

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, November 20, 2023 at 5:00 PM

	MINUTES
1	Call Meeting to Order
2	Pledge of Allegiance
3	
4	Present
5	Chairperson Andy Ward
6	Vice Chairperson Tony DiBernardo
7	Planning Board Member Collins
8	Planning Board Member Lawler
9	Planning Board Member McClendon
10	Planning Board Member (alternate) Michael Zehner
11	Wes Haskett, Deputy Town Manager/Planning Director
12 13	Town Attorney Lauren Arizaga-Womble
14	Approval of Agenda
15	Motion made by Vice Chairperson DiBernardo to approve the agenda as presented, Seconded by
16	Planning Board Member Lawler. The motion passed unanimously.
17	
18	Approval of Minutes - November 1, 2023, Closed Session Minutes
19	Motion made by Planning Board Member Collins to approve the minutes of November 1, 2023 (Closed
20	Session) as presented, Seconded by Chairperson Ward. The motion passed unanimously.
21	Public Comment
22	
23	The following residents spoke in opposition to SUP-23-01, a Special Use Permit for a mixed-use
24	group development of commercial and residential buildings at 6195 N. Croatan Hwy.
25	Matt Huband-110 Landing Trail
26	 Andrew Keeney-6008 Currituck Rd
27	 John Vermeulen-2061 Creek Rd.
28	Elizabeth Ryan-1101 Colington
29	Mike Magnum-8 Foxwood Circle
30	
31	Old Business
32	SUP-23-01, a Special Use Permit application submitted by Cathleen M. Saunders, P.E. on behalf of
33	Ginguite, LLC for a mixed-use group development of commercial and residential buildings at 6195 N.
34	Croatan Hwy.
35	
36	Applicant's Representatives present: Ashley Honeycutt Terrazas, Parker Poe (virtual)
37	Michael W. Strader, Jr., P.E., Quible and Associates
38	Erin Dunigan, SAGA

Applicant's attorney Ashley Honeycutt Terrazas with Parker Poe provided an introduction, highlighting the following:

Special use permit site plan application for a preliminary discussion about an application that has already gone through several rounds of technical review with Town staff, ultimately to be decided after a quasi-judicial hearing before the Town Council.

This is a two-building development of 36 apartments, non-residential and commercial office uses, as well on a parcel that's been zoned for multi-family and commercial uses for many years but because the uses are mixed in one development a special use permit is required for the application, per the zoning ordinance.

Our development team has been going through this preliminary discussion process for the past three months, heard concerns and feedback from neighboring property owners, and wanted to amend the plan we originally submitted to try to respond to some of that (which is the intent of this public process). We met with neighboring church leaders and our team offered to meet multiple times with the Southern Shores Landing residents. A concept plan was shown last time which showed several changes based on what we heard.

 Original 15ft of Landscaping on Eastern proper property line, although no buffer is required under the zoning ordinance between commercially zoned properties. Made it a 20 ft buffer with existing vegetation and retaining wall on eastern property line.

o The dumpster enclosure was on the property line. Now moved the dumpster closure away from the property line and now plan to retain more existing vegetation.

• We also had new landscaping on the property line adjacent to the church where there's an existing path used by the church (that's on our property), so we officially amended the plan to address some of those concerns and we've submitted the full amended set to the town. We added the existing path being used by the church on our site.

Removed the marina, as staff has determined it's not currently permitted in the general commercial zoning district.

The rest of the plan has not changed. We submitted all of the elements.

 The applicant has submitted an updated US Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Determination in which the US Army Corps of Engineers determined just last month that there are no wetlands on the area of the property that the applicant plans to develop. There are on the northern side of the creek which are not being developed.

 The applicant also added some additional landscaping to the renderings, the front elevation is a requirement. We added more Landscaping on the front and the sides of the building.

 • If the Town Council approves the special use permit, there will be still more permits and state agencies that will review the development, more studies including a traffic impact analysis that we will have to do to be able to build this project.

The private wastewater treatment plant that will serve the project has been and continues to go through additional processes through the regulating agencies, which are the North Carolina Utilities Commission and the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality. Those will need to be resolved before permits are issued to extend the Wastewater infrastructure to this plan project.

• All the required information has been submitted, extensive hours spent discussing this, and responding to the 36 additional written questions that this Planning Board has submitted between meetings.

88 89

87

Chairperson Ward called on the applicant or applicant's representative to review the 26 answers addressing questions or concerns that the Planning Board had at the previous meeting.

