

Minutes  
The Special Meeting of the  
Watershed Review Board

May 16, 2013  
Thursday, 6:00 p.m.

Robert N. Page Municipal Building  
Aberdeen, North Carolina

The Aberdeen Watershed Review Board met on Thursday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. for a Watershed Review Board Meeting. Members present were Chairman Johnny Ransdell, Vice Chair Sarah Ahmad, Joe Dannelley, Janet Peele, and Raymond Lee. Alternates Tim Marcham and Peter Koch were also in attendance. Planning staff members in attendance were Planning Director Kathy Liles, Senior Planner Pam Graham, and Permit Technician Amy Fulp. Others in attendance were Allen Brooks, Latasha Johnson, and Shane Sanders.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Johnny Ransdell called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. New Business

- a. Consideration of Watershed Authorization for Conditional Use Permit CU #13-01 for a 152 lot subdivision on property owned by J. Speight Investment, LLC south of Hwy 5 in the WS-II Watershed Protection Area.

Planning Director Liles stated that the Watershed Review Board is the Planning Board sitting in a different function. Their purpose is to focus on the Watershed Protection Areas, and when we have development in these areas what are the appropriate measures to take. The main objective is to make sure that the quality of our drinking water is protected, and the way to do this is to look at density of development and storm water management.

Planning Director Liles stated that the property is not within the Highway Corridor Overlay District; however, it is located within a WS-II Watershed Protection Area. Residential developments are allowed uses within the overlay districts but density is limited to one dwelling unit per acre. It is also limited to no more than 12% built upon area for the project for single family residential uses.

Planning Director Liles stated that the project before the Board has been proposed by J. Speight Investments, LLC. The project is for a 152 lot subdivision on 152.22 acres and the applicant proposes 152 dwelling units. Minimum lot sizes are not applicable to single family development in which Watershed clustering is used. Cluster development is defined as “the grouping of buildings in order to conserve land resources and provide for innovation in the design of the project.” Although densities are consistent with R20-16, for the purposes of Watershed protection, clustering is being used for the purposes defined above.

Planning Director Liles stated what the Watershed Review Board needs to consider this evening is a cluster function for Watershed. Whenever there is a subdivision, in a Watershed Protection Area, the Watershed Review Board has to approve that piece of it. The Chairman of the Planning Board will actually sign the plat before it gets recorded.

Planning Director Liles stated the project is a 152 lot subdivision to be built in 6 phases. There is more than 25% open space and that is one of the requirements of the UDO if you are in the Watershed Protection Area and exercising the Cluster Development option. Everything else on the property, which is not built upon, has to be preserved in a natural condition. In this particular case and design they meet this requirement for having the open space set aside.

Planning Director Liles stated that two other things that they must do, when building a Cluster Watershed Development, is it must be designed and located to direct storm water away from surface waters, and it has to minimize stormwater runoff to receiving waters.

Planning Director Liles stated that the other thing the applicant is proposing to do is use sidewalks on just one side of the road, and that minimizes the amount of built upon area that you would have within the Watershed Protection Area.

Planning Director Liles gave the Staff recommendations for the Watershed Review Board to consider approval subject to the following:

1. Lots are subject to clustering under Watershed Provisions. A maximum of 152 lots are approved for the parent tract. No further subdivision of the parent tract is allowed.
2. A drainage system shall be designed that diverts stormwater away from surface waters and incorporates best management practices to minimize water quality impacts. As such, sidewalks should only be installed on one side of the street and curb and gutter is not recommended for use. Low impact stormwater design shall be used as recommended by the UDO. The project is not approved for high density option.
3. A copy of an approved Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plan shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to site disturbance.
4. The overall density of the project is one dwelling unit per acre. No Special Non-residential Intensity Allocation applies.
5. The remainder of the tract shall remain in a vegetated or natural state.
6. The final plat must be signed by the Chairman of the Watershed Review Board before recordation.

Sarah Ahmad asked about sidewalks in general and the difference between the concrete sidewalk on one side, a natural sidewalk, and the impact. Planning Director Liles stated that what they really wanted to move away from is the compacted gravel, asphalt, or concrete. A mulch sidewalk could be considered. There could be a condition to allow for a second sidewalk, at the discretion of the Planning Board and the Board of Commissioners, subject to it not being a hard surface.

Joe Dannelley asked if they are looking at a two phase approval process based on the agenda. Are they going to look at the Watershed implications first and then move forward based on a decision there, and then move into the regular agenda? Planning Director Liles stated yes, it will be a two phase approval process.

Planning Director Liles stated the way the Staff report was written, it is addressed to both the Watershed Review Board and the Planning Board. There is a section on Overlay Districts and Watershed Protection Area; this applies specifically to Watershed issues. There are also Staff recom-

mendations for the Watershed Review Board and Staff recommendations for the Planning Board.

Raymond Lee asked what they were trying to approve. Planning Director Liles stated they are trying to determine if this project can move forward as proposed and be consistent with the Watershed Protection standards of the UDO.

Planning Director Liles made a suggestion to close the meeting of the Watershed Review Board and move into the meeting for the Planning Board. The Planning Board should then be able to go over the whole subdivision process and then reopen as the Watershed Review Board.

Raymond Lee made a motion to close the Watershed Review Board, seconded by Joe Dannelley. Motion unanimously carried.

---

Amy Fulp, Permit Technician  
Minutes were completed in  
Draft form on July 19, 2013

---

Johnny Ransdell, Chairperson  
Minutes were approved  
on September 19, 2013