



Planning, Development & Inspections

TEL (PLANNING) 919 856 6310
TEL (INSPECTIONS) 919 856 6222

A Division of Community Services
P.O. Box 550 • Raleigh, NC 27602
www.wakegov.com

MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING BOARD - JUNE 1, 2022

LOCATION: Wake County Justice Center, 301 S. Salisbury St., Room 2700, Raleigh, NC

MEMBERS PRESENT:

1. Mr. Asa Fleming (Chair)
2. Mr. Thomas Wells (Vice Chair)
3. Mr. David Adams
4. Mr. Jason Barron
5. Ms. Brenna Booker-Rouse
6. Mr. Amos Clark
7. Mr. Danny Kadis
8. Dr. Kamal Kolappa
9. Mr. Ted Van Dyk

MEMBERS ABSENT:

1. Mr. Bill Jenkins.

COUNTY STAFF:

1. Ms. Jenny Coats
2. Mr. Steven Finn
3. Mr. Tim Gardiner
4. Mr. Keith Lankford
5. Mr. Tim Maloney
6. Mr. Josh McClellan
7. Mr. Akul Nishawala
8. Ms. Sharon Peterson
9. Ms. Beth Simmons

COUNTY ATTORNEY:

1. Ms. Allison Cooper, Deputy County Attorney

GUESTS:

1. Ms. Erin Catlett, Attorney Fox Rothchild

-
1. **Meeting Called to Order:** Mr. Fleming called the Planning Board meeting to order at 1:31 pm.
 2. **Petitions and Amendments:** None.

3. **Approval May 4, 2022, Minutes:** Motion to approve the minutes from May 4th, 2022, was made by Mr. Barron and seconded by Dr. Kolappa. The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.
4. **Proposed Zoning Map Amendment – PLG-RZ-003482-2022**
Request to rezone a 98.54-acre parcel located at 7226 Buckhorn-Duncan Road from Residential-80 (R-80) to Residential-40 (R-40).

Presentation by staff: Mr. Keith Lankford, Planner III

Mr. Lankford began by explaining that the Wake County General Classifications map designates this area as Holly Springs' Short-Range Urban Services Area (SRUSA). SRUSAs are defined as areas within the county's zoning jurisdiction that are intended to be urbanized-probably within the next ten years.

The PLANWake Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2021 and designated this area as Rural. The petitioner, quoting from the plan, has noted that "The Rural designation is applied to the least-developed, lowest-density residential and natural lands in Wake County including areas in proximity (such as the subject parcel) to the Harris Lake/Nuclear Power Plant. The Plan recommendation is for residential density up to one dwelling per acre with building heights of 1-3 stories, two lane roads, swales, and/or agriculture uses and/or community service facilities supporting surrounding residential/farm activities."

In addition to the general PLANWake Comprehensive Plan, there are several area land use plans that were developed for different portions of Wake County. One of these area plans is the Southwest Area Land Use Plan Update which was adopted in 2007. The subject property is currently designated on the Southwest Area Land Use Plan Update as appropriate for "Residential of up to 1 [Dwelling] Unit Per Acre", which corresponds to the requested Residential-40 zoning district (however the property is currently zoned Residential-80). [It should be noted that a small strip of the northwestern corner of the subject property (approximately 810 feet long by 20 feet wide) is already zoned R-40. This is apparently a residual deed overlap from the adjacent property that is now within Holly Springs' extra-territorial jurisdiction.]

The proposed rezoning would allow for the construction of approximately 50 single-family homes. However, it should be noted that any decision on a rezoning petition must be based upon all possible uses (identical in the R-40 and R-80 zoning districts). The requested Residential-40 zoning allows for a limited range of nonresidential uses such as churches, schools and daycares that are generally consistent with the Area Land Use Plan's residential designation, are reasonable, and appropriate for the area. Any future use on this property will have to be determined to be consistent with the Area Land Use Plan via a site-specific development plan before it can be approved.

In accordance with the North Carolina General Statutes and the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance, any proposed rezoning should be consistent with the PLANWake Comprehensive Plan. It is the planning staff's professional opinion that the rezoning petition for Residential-40 zoning, the stated proposed use of approximately 50 single-family homes, and the permissible range of uses would be consistent with both the general PLANWake Comprehensive Plan and the Southwest Area Land Use Plan Update, are reasonable, and appropriate for the area.