90 91 92

The document submitted read as, Ginguite, LLC (the "Applicant") responds as follows:

93 94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

106

107

1. Add a condition that requires an independent traffic study prior to Town decision, or application for a building permit, with review by third party engineer?

> The Town Staff recommended a condition that a TIA be conducted, and any recommended improvements be added, prior to receiving a building permit for the development. The Applicant has already indicated that it feels this is an appropriate condition for the Planning Board to recommend and the Town Council to impose on the special use permit site plan. NCDOT, an independent state agency, will review and approve this TIA. Under the TOSS Zoning Ordinance, a TIA is not required for the proposed development, and thus the Planning Board cannot require a TIA prior to making a recommendation.

104 105

2. Strike "If in recommended condition #5.

The Applicant has already publicly agreed that this would be an appropriate

108 109 110

111

112

113

condition on the special use permit. 3. How often is water quality testing conducted? Before and after construction?

The plant is operated as per a NCDEQ permit by a NC licensed operator and regularly monitored by NCDEQ for compliance. SUP-23-01 is not an application for a WWTP. GWWTP, while controlled by the Applicant, is not the applicant for this case, and the TOSS is not reviewing any permits or applications for the properties upon which the WWTP sits. The WWTP planned to serve the subject development is regulated by the NCDEQ, and NCDEQ is responsible for determining whether the WWTP can serve the development. It will not issue the necessary permits otherwise.

114 115

116

117

4. Has transfer of ownership of the wastewater treatment been approved by the N.C. Utilities Commission and if so, who is the owner?

118 119 120

Yes, GWWTP is the owner and permittee of the wastewater treatment plant that is planned to serve the development. Thus, the letter dated June 1, 2023, from GWWTP confirming that it is willing to serve the development is sufficient to show that the site plan meets the requirement in TOSS Ord. § 36-299 (b)(2)(c)(5) ("name of and written approval for connection from any organization that will collect or dispose of wastewater"). The transfer of the franchise is still in process with NCUC.

122 123 124

121

5. Is the wastewater treatment plant still under emergency operation?

125 126 127

GWWTP is going through the process to end the emergency operation permit. But, in any event, this process is not relevant to SUP-23-01. SUP-23-01 is not an application for a WWTP. GWWTP, while controlled by the Applicant, is not the applicant for this case, and the TOSS is not reviewing any permits or applications for the properties upon which the WWTP sits. The WWTP planned to serve the subject development is regulated by the NCDEQ, and NCDEQ is responsible for determining whether the WWTP can serve the development. It will not issue the necessary permits otherwise.

129 130 131

128

6. The current NCDEQ permit for the wastewater treatment plant expires in November.

133

132

Again, this is not relevant to the subject application, but the permit is in the process of being updated.

134 135

7. Require an independent study of the wastewater treatment plant prior to Town

136 decision application for a building permit? No. SUP-23-01 is not an application for a WWTP. GWWTP, while controlled by 137 138 the Applicant, is not the applicant for this case, and the TOSS is not reviewing any permits or 139 applications for the properties upon which the WWTP sits. The WWTP planned to serve the subject development is regulated by the NCDEQ, and NCDEQ is responsible for determining 140 141 whether the WWTP can serve the development. It will not issue the necessary permits 142 otherwise. 143 144 In any event, NCDEQ is the regulating authority for the wastewater treatment plant that will 145 serve the development, not TOSS. And under the TOSS Zoning Ordinance, a study of the 146 wastewater treatment plant that will serve the project is not required for this application, and 147 thus the Planning Board cannot require this prior to making a recommendation. 148 8. Add a condition that requires the wastewater treatment plant parcels to be 149 recombined prior to Town decision or application for a building permit? 150 GWWTP (the owner of the parcels) is not opposed to recombining these parcels, and the 151 Planning Board may recommend, and the Town Council may entertain, a condition that they 152 be recombined prior to receiving a building permit for the development if determined to be 153 related to issues raised at the hearing. The Applicant does question the relevance of the 154 recombination of these parcels to the subject Application as this does not relate to the special 155 use or the site plan. 156 9. Do covenants allow the proposed number of residential units with respect to 157 wastewater? 158 Yes. The covenants do not specify the number of units. Furthermore, the covenant entitles 159 site to a minimum amount of wastewater treatment by the utility. If the wastewater 160 treatment plant can handle more wastewater, which is determined by NCDEQ, it can treat 161 more wastewater. This has been discussed and explained at prior Planning Board meetings. 162 10. Provide updated covenant that replaced previous covenant (recorded 163 12/02/2002) between Southern Coastal Associates (Blinken) and Boddie-Noell 164 (Hayes) referencing 18,000 gallons per day or 50 single family equivalents [#5 in 165 summary of deeds]. 166 No updated covenant is needed. Per the terms of the recorded covenant (Paragraph 5), it is 167 binding upon the successors and assigns of the original declarants. 168 11. Require a Corps. of Engineers wetlands delineation prior to Town decision or 169 application for a building permit? 170 An updated wetlands determination by the US Army Corps of Engineers dated October 27, 171 2023, has been submitted to the Town. 172 12. Add GIS overlay to concession sheet. 173 This is not required but will be provided with the updated site plan. 174 13. Remove "marina", proposed dock/picnic area/kayak storage, and proposed 175 dock that extends into Ginguite Creek from all plan sheets prior to the next Planning 176 Board meeting. 177 This change is reflected on the modified plan submitted to the Town. 178 14. Submit elevation drawings that show the buildings from the rear of the site. 179 This is not required. Zoning Ord. § 36-299(b)(2)(c)(1) requires front and side elevations, which 180 have been submitted. Drawings of the rear elevations (which were not required) were

