

X. DISCUSSION

- ZONING AND SCHOOL ZONING

Board discussed how input is received from the school board and what their role is and how they interact with the Planning Board. A request was made that someone from the school board come to a meeting but there has not been a response yet.

- DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

Mr. Howard advised the Board about the status of the historic grant that the Planning Department submitted to the State.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.