

**MINUTES**  
**The Regular Meeting of the**  
**Aberdeen Planning Board**

March 15, 2012  
Thursday, 6:00 p.m.

Robert N. Page Municipal Building  
Aberdeen, North Carolina

The Aberdeen Planning Board met Thursday, January 19, 2012 at 6:00 p.m. for their Regular Board Meeting. Members present were Chairman Johnny Ransdell, Bob Rigsby, Joe Dannelley, and Janet Peele. Vice Chair Sarah Ahmad and Owen Gallagher were unable to attend the meeting. Others in attendance were Senior Planner Pamela Graham and Permit Technician Jenni Secrist.

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Approval of Agenda

Staff recommends changing Special Meeting to Regular Meeting.

Bob Rigsby made a motion to approve the agenda with the staff recommendations.

Seconded By Janet Peele

**Vote:** Unanimous

3. Approval of Minutes:

a. Approval of Minutes from the Regular Meeting of June 23, 2011.

Bob Rigsby made a motion to approve the minutes of June 23, 2011.

Joe Dannelley Seconded

**Vote:** Unanimous

b. Approval of Minutes for the Special Called Meeting of September 29, 2011.

Mr. Ransdell pointed out on page three, third paragraph, where it talks about Highway 5 it needs to be changed to Roseland Road.

Janet Peele made a motion to approve the minutes of September 29, 2011 with the road name corrections.

Joe Dannelley Seconded.

**Vote:** Unanimous

c. Approval of Minutes for the Regular Meeting of January 19, 2012.

Changes needed to be made:

- Paragraph c, page 4: Mr. Dannelley needs to be added to replace Joe.
- Mrs. Liles needs to be substituted for Kathy.

- Page 2: disable needs to be replaced with decibel and Condition needs to be replaced with Conditional.
- Page 3 third paragraph from the bottom: jurisdiction needs to be replaced with jurisdictions.
- Add “Roberts Rules of Order” to the seventh bullet point under the discussion of the Rules of Procedure.

Bob Rigsby made a motion to approve the minutes of January 19, 2012 with correction.

Janet Peele Seconded

**Vote: Unanimous**

#### 4. New Business

##### a. Unified Development Ordinance Amendment UDO#12-02 Regarding Building Exteriors

Ms. Graham presented the staff report. She also stated the reason behind the needed changes is to correct an inconsistency in the Unified Development Ordinance. Two different sections had two different sets of standards and staff is recommending removal of the lower standard and replacing it with the higher standard.

Mrs. Peele asked if the language included roof material. Ms. Graham stated it did not that is was just the wall façade.

Mr. Ransdell asked what the basis behind these restrictions are. Ms. Graham stated for appearance purposes. She stated the new Dollar General presently under construction on Highway 211 is the reason staff found the inconsistency in the language.

Mr. Dannelley asked until the Board of Commissioners signs off on this language if another project comes in they can still follow the lesser of the two standards. Ms. Graham said yes. He also asked if all future amendments will have to follow this same procedure of a public hearing or if a vote could be called in. Ms. Graham stated a public hearing is required.

Items of concern for the Board:

Mr. Ransdell feels that metal buildings are an acceptable form of construction and feels the language is overly restrictive. He pointed out there are several buildings in Town with viable businesses that would not fit these standards including the Town’s Public Works Building. He believes it is a misdirected idea that appearance is the reasoning behind this language. He stated there are many acceptable looking metal buildings and presented photos for examples. Metal building can have 50 year finishes that are much better than the architectural concrete mentioned in the language which is basically stucco on foam. He feels that metal should be as viable an option as any other material.

Mrs. Peele stated that metal is fire proof and inexpensive and would rather see a metal building over a wood building that has been left to deteriorate.

Mr. Ransdell said the exemptions are meant only for industrial use and you have to prove that other materials would be unsafe or impractical. What is considered impractical? He believes the language is too vague.

Mrs. Peele stated one thing that should be considered is the language stating "visible from any road way" she feels that this is too constrictive especially to buildings with front, side and rear visibility to public right of ways. She stated her building would not fit this standard meaning if something were to happen to her building she would not be able to put it back as is. She is only able to get it insured for what she has and if she is required to conform to this standard she would not be able to afford to rebuild if something were to happen to her building. Ms. Graham stated if she would like to make any additions to her building she would have to follow these standards. Mrs. Peele stated you cannot insure more than what is already there and she thinks that someone should be able to put back what is there if it is removed or destroyed.