submitted on the elevations, and show that the rear will be very similar to the front of the

building in terms of architectural style, and the materials will be consistent throughout the

15. More landscaping detail is needed.

building.

181

182

183

184

More landscaping detail has been added to the front elevations, which has been resubmitted.
The Landscape Plan is on Sheet 2, and a rendered landscape plan has been submitted as well.

16. Submit renderings that show the buildings relative to the landscape plan. Show

16. Submit renderings that show the buildings relative to the landscape plan. Show from Hwy. 158.

More landscaping detail has been added to the front elevations, which has been resubmitted.

17. The foundation encroaches into some of the parking spaces.

All of the parking spaces meet the minimum dimensional requirements in TOSS Ord. §36-163.

18. No building mounted lights are shown.

This will be shown at the building permit phase. Consistent with TOSS Ord. § 36-166, all building-mounted lights will be full-cutoff, Dark Sky compliant lighting. In addition, when building-mounted lighting is fully planned and shown on a building permit application, the Town will still enforce the Ordinance requirement that all outdoor lighting, taken together, will not exceed 1 footcandle measured at the property line. The subject site plan shows no more than 0.5 footcandles at any given point on any of the property-lines.

19. The lighting specifications do not match the proposed lights.

The lighting plan (Sheet 11A) shows the proposed outdoor lighting, and the fixtures are highlighted on Page 4 of the submitted lighting specs. These match the description of the "Luminaries Schedule" on the Lighting Plan. We have also added an additional symbol on Sheets 11A-C, to further clarify which lights are pole lights lighting the parking field: and which lights are the shorter bollard lights illuminating the boardwalk adjacent to the Creek --S-

20. Submit a plan for emergency vehicles and large truck deliveries, including clearance under the east building.

There is 8 ft clearance for east building parking, and this was clarified to Town staff on 7/31. No emergency vehicles or large delivery vehicles will park or otherwise pass under this building. The plan meets North Carolina Fire Code standards. The site plan demonstrates that the circulation will accommodate emergency vehicles. The Fire Exhibit submitted 7/31, which was reviewed by Fire Marshal, shows that no emergency vehicles need to enter under the east building. The Fire Exhibit shows that, consistent with the Fire Code, there is less than 600' from fire hydrants to any point on the exteriors of the buildings, and the circles demonstrate that there is at least 200' from parking locations for a fire truck to any point on the exterior of the building.

21. There isn't anywhere to mount wall signage.

Wall signage location will be determined at the time of building permits, and signage for individual tenants will be permitted through the Town and will be required to meet all signage requirements.

22. Submit a construction management plan for construction phases and a timeline.

This is not required for a site plan or a special use permit.

23. Where will the materials be left?

They will be left on the subject property, as required by law. Exact locations have not been determined at this stage.

24. No construction entrance off of Landing Tri. and no left turn onto Landing Tri. from the site.

The updated site plan shows the relocation of the construction entrance on Sheet 6.

The site plan already proposes a right-in-right-out on Landing Trail.