Staff review of the Petitioner's Application

Mr. Lankford stated that the petitioner has indicated that the proposed rezoning and subsequent development of approximately 50 single-family detached homes in a cluster subdivision will benefit adjacent and surrounding properties because "property values will be enhanced and preserved by this neighboring property being developed in a low-density, low-impact manner." The petitioner also noted "a cluster R-40 residential subdivision on the tract will allow reasonable housing density while still preserving considerable open space and preserving buffers along the stream areas bisecting the property."

Staff agrees with the petitioner in their statement that the requested rezoning "would encourage and allow its development for low-density residential purposes complementary to the semi-rural character of the surrounding neighborhood. The limited number of homes would have minimal impact upon the local road network. Buckhorn-Duncan Road is operating well below its design capacity (i.e., 2,800 vehicles per day versus 12,000 vehicles per day)."

The petitioner also noted that the "requested rezoning is reasonable, in the public interest and advances the public health safety and welfare [for the following reasons]:

1. By tending to meet an ongoing increased need for housing, increasing the housing stock available for purchase, thus helping to stabilize housing prices.
2. By allowing a low-density subdivision preserving natural areas and protecting water quality.
3. By providing a transition between nearby R-30 zoned areas to the north and east and the Harris Lake area, as well as to the Martin Marietta quarry property to the South.
4. By efficiently utilizing an existing community water supply system without directly impacting the capacity of Holly Springs and Fuquay Varina municipal water and sewer systems to serve higher urban densities within their primary corporate limits.
5. By having minimal impact upon the existing area road network.

The relevant Area Land Use Plan goals that have been identified by the petitioner are:

- Goal # 3--To encourage the development of communities which provide adequate land for anticipated demands, in a pattern which allows a mixture of uses.
- Goal # 4--To encourage maintenance of open space, scenic aspects of rural areas, entranceways to rural areas and transition areas between urban areas.
- Goal # 7--To ensure that the land use plan and transportation plan mutually support each other.
- Goal # 8--To ensure that the County always protects the property rights of landowners.

Town Input

With respect to input from the Town of Holly Springs, Mr. Lankford reported that as part of the Wake County planning staff's review of any rezoning request, they consult with the relevant municipality whose Urban Services Area that the subject property lies within to allow them the opportunity to provide courtesy review comments. The subject property is classified as the Town of Holly Springs' Short-Range Urban Services Area (SRUSA).

Holly Springs' planning staff provided feedback (see attached) indicating that "The proposed rezoning to R-40 residential would limit the Town's ability to realize the long-term land use vision of the Town outlined in the Comprehensive Plan." The town's planning staff noted that "the proposed density is less than the density suggested by our Future Land Use Map, which is based upon the idea that public water and sewer utilities would be extended to this area." In their comments, the Town staff

prefers properties in the SRUSA be developed in compliance with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and under the standards in the Town's UDO. This includes the Town's standards for lot size and density, street network and sidewalk design, open space, and utility design.

However, the petitioner has had discussions with the Town staff (see below) and has reported that the town has no plan to extend municipal services within the foreseeable future. The result of discussions with the town staff was that the subject property would connect to the existing Buckhorn Creek Phase 1 community water system directly across Buckhorn-Duncan Road with the provision of two additional wells and would be served by individual septic systems for each lot.

The petitioner also noted that the Town of Holly Springs controls a cross county Harnett County water transmission line (as opposed to a service line) within the Buckhorn Duncan Road right of way; the property owner has inquired under what circumstances, if any, permission to connect the subject property to the transmission line would be granted.

Currently, the Town of Holly Springs does not allow water connections without concurrent annexation. Taking Margaret Hall Floyd's property into Holly Springs would be a satellite annexation and it appears there is no interest or Town rationale to extend other required municipal services to 50 +/- homes this far from principal corporate limits.

If approved, the proposed development would be served by individual on-site septic systems approved by the Wake County Health Department because municipal gravity sewer is not available. A pump station and force main would be required, as well as an upgrade to one or more existing regional pump stations.

Presentation by Petitioner: Ms. Erin Catlett, Attorney for Fox Rothchild

Ms. Catlett introduced herself as the legal representative for the applicant for PLG-RZ-003482-2022. She also introduced Mr. Sanford Bailey and indicated they would be willing to answer questions. Ms. Catlett indicated that the engineer for the proposed rezoning was unable to attend but they would address any questions to the best of their ability. After reiterating that the request is to change rezoning from R-80 to R-40 for a 50-home low density cluster subdivision, Ms. Catlett offered to address questions.