Mr. Dannelley questioned what we would do if the Planning Board did not approve of this language. Ms. Graham stated you can recommend other language if the Board can agree as a majority. Mr. Dannelley asked how many applications does staff see that would be affected by this language. Ms. Graham stated that the Dollar General was the only open file presently that has metal façade. Mr. Dannelley asked if the more stringent language could have been considered a deal breaker. Ms. Graham stated she did not know, at first the applicants did not see the metal building language at all and planned for an all metal building. After realizing the inconsistencies the applicant agreed to put 100% non metal material on the front and 30% on the sides.

Mr. Ransdell asked if someone like Ms. Peele for example wanted to make changes to her building is there a threshold or trigger point where she would have to bring it into full compliance with this language. Ms. Graham read the nonconforming language in the UDO.

Mr. Dannelley stated if someone is renovating or repairing nonconforming buildings he does not think they should have to conform to this language. Mrs. Peele stated at some point in time you may have to replace the exterior. She does not think that we should approve something that would discourage renovations. Ms. Graham stated that is also addressed in the nonconforming language and read that to the Board as well.

Mr. Ransdell stated that he feels this language should not apply to all buildings in all districts for all situations. He does not see where there is anything wrong with metal buildings and the Town should not be responsible for saying what looks nice and what does not.

Mrs. Peele stated she does not have a problem with the language addressing the front of the building. She does have an issue with the sides and the back and feels you can use landscape screening to shield the façade but the landscaping would not be mature enough at the beginning.

Mr. Ransdell gave an example of a major industry that would like to put up a 250,000 square foot building in the industrial park that could be visible from

several roads. This language could potentially be a deal breaker. He feels this language is deterring businesses like this from moving to Aberdeen.

Mrs. Peele asked if the 60% language was used prior to the UDO. Ms. Graham stated yes it was and it was replaced by the 100% language prior to the UDO but is not sure at this time of the exact date the language was changed. Mrs. Peele stated she understood why you would not want to see a metal building in the historic district but would like to see language that would be acceptable in areas like Highway 5 or more industrialized districts.

With no further discussion a motion was made.

Bob Rigsby made a motion to table Unified Development Ordinance Amendment UDO#12-02 Regarding Building Exteriors until further clarification can be made. Janet Peele Seconded.

**Vote:** Unanimous

Mr. Ransdell stated he would like to know how this language would be applied to existing structures and he is concerned with the all encompassing nature of the Ordinance and believes it should be looked at differently for commercial and industrial. He would also like to know a little more about the bases on why metal buildings are singled out.

Mr. Dannelley would like to see some language for 100% only on the front and 50% on the sides as being the criteria, upping it from the 25%.

b. Unified Development Ordinance Amendment UDO#12-03 Regarding Window and Door Signs

Ms. Graham stated the language submitted was language previously in the Code of Ordinance and was omitted from the Unified Development Ordinance unintentionally.

Mr. Ransdell asked about the language concerning interior door and window glass.

Ms. Graham stated the language was a little vague.

Mr. Dannelley stated a business owner could weather proof signage and place it on the exterior of the glass and would be considered in compliance if the language is approved as submitted.

Mrs. Peele suggested removing the word interior all together.

Mr. Dannelley agreed the word interior is unnecessary and both the exterior and interior glass of the windows or doors should be regulated.

Mr. Rigsby made a motion to approve Unified Development Ordinance Amendment UDO#12-03 regarding windows and door signs.

Motion expires with no second.

Janet Peele made a motion to approve Unified Development Ordinance Amendment UDO#12-03 regarding windows and door signs if the language is changed to all window and door signs that can be viewed by the public.

Bob Rigsby Seconded

**Vote:** Unanimous

- c. Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment UDO#12-04, the Use of More Stringent Standards.

Ms. Graham explained the language was submitted in case other discrepancies may arise like the metal building language. This basically stated if there is a discrepancy the more stringent of the two languages will apply.

Mrs. Peele questioned if this language is approved does that eliminate any other discussion of metal buildings.

Ms. Graham said she did not believe so because we are going to come to an agreement on one standard for metal buildings that appears one time in the code.

Janet Peele made a motion to approve Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment UDO#12-04, the Use of More Stringent Standards as submitted.

Bod Rigsby Seconded.

Joe Dannelley made a motion that the UDO#12-04 amendment is not inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Land Development Plan

Janet Peele Seconded.

**Vote:** Unanimous

Bob Rigsby made a motion that the UDO#12-03 amendment is not inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Land Development Plan

Janet Peele Seconded.

**Vote:** Unanimous

5. Other Business

With no other discussion a motion was made by Janet Peele to adjourn the regular meeting for the Planning Board.

6. Meeting Adjourned: 7:15pm

---

Johnny Ransdell, Chairman

---

Jenni Secrist, Secretary