25. Provide copy of easement that allows Southern Shores Landing residents to traverse 6195 **N.** Croatan Hwy.

Whether or not they have an access easement is irrelevant to this application. The applicant has no intention of blocking Landing Trail for use by SSL residents or anyone else. In any event, an "Access Easement" is noted on the recorded plat for the area of the subject property, included in the package of deeds and easements submitted to the Town, Documents #4. Under state law, easements can be recorded on a plat map and do not need to be further defined in a separate instrument. *Benson v. Prevost*, 277 N.C. App. 405, 411-12, 861 S.E.2d 343,348

26. Provide copy and explanation of easement allowing sewer line connection to the lift station (where the new sewer line is proposed).

This was provided in the package of deeds and easements submitted to the Town, Documents #4 and 5. Document 5, The Declaration of Protective Covenants recorded in the Dare County Register of Deeds Book 1463/Page 391, Paragraph One requires the Private Utility (GWWRA, and its successors and assigns, per Paragraph Five) to construct, install, operate, maintain, repair and replace wastewater treatment infrastructure for the benefit of the Boddie-Noell property (the subject of SUP-23-01) and Southern Shores Landing. Paragraph Two also guarantees that the Private Utility will provide certain wastewater capacity to these properties. Thus, the Private Utility may construct (and repair/maintain) the necessary infrastructure to serve both the subject property and Southern Shores Landing to comply with these covenants. Furthermore, Document 4, Note 18 of the Southern Shores Landing Final Plat memorializes an easement agreement between Bodie-Noell, Southern Shores Landing, and the Utility for "encroachments of the wastewater treatment plant."

Planning Board comments/questions to applicant's responses submitted.

Item #1

 Chairperson Ward stated he was confused about the order of items stated in the last sentence of the applicant's reply to item number one and asked for clarification to the order. He also inquired who hires the traffic engineer. Michael Strader, Quible and Associates stated there would be an independent traffic consultant (engineer) that must be hired to do the traffic study. They work directly with NCDOT, who obviously do the review and then they make formal recommendations and could add requirements. The traffic engineer is hired by the applicant unless the town is willing to take that on.

Chairperson Ward also clarified that the response to item number one stated, "the Planning Board cannot require a TIA prior to making a recommendation" which is a correct statement. The Planning Board has no authority to require anything in this process.

Item #2

No further comment/concern

Item #3

Chairperson Ward asked to circle back to this item later in the meeting. He said the question says how often water quality is tested before and after construction and the answer was the plan is operated as per NCDEQ permit by North Carolina licensed operator regularly monitored by NCDEQ. The same answer was submitted for number five and seven. He stated we understand where the applicant stands on their requirement for wastewater.

item #4

283 Chairperson Ward stated this is another wastewater item and would like to revisit it later in the 284 discussion. 285 286 Item #5 287 Same response at #3 288 289 Item #6 290 Chairperson Ward stated this is another wastewater item and would like to revisit it later in the 291 discussion. 292 293 Item #7 294 Same response as #3 295 296 Item #8 297 Chairperson Ward stated the applicant is agreeable to combine the two parcels that make up 298 the wastewater treatment plant. The Planning Board had no further comment. 299 300 Item #9 301 Chairperson Ward stated this would be determined by the town's attorneys. 302 303 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo asked for clarification, as he stated the covenants do specify the 304 number of units. He stated the covenants read, "18,000 gallons per day or 50 single family 305 equivalents". 306 307 Michael Strader, Quible and Assoc. stated NCDEQ rules for determining the gallons per day per 308 bedroom have also changed from the time of those covenants. Also, the covenants do not 309 specify the number of units, it uses equivalent. A certain number of restaurant seats are 310 equivalent to a single-family unit. 311 312 Attorney Ashley Honeycutt Terrazas stated per the covenants, which is a minimum that that this 313 parcel is entitled to. If the wastewater treatment facility can treat more than that would need to 314 be approved by NCDEQ. 315 316 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo stated the word minimum is not in the covenant. 317 318 item #10 319 Chairperson Ward stated this would be determined by the town's attorneys. 320 321 Item #11 Applicant submitted updated wetlands determination by the US Army Corps of Engineers dated 322 323 October 27, 2023, which does show 404 wetlands only on the marsh area to the north not in the 324 proposed development area. 325 326 Item #12 327 No comment from Planning Board members. 328