Mr. Van Dyk asked for clarification of how many acres were in the overall parcel and what portion would be considered for the subdivision? Ms. Catlett responded that the parcel is 98 acres and Mr. Bailey indicated that the section being considered at this meeting was 63 acres. Mr. Barron asked if only the 63 acres were being rezoned and Ms. Catlett responded that all 98 acres were being rezoned but that the 50-home subdivision would be located on 63 acres.

Mr. Barron noted that because this is a general use case, there is a limit to the questions the board would be able to ask, however he was curious about the discussions with the Town of Holly Springs pursuant to Mr. Lankford's indication the town would not immediately be able to provide municipal services. Ms. Catlett explained that they met with the Town of Holly Springs in April and received comments the week prior to this meeting. They are awaiting a definitive answer but are willing to work with the Town to meet all requirements. Mr. Barron mentioned that the board does not have the ability to adhere to conditions or recommendations in a general use case.

Mr. Lankford indicated that initially the Town of Holly Springs had received the request for the subdivision before realizing the planning division had to resolve several points first. The Town only recently provided comments but have indicated a willingness to work with the applicants to revise the subdivision.

Mr. Clark asked about the floodplain running through the parcel, how much of the area the stream shown on the site plan covered. Ms. Catlett and Mr. Bailey indicated that the engineer has the exact information and will provide it to them at a later date. Ms. Catlett added that petitioner is committed to maintaining the environment during any development.

Public Hearing

Mr. Fleming opened the floor for public comment at 2:11 p.m.

Citizens in Opposition

Mr. John Burt introduced himself as the owner of the farm property to the south of the proposed rezoning area. Mr. Burt said that he supported the right to develop the land as they see fit, but he objects to a high-density development. He expressed serious concerns about the flow of water through streams that run adjacent to and into his farmland and their increased capacity to overflow. By Mr. Burt's estimation, Buckhorn Creek averages six inches of water flow daily. His property is located on the banks of the creek, separated by five to six feet from the farm soil, but when an inch or two of rain causes the level to rise, erosion of his pastures is common. Even with tree buffers for water conservation, the soil surrounding the creek is problematic. With the increased impervious surfaces, he considered the likelihood of his land to see flooding and become unusable regardless of a proposed water retention system.

Mr. Burt expressed a concern that once the subdivision has been built, the water flow will continue to be his problem. He referred to a letter submitted by Ms. Joanie Bowden supporting his opposition.

Mr. Wells asked about the direction of the water flow through his property and about the existence of a quarry on the southernmost portion of his land. Mr. Burt indicated the water flows across his property and then down, ultimately into Harris Lake.

Mr. Kolappa asked about the adverse impact the increased waterflow might cause in a quantitative sense. Mr. Burt responded that as he has grown up on the farm, much of the tree buffer has eroded and that sections of his pasture are now only floodplain, but that he did not have a dollar amount to assign to the potential loss of farmland.

Mr. Lankford added that prior to any development, a thorough stormwater review would take place, including a downstream impact analysis. This will either be mitigated by storm water devices or off-site easements.

Board Discussion

Ms. Booker-Rouse asked what the difference in available housing would be if the parcel was rezoned from R-80 to R-40? Mr. Lankford replied that R-80 would be 49 available lots, whereas R-40 would bring a total density to 90 units. Rezoning would bring the range to between 49 and 98 units. Mr. Barron reiterated that as this is not a conditional use case, the application would not factor in development density. The rezoning would provide the option for up to 98 lots, but whether that is

realistic with the streams, but the general use request precludes the board from weighing in on specific aspects of the potential development.

Mr. Van Dyk commented that with respect to Mr. Barron's statement, it was important that the Board consider the parcel as presented in this application rather than an abstract exercise. From his perspective, the Board must weigh the fact that some parties consider the area to be of a higher density but simultaneously the Town of Holly Springs does not consider it dense enough. What is the impact of rezoning this property?

