

**MINUTES  
CHATHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
REGULAR MEETING  
OCTOBER 18, 2010**

---

The Board of Commissioners (“the Board”) of the County of Chatham, North Carolina, met in the Chatham Community Library, Meeting Room, located in Pittsboro, North Carolina, at 6:00 PM on October 18, 2010.

Present: Sally Kost, Chair; George Lucier, Vice Chair; Commissioners Mike Cross, and Tom Vanderbeck

Absent: Commissioner Carl Thompson

Staff Members Present: Charlie Horne, County Manager; Jep Rose, County Attorney; Renee Paschal, Assistant County Manager; Vicki McConnell, Finance Officer; Jason Sullivan, Planning Director; Carolyn Miller, Deputy Clerk to the Board

**INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Cross delivered the invocation after which the Chair invited everyone present to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Kost welcomed everyone in attendance and called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA and CONSENT AGENDA**

The Chair asked if there were additions, deletions, or corrections to the Agenda and Consent Agenda.

The Chair asked consideration of the following:

- Item #1, Minutes for Regular Meeting held on September 20, 2010, removed for consideration at the next meeting

Commissioner Lucier moved, seconded by Commissioner Vanderbeck, to approve the Agenda and Consent Agenda with the noted requests as follows:

1. ~~Minutes: Approval of Board Minutes for Regular Meeting held on September 20, 2010~~

Item was removed from the agenda for consideration at a later date.

2. **Nursing Home and Adult Care Home Advisory Committee Reappointment:** approval of reappointment of Lisa F. Hannah to the Nursing Home and Adult Care Home Advisory Committee by the Board of Commissioners

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

3. **Nursing Home and Adult Care Home Advisory Committee Reappointment:** approval of reappointment of Evelyn Kidd to the Nursing Home and Adult Care Home Advisory Committee by Chair Kost

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

4. **Contract for Cedar Mountain Phase I:** Approval of contract with Lewis Metty Development Inc. for Subdivision improvements for Cedar Mountain Phase I

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

5. **NC DENR Forestry Services Agreement:** Approval of a request to approve NC DENR Forestry Services Agreement

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

6. **Tax Releases and Refunds:** Approval of a request to approve the tax releases and refunds

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

7. **Chatham Wireless Contract:** Approval of previously approved broadband wireless pilot project contract with Chatham Wireless LLC with revised effective date of November 1, 2010

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

8. **Debt Write-Off for the Health Department:** Approval of a request to approve the Debt Write-Off for the Health Department in the amount of \$44,532.30

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

9. **Reduction in Funds for Minority Health Interpreter Services:** Approval of a request to approve the State appropriation reduction in the amount of \$1,000

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

10. **Vaccine Fees:** Approval of a request to approve the vaccine fees for the Chatham County Health Department as proposed

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

11. **Microsoft Enterprise Contract:** Approval of a request to approve the Microsoft Enterprise Contract with Dell

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

12. **Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Budget:** Approval of a request to amend the Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Budget by appropriating \$485,000 in fund balance to reimburse Chatham County Schools for charter school payments made subsequent to the Sugar Creek rulings

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

13. **Chatham County Human Relations 2010 Annual Report:** Presentation of the 2010 Annual Report to the Board by Esther Coleman on behalf of the Human Relations Commission

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

No one was present that wished to make public comments.

## **PLANNING AND ZONING**

**Revision to Sketch Design Approval:** Request by Sears Design Group, P.A. on behalf of Fitch Creations, Inc. for a revision of sketch design approval of “Farrington – Section X, Phases 1 and 2,” consisting of 41 lots on 21.87 acres off S.R. 1817, Millcroft, Williams Township

Jason Sullivan, Planning Director, stated that the request is being processed under the subdivision regulations prior to December 2008. He added that the Stormwater Ordinance and the Soil and Erosion Control Ordinance will apply to this request, with the exception of the steep slope provisions. The old riparian buffer rules also apply under the Watershed Protection Ordinance. The developer has offered to meet the new buffer widths under the new rules. There is a 150 buffer along a perennial stream that transitions into a 50 foot buffer on the intermittent portion. There is a 30 foot buffer that extends along an ephemeral channel that was also identified on this property. The plat shows a 50 foot right-of-way, but notes included in the packet state that the right-of-way is only 45 feet. An e-mail from Dan Sears was included in the packet which clarifies that the width should be 45 feet. The Planning Board and Planning Department staff recommend approval of this request with two additional conditions.

Commissioner Lucier asked how the current number of lots compares to the number of lots on the design approved in 1999. Mr. Sullivan stated that there is a reduction in the number of lots for this area.

Chair Kost asked if there is knowledge of any streams or seeps on the area. Mr. Sullivan stated that Fred Royal, Environmental Resources Director, reviewed information he was provided on wetlands for this property.

Commissioner Lucier added that it appears that there are no ephemeral streams on the property, based on the topographical map.

Alan Keith, P.E. from Dhill and Phillips Engineers, stated that the Corps of Engineers has been on the property. He also added that Mr. Royal has been on the property as well.

Commissioner Lucier moved, seconded by Commissioner Vanderbeck, to approve the sketch design revision with the two additional conditions: (1) the preliminary plat will be revised to show the correct right-of-way widths and (2) a note will be added to the preliminary plat stating the maintenance responsibility of Burke Place until such time as NCDOT takes the road over for maintenance. Motion carried four (4) to zero (0).

### **Evidentiary Hearing**

*Continued from September 20, 2010*

**Public Hearing** request by HBP Properties, LLC for a revision to the existing conditional use permit on Parcel No. 2407, know as Polk’s Village, 10677 US 15-501 N, to add additional uses on the property

Chair Kost delivered the oath to those who wished to make comments.

Mr. Sullivan explained the specifics of the request.

Chair Kost opened the floor for public comments.

Rita Spina, Vice-President of Chatham Citizens for Effective Communities (CCEC), submitted her comments and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“My name is Rita Spina, Vice-President of Chatham