329	item #13
330	Chairperson Ward stated boat docks have been removed from the site plan but still need to be
331	removed from the colored rendering (landscape rendering plan).
332	
333	Item #14
334	Planning Board Member Zehner stated it is certainly not required as part of the application but
335	through the board's review they can certainly request additional information and I don't think
336	the applicant has been responsive. He stated a line of site view from the rear was requested and
337	that has not been supplied.
338	
339	Item #15
340	No comment from Planning Board members.
341	
342	Item #16
343	No comment from Planning Board members.
344	
345	Item #17
346	The applicant revised the plan to resolve the parking spaces issue and any further parking space
347	discrepancy will be caught at permit review.
348	
349	Item #18
350	Planning Board Member Zehner commented that a site plan is supposed to show all outdoor
351	lighting and the plan does not show building mounted lighting.
352	
353	Item #19
354	Planning Board Member Zehner stated there is a discrepancy between the spec sheet and the
355	lumen numbers on the plan. They are not matching up.
356	
357	Michael Strader, Quible and Associates, stated the foot candles noted on the lighting plan on
358	the photometric plan are accurate.
359	
360	Chairperson Ward stated there will be a permit review and any discrepancy will be addressed at
361	that time.
362	
363	Item #20
364	No comment from Planning Board members.
365	
366	Item #21
367	Michael Strader, Quible and Associates, commented that any application would go through
368	planning.
369	
370	Item #22
371	Planning Director Haskett commented that typically the building inspector will look into all that
372	prior to construction commencing. As far as timeframes are concerned, if an inspection is not
373	conducted within 180 days the permit expires. If they do have an inspection within 180 days,
374	then they have 12 months from the date of that inspection to have the next inspection. Per the

noise ordinance on weekends, no work-related noise on Sundays but is allowed on Saturday 375 376 7am-8pm. 377 Planning Board Member Zehner suggested a construction management plan and some 378 379 prohibition on construction hours on Saturdays, as there would be issues accessing the site 380 during certain times of the year. 381 382 Item #23 383 No comment from Planning Board members. 384 385 Item #24 386 No comment from Planning Board members. 387 388 Item #25 No comment from Planning Board members, for attorney review. 389 390 391 Item #26 392 No comment from Planning Board members, for attorney review. 393 394 Chairperson Ward stated there is an additional question briefly touched on by the board's 395 attorneys and that is soil data as it relates to NCDEQ storm water management permit. 396 397 Michael Strader, Quible and Associates stated for the areas of proposed infiltration there will be 398 undercutting of that underlying restrictive horizon, which will be undercut and then back filled in with good permeability soils. 399 400 Chairperson Ward stated there is a lot of peat there and what will replace it. He also asked if 401 this soil report is shared with NCDEQ. Michael Strader responded it will be replaced with select 402 fill material and the report accompanies the storm water permit application package and those 403 specifications have been incorporated into the site plan design and that permit application 404 405 package. 406 407 Planning Board Member McClendon asked Mr. Strader if they knew how far they would have to dig down. Mr. Strader replied that it is specified in the design drawings based on the soil report. 408 409 410 Vice Chairperson DiBernardo asked for clarification on the good fill material. Michael Strader, 411 Quible and Associates, stated it is high permeability soils based on infiltration requirements, type one core sand material. 412 413 Planning Board Member McClendon asked how the stormwater facility will be maintained. 414 415 Michael Strader, Quible and Associates, answered there is an operation and maintenance 416 agreement that the applicant signs and this agreement follows the whole life of that storm 417 water permit. 418

Planning Board Member Lawler asked how that agreement differentiates from the maintenance agreement for the infiltration pond on the Wastewater side. Michael Strader, Quible and Associates, stated he is not familiar with the wastewater.

PLANNING BOARD DELIBERATION
Chairperson Ward stated it is time for the board to deliberate, there are six members present

Chairperson Ward stated it is time for the board to deliberate, there are six members present but only five will be voting. Planning Board Member Zehner is sitting as an alternate and will not vote but can answer or ask any number of questions.

Planning Director Haskett read town code 36-300. (5)

Sec. 36-300. - Application for permit for special uses.

(5) Before they may grant any special use permit or vested right, the town council shall make affirmative findings that:

a. The applicant has met the requirements of the applicable provisions of the town chapter pertaining to zoning, subdivision chapter, and all other applicable ordinances.

b. That the use as proposed will conform with the town's land use plan and will be compatible with the area in which it is to be located, if developed in accordance with the conditions specified in the chapter and additionally required by the town council as authorized by the chapter.

c. That the use will not materially endanger the public health and safety if located where proposed and developed according to the plan submitted.

d. That the use as proposed will not overburden the town volunteer fire department fire-fighting capabilities and the county water supply capacity to the town, as said facilities and capabilities will exist on the completion date of the special use for which the application is made.