Mr. Barron pointed out that the surrounding subdivisions and developments are consistent with the proposed rezoning. The Town of Holly Springs is not able to extend services yet, but the one unit to acre development did not appear to contradict current growth trends. Mr. Barron mentioned that while he was sensitive to stormwater impacts, it was not clear that the Planning Board had any role to play at this stage, especially in a general use case. Were this a conditional use case, the board might have had greater authority, but as presented he found the increase in housing stock to be in keeping with surrounding developments.

Mr. Van Dyk asked what the classifications of the surrounding developments north of the parcel in question. Mr. Lankford responded that most were R-20 or Holly Springs ETJ with community wells. There was also county jurisdiction classified as R-30 that Mr. Van Dyk pointed out on the map, which Mr. Lankford confirmed.

Mr. Kadis asked the petitioner for clarification about the nature of the property: was this parcel of land originally purchased and classified before the owner realized the setbacks and environmental concerns would prevent them from developing as anticipated? Mr. Kadis expressed concerns that this rezoning might be reflective of attempting to increase the density to continue as planned.

Ms. Catlett responded that the original owner has not sold the property and to protect the existing area, rezoning was their best option. Ms. Booker-Rouse asked specifically about the placement of the streams and potential access areas from the Buckhorn Duncan Road. Ms. Catlett acknowledged that the engineer would be better equipped to address this question, but that there is a plan in place to mitigate any access issues. Mr. Lankford indicated from his discussions with the engineer that the access point would be located to avoid the streams but that a flood study would be conducted prior to any action taken.

Mr. Kadis, Mr. Barron, and Mr. Van Dyk expressed concerns about the nature of this parcel as an anchor subdivision, as well as the placement of septic and well water. Mr. Van Dyk asked if the subdivision development would come before the Planning Board after rezoning, and Mr. Lankford indicated that pending the rezoning recommendation that any future development would be subject to administrative approval.

Mr. Adams indicated that he appreciated both the applicant and opposition and asked for clarification as to how many lots are currently planned for and where the additional lots would be located. Ms. Catlett responded that currently the planning is for 50 lots in the southern portion and additional lots may be considered in the northern area of the parcel. Mr. Barron clarified that this is for 98 total lots, whether the upper limit could be reached.

Mr. Clark noted that there has been significant change to the watershed over the years but that in any development the County would look at runoff requirements and soil conditions that would address Mr. Burt's concerns. He added that this request meets what the county has expressed a desire for in the area in PlanWake. Mr. Van Dyk reiterated Mr. Barron's point that this would be a different

discussion under a conditional use case, but they are being asked to make a motion on a general use case. Mr. Kadis asked again if the case was to rezone or to change to a cluster subdivision. Mr. Barron replied that because this is a general use case, they cannot ask for any specific changes made to the application.

With no further discussion, Mr. Fleming asked the board for a motion. Ms. Cooper reminded Mr. Fleming that the board that they would consider two motions: a motion of consistency with the land use plan, and a motion to recommend the Board of Commissioners to consider this rezoning application.

Board Motion #1 – Adoption of the Statement Consistency in PLG-RZ-006482-2022

Motion was made by Mr. Wells in the matter of PLG-RZ-002881-2021 that the Board offers to the Wake County Board of Commissioners the following Statement of Consistency, Reasonableness and Public Interest:

- 1) The Board finds that the requested rezoning to Residential-40, the stated proposed use, and the permissible range of uses are:
 - a) Consistent with both the general PLANWake Comprehensive Plan and the Southwest Area Land Use Plan Update, are reasonable, and appropriate for the area.
 - b) Consistent with four of the stated goals referenced in the Southwest Area Plan Update, more specifically:
 - Goal # 3--To encourage the development of communities which provide adequate land for anticipated demands, in a pattern which allows a mixture of uses;
 - Goal # 4--To encourage maintenance of open space, scenic aspects of rural areas, entranceways to rural areas and transition areas between urban areas;
 - Goal # 7--To ensure that the land use plan and transportation plan mutually support each other;
 - Goal # 8--To ensure that the County always protects the property rights of landowners.
 - c) Reasonable, and in the public interest because it would allow for subsequent development that would:
 - Meet an “ongoing increased need for housing”, which is generally accepted as a “public necessity”.
 - Provide “a low-density [cluster] subdivision preserving natural areas and protecting water quality”.
 - By “efficiently utilizing an existing community water supply system without directly impacting the capacity” of the area municipalities.
 - Have minimal impact upon the area road network.

All of which advance the public health, safety, and general welfare.