Chairperson Ward reviewed the recommended conditions of SUP-23-01 and asked the board members if they had any additions or subtractions.

SUP-23-01 Recommended Conditions

1. The following approvals shall be issued prior to submittal of a Building Permit application:

a. Soil Erosion Sedimentation Control Plan Permit for land disturbance over 1 acre from the NCDEQ.

b. Stormwater Management Permit from the NCDEQ.

 NCDOT driveway permit and/or encroachment application for work in a State rightof-way.

d. Modification to Permit No. WQ0017224 from the NCDEQ (tentative wastewater approval received).

e. CAMA Permit from the NCDEQ; (addition: add word major. Major Permit)

- f. Review and approval of potable water distribution system modifications or extensions by the Dare County Water Dept. (tentative approval received).
- g. Receipts for payment of water connection fee from the Dare County Water Department.
- h. Water Main Extension Permit from the NCDEQ.
- i. Lot Disturbance/Stormwater Management Permit from the Town; and
- j. Approval from the Dominion Energy Transmission Group. (addition: language to include an easement for 50 feet at the power poles and 70 feet of power line easement with parking inside those 70 feet easement prior to submittal)
- 2. Prior to submittal of construction drawings, an updated fire hydrant flow test must be conducted and witnessed by Town Staff.
- 3. Construction drawings shall demonstrate compliance with Needed Fire Flow requirements, and all other applicable Fire Code requirements.
- 4. The site plan identifies a "Marina." The "Marina" is a series of docks and piers which are not permitted in the C, General Commercial zoning district (see interpretation letter dated August 14, 2023) and as a result, the proposed "Marina," proposed dock/picnic area/kayak storage, and proposed dock that extends into Ginguite Creek cannot be approved as a part of the application. (subtraction: remove recommended condition number four as a marina/dock slips have been removed from the site plan)
- 5. If NCDOT requires a traffic impact assessment or traffic study, the requirements in the traffic impact assessment or traffic study must be satisfied prior to submittal of a Building Permit application. (addition: revise that condition to any and all requirements in the NCDOT required traffic impact assessment or traffic study must be satisfied prior to submittal of a building permit application) * PB also recommends the town hiring a third-party to review the traffic study plan on behalf of the town.
- 6. Maintain a 50 ft. setback from the eastern property line adjacent to Southern Shores Landing (applicable to buildings and other facilities such as parking spaces, incinerators, trash collection areas, etc.) and preserve the existing natural vegetative buffer.
- 7. Maintain a 50 ft. setback from the northern property line adjacent to All Saints' Episcopal Church (applicable to buildings and other facilities such as parking spaces, incinerators, trash collection areas, etc.) and preserve the existing natural vegetative buffer.
- 8. The applicant must strictly abide by all requirements of the Town Code and must also strictly comply with all other applicable local, State, and Federal requirements.

Planning Board Member McClendon asked if the fire department or any other public safety group were involved in the review. Planning Director Haskett answered the Fire Chief, Fire Marshal, and our building inspector were involved in the review. They were in support of recommended condition number two and number three.

- 510 Chairperson Ward read the following town code sections:
 - Sec. 32-2. Public protection
- Sec. 32-3. Wastewater management.
- Sec. 32-4. Planning board review.
 - Sec. 32-5. Community, noncommunity and private wastewater systems.

514515516

517

518

519

520 521

522

523

524

511

Planning Board Member Lawler researched documents received off the state website, stating two inspections of the wastewater treatment plant have taken place since 2018 and the summary report on both stated the plant was non-compliant. He stated the report cited numerous deficiencies in the equipment and the operation and the maintenance of the facility. The water quality in the monitoring wells outside of the wastewater plant has exceeded their limits. This wastewater plant was permitted to be operated as a wastewater reuse plant, yet the spray field has not been used in a number of years, the pumps that operate the spray field are not operational if in fact they're there. The control panel does not work so all the wastewater, whether it meets treatment standards or not, goes into the infiltration pond which is supposed to be used for emergency situations.

525 526 527

528

531

533

536

537

538

- Chairperson Ward reviewed and submitted eleven documents for the record, all pertaining to the wastewater treatment plant. [1-11 are hereby attached as exhibits]
- 1. 10-3-18 NCDEQ Permit
- 2. 8-3-21 Inspection Report
 - 3. 10-27-21 Civil Penalty & Notice of Violation
- 4. 5-24-22 Unpaid Civil Penalty Assessments
 - 5. 2-10-23 Petition to Sale or Transfer CPCN & Rate Increase
- 6. 3-14-23 Inspection Report
- 7. 4-3-23 Notice of Violation
 - 8. 5-8-23 Notice of Violation
 - 9. 7-25-23 Public Staff Recommendation
 - 10. 7-31-23 Order Finding Application Incomplete & Request for Additional Information
 - 11. 9-15-23 Petition to Terminate Emergency Operator

539540541

542543

Chairperson Ward stated the applicant, Mr. Gupta and his family purchased the wastewater treatment plant in 2017, securing the permit in 2018. The ten-page permit is very specific, and the majority of the conditions have not been met. The plant does not operate as permitted.

544 545

546

547

Planning Board Member Collins inquired about the permit expiring shortly. Planning Board Member Lawler stated the permit will probably be renewed, same conditions as the original but until the plant is brought into compliance, they will most likely not receive an approval to increase capacity.

548549550

Chairperson Ward added that the town cannot inspect the wastewater treatment plant, but it can certainly put pressure on the state.

551552553

Chairperson Ward highlighted the following information within the documents submitted:

- The facility has been inspected over the last five years and has been non-compliant. The treatment facilities are corroded and not functioning properly, turbidity is required to be reported continuously and it is not reported for multiple days in February of 2021.
- With treatment units not functioning properly the groundwater and surface water may be impacted with high nutrients and bacteria. There are documented groundwater exceedances for nutrients in the monitoring Wells located around the high-rate infiltration Pond. No documented fish kills or health risk to the public.
- The facility has not been compliant since 2017 and has failed to come into compliance.
- The facility has a chronic history of exceeding limits and various monitoring and frequency violations. Recent inspections have shown the facility is currently in a state of disrepair and is not being properly operated or maintained. (report from 2021)
- Numerous fines and the percentage of over the limit bacteria count amounts documented in the assessment was excessive.
- As of May 24, 2022, letter from NCDEQ to Prem Gupta GWWTP, LLC the total unpaid civil penalty assessments totaled \$10,250.00 (state eventually reduced fine to \$3087.50)
 - Planning Board Member Lawler stated the state does not want the money; they
 want the plant to be fixed and most likely there is an agreement to put the
 remainder of the fine into correcting the deficiencies in the plant.
- 3/14/23 Most recent compliance inspection report shows the facility is still non-compliant. The comment on the bottom of the report reads, "Reclaimed irrigation system is not functional. New irrigation pumps and controllers are required. Diversion valve needs to be checked to make sure it is functional and if not, it needs to be replaced. New irrigation pumps and controllers are required. The reclaimed irrigation system is not functioning".
 - Planning Board Member Lawler added the generator needs to be replaced and the clarifiers and filters all need to be replaced. They are running the stuff through there with no effective treatment.

Chairperson Ward reviewed documents from the Utilities Commission, an application for a transfer of certificate of public convenience and necessity for increase in rates. He stated the application is seeking to double the rate to Southern Shores Landing (gradually over a two-year term). It also appears that Neil Blinken from the Water Reclamation is still the franchise owner (as of 2/10/23). The commission found the application to be incomplete. The Utilities Commission also responded to the application stating that the sewer system has been abandoned by the current franchise holder and the commission appointed an emergency operator. The property on which the system is located has been sold multiple times without commission approval and due to the irregularities, transfer proceedings are not appropriate at this time.

Planning Board Member McClendon requested to see the requirements for approval of special the use permit. The board highlighted some considerations.

Planning Board Member Zehner stated to consider under "all other applicable ordinance" as to include the wastewater provisions.

 Planning Board Member McClendon recommended considering Item B the town's land use plan compatibility and with the area in which it is to be located.

Planning Board Member Zehner commented that part of the challenge is that it is unclear whether the entity that authorized the wastewater has any authority to do that. They may own the real property under it, but they don't have the franchise for the actual facility. No one has authority to allow for an increased tie-in, the records completely unclear on that.

Chairperson Ward felt the board had done their job and reviewed all documents thoroughly. He read a summary he had written concerning the situation with the water quality and the franchise situation.