Reasonable, and in the public interest because various provisions in the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance and the established development review process with outside agencies such as the North Carolina Department of Transportation and other county departments, will ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the public health, safety, and general welfare. For example, there are no significant traffic issues on the adjacent roadways, the subsequent

development will comply with county requirements regarding buffering, stormwater and erosion control, and protection of environmentally sensitive areas.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion with 8 members voting for and 1 against. The motion was adopted.

Board Motion #2 – Approval of the Proposed Rezoning of PLG-RZ-0003482-2022

Motion was made by Mr. Wells in the matter of PLG-RZ-0003482-2022 that the Planning Board offers to the Wake County Board of Commissioners a recommendation for approval of the rezoning request as presented.

Dr. Kolappa seconded the motion with 8 members voting for and 1 against. The motion was adopted.

5. Lower Swift Creek Area Plan Update- Presentation by Akul Nishawala, Planner III

Mr. Nishawala began his presentation to update information on the Lower Swift Creek Area Plan and recommended draft and land uses with a recap of the area in discussion, Fuquay-Varina, and Garner in particular. Wake County held two in person events on May 4th at the Southeast Regional Library and on May 17th for election day at Garner High School and Turner Memorial Baptist Church as well as a virtual meeting on April 7th. Community engagement was positive and many expressed interests in following the LSCAP through the online portal made available by the county. The Social Pinpoint Interactive Tool allows citizens to make comments on an interactive map of the area as well as ask questions about specific intersections for staff to respond to. Online surveys have resulted in feedback about traffic, communication, sidewalks, greenways, and parks.

For the purposes to today's update, Mr. Nishawala indicated the area in question is in the southeast portion of Wake County, just south of Garner. The ongoing I-540 project is a major consideration and was a topic of conversation during public outreach and online comments. The Lower Swift Creek Area Plan takes into consideration the town of Garner's comprehensive plan for development of the lowest area in particular. Development around the I-540 area was considered a priority, particularly before construction is completed. Considering community member needs to best utilize the area and provide value to Lower Swift Creek is also a consideration.

Mr. Nishawala provided some history on the Towns of Fuquay and Garner's Area Language Plan – adopted in November 2003 – and identified areas of municipal jurisdiction, including ETJs and annexations in the ensuing years. Taking into consideration the changes made between 2003 and 2022 – including the I-540 project – PLANWake has focused less on subdivision and more on walkable centers identified on maps presented to the Board. Several activity centers considered in PLANWake now appear in municipal jurisdiction or are part of I-540 and are now no longer under active development or planning.

Wake Planning, Development, and Inspections Division (PDI) is now considering areas near the I-540 for activity centers or multi-use centers. The size of the areas are currently up for discussion based on access from interchanges, as well as soil quality. Buffer areas and walkable areas are also options within these proposed sections. Mr. Van Dyk asked for clarification on the gray areas of the map, and Mr. Nishawala indicated those are municipal areas that are no longer under county jurisdiction.

Mr. Maloney pointed out that many of the areas on the PLANWake map are community designations but that the Planning Board would also be able to make recommendations with respect to bringing utilities into these proposed development areas.

Mr. Fleming asked for more specificity regarding the activity centers proposed near I-540 and 70. Mr. Nishawala indicated the land is currently zoned for mixed use and that the Town of Garner is amenable to activity centers as it aligns with their long-range plans. Mr. Wells asked about the timeline for I-540 being extended to the Lower Swift Creek Area. Mr. Nishawala said construction is currently in the southern portion near Fuquay but that the second phase should be completed towards the later end of the decade.

Mr. Barron asked about the exact size of the multi-use district, the rough acreage. Mr. Nishawala did not have the exact number but would be able to provide it later. Mr. Barron expressed concern it was not too large and was in fact a more targeted plan. Mr. Nishawala indicated that the next portion of community engagement was to be clear what potential activity centers could provide the public: park and ride, potential transit, retail mixed use.

Providing the public with specific locations would assist in determining what would fit best. PDI has scaled down the size of the area to serve the county's goals more realistically. In addition to community engagement, Mr. Nishawala indicated that the Planning Board's input would be valuable at this juncture. Mr. Van Dyk suggested that it might be a good idea to compile a list of desirable attributes in the proposed area. In addition to mixed retail, perhaps pedestrian friendly areas would be useful coming off a six-lane highway. The integration of this area into a community or county space should be a consideration as planning continues. Mr. Nishawala thanked them for their questions and comments and indicated that round two of public engagement would continue through June before the Plan Proposal is drafted in summer 2022 for approval in the fall. If all goes according to the schedule, implementation of the Lower Swift Creek Area Plan would take effect in winter 2022/2023.