Since assuming ownership of their wastewater treatment plant in March of 2017 the Gupta managed LLC continues to operate it in a manner that is detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare not only of our town citizens but of all the surrounding communities that enjoy clean air and water quality. I think it is incumbent on our town to put as much pressure and resources as possible to force the Gupta managed LLC that owns and operates this wastewater treatment plant into compliancy with the permit that it currently holds and owns.

Chairperson Ward continued by saying, as set forth in article 10 chapter 36-299 and chapter 36-300 the Planning Board may recommend to Town Council approval, conditional approval, or rejection of the special use permit and site plan.

Chairperson Ward **moved** that the Planning Board reject the Special Use Permit 23-01 and accompanying site plan submitted by the applicant Ginguite, LLC, Seconded by Vice Chairperson DiBernardo. Chairperson Ward called for discussion.

Planning Board Member Zehner stated he wanted to point out one more thing. The rendering that was provided added a lot of clarity about the appearance of the site and regarding the size and scale of the buildings. There is nothing in the documents beyond what the building lot coverage is at 41,158 sq. feet, multiple that by 3 because there are two three story buildings., that is a total of 123, 474 sq. feet of building area. Technically you can discount the parking level as not floor area, but it does contribute to the volume of the buildings. The Marketplace has 158,814 sq. feet, so this development is only shy of that by 30,000 sq. feet. The square footage per acre of the marketplace is 8,766 square feet per acre. The square footage of this site based on what they have proposed is 17,740 square feet per acre. You are doubling the density of maybe the nearest benchmark within the town, and I think it's important to mention that and put that on the record.

Town Attorney Lauren Arizaga-Womble asked the board if there was anything not mentioned in the deliberation portion that contributed to the motion, it would be helpful to include that.

Chairperson Ward stated the wastewater situation from a water quality standpoint and environmental quality standpoint became the main issue but before that, it would be the 50 ft setback on the east side that the applicant is not in favor of, wastewater all phases including

the covenant issues, the traffic study requirement, storm water issue with all this fill and what will be the repercussions of doing all that, the use of Landing Trail which has been answered by the applicant, Dominion Power 70 ft powerline easement questions, and the marina which not allowed.

648 649 650

651 652

653 654

655

656

645

646

647

Vice Chairperson DiBernardo stated the Land Use plan comes into effect here and does it conform with the Southern Shores Land Use Plan. He is very skeptical as far as from the initial look at it. He further stated he knows he has belabored this before, but the covenant requires 50 or 18,000 gallons. If you want to change the covenant in North Carolina it's a 67% vote to change a covenant, that's the regulation in North Carolina. The covenant would need to be straightened out, what is the requirement, and there is no word minimum as stated by the applicant's attorney. Mr. DiBernardo stated the other items for him were the 50-foot setback and wording such as, "if feasible", is concerning and needs stronger clarification.

657 658 659

660

661 662

663

664

665

Planning Board Member McClendon stated his concerns consisted of the issues with the wastewater treatment plant which has not been satisfied, the use as proposed would not conform with the town's land use plan, nor would be compatible with the area in which it is located. There is a lower density residential area adjacent and therefore the massing of the buildings, a huge bar blocking the view from the road of the waterway is not compatible with that area. Breaking that project up into smaller pieces that doesn't look like a Comfort Inn so that there is light and air and views through there, and having the sizes of the of the buildings somehow reflect the adjacencies which is residential both in Martin Point and in Southern Shores Landing. The project is not compatible with the area.

666 667

668

669

- Planning Board Member Collins stated the density for that area and the wastewater treatment plant issues were her concerns.
- 670 Chairperson Ward read his motion once more, MOTION to reject the Special Use Permit 23-01 and 671 accompanying site plan submitted by the applicant Ginguite, LLC, Seconded by Vice Chairperson
- 672 DiBernardo. The motion passed unanimously 5-0.

673 **Public Comment**

-An unnamed resident thanked the Planning Board for looking out for their community.

674 675 676

Planning Board Member Comments

677 None

678 679

Announcements

680 Planning Director Haskett stated the next regular meeting will be held December 18th at 5:00 p.m.

681

682 Adjourn

683 Motion to adjourn the meeting by Vice Chairperson DiBernardo, Seconded by Planning Board Member 684 Lawler. The time was 7:31 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

685

686 ATTEST:

687 688

Tony DiBernardo, Vice Chairperson

Respectfully submitted,

Southern Shores Planning Board-November 20, 2023 pg. 15