6. Highway Corridor Reforestation Update – Tim Gardiner, Transportation Planner III

Mr. Gardiner updated the Board on transportation conditions regarding highway reforestation: working with DOT on potential project areas in identified Right-of-Way areas. Opportunity areas where plant material would be placed to regenerate growth. The DOT has funds allocated for this plan and would be able to assist in identifying locations and implement management plans. Currently they are looking at an area near I-40 South or the I-540 as potential reforestation sites. The DOT has asked for specificity in what kind of vegetation Wake County is requesting, expressing concerns about high maintenance. Wake County and the DOT will discuss with CAMPO on June 2nd. The Board will continue to be updated as plans develop, but Mr. Gardiner expressed that there was good momentum in moving forward with this project.

7. Committee Reports

Code and Operations Committee:

Mr. Adams explained he was elected chair and that the meeting was very productive. Mr. Maloney presented to Code and Operations about updates to the UDO and merging of subdivision classifications (conventional, open space, and cluster) to provide a more concrete definition of open space. Once this language is formalized the hope is to deliver this to the Board of Commissioners for adoption.

Planning, Development, and Inspections Report

Ms. Peterson updated the Board on the Farmland Preservation Ordinance would be before the Board of Commissioners at a work session on June 13th. She also updated information on the micro-transit study in southern Wake County: after two months of service, over 700 completed rides have been logged and the service area has grown from 90 to 100 square miles to incorporate elementary and childcare center areas. Rides are averaging six miles in duration with a 15-minute time from pick up to destination. Wait time is at an average of 60 minutes. Ms. Peterson indicated that some rides are reaching into Knightdale, although it is not currently in the active ride area. Based on the pilot plan, the next steps would be to take the presentations to municipalities in the first quarter of FY23.

Mr. Steven Finn provided the board with some context about the rezoning request. To his knowledge, this is the first general rezoning that he could locate in several years after researching requests. When possible, PDI recommends conditional rezoning, but it is up to the applicant to make this determination. He indicated that they have had an uptick in complaints regarding zoning enforcement.

Mr. Finn provided some additional information to the Codes and Operations meeting by outlining the subdivision process. During the preliminary phase, a potential layout is provided to them, followed by the construction phase where roadbeds and water infrastructure is considered along with septic systems. As changes are made in configuration, they move to the record plan, which is the documentations filed with the Register of Deeds. He provided information from the last five subdivisions depending on size and location.

Mr. Finn also introduced the newest member of the planning staff, Leila Cole. She emerged from a talented pool of candidates and Mr. Finn looks forward to her presenting in the future. Mr. Fleming and the Board extended their congratulations to Ms. Cole.

Mr. Maloney indicated that there are items for July, but that the Board Meeting would not take place the week of the 4th of July. He recommended a rescheduled to July 20th with a Codes and Operations meeting to be held beforehand. The June 21st Board of Commissioners meeting will address the Falls of Neuse Road rezoning and the chair and vice chair would be recommended to attend. The rezoning request from today's meeting would be considered by the Board of Commissioners at a date in July to be determined.

In addition, Mr. Maloney and Ms. Peterson attended the inaugural Eastern Wake Local Government Association meeting the previous week and discussed with the elected officials of Knightdale, Rolesville, Wendell and Zebulon. The officials expressed their awareness that as Wake county continues to expand, their municipalities will be the next areas of growth. Mr. Maloney and Ms. Peterson also provided a presentation on demographics and PLANWake. He expressed confidence in the preparedness of the municipalities and their plans for comprehensive growth.

Mr. Adams asked about procedural issues surrounding public comment, and Mr. Maloney clarified that the nature of public comment is not necessarily interactive unless the Board has a follow-up question after the period has been closed.

8. Adjournment


The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

=====

REGULAR MEETING
WAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
June 1, 2022

Chair Asa Fleming declared the regular meeting
of the Wake County Planning Board for
Wednesday, June 1, 2022, adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

DocuSigned by:

C8A4EBCADFAA468...

Asa Fleming
Wake County Planning Board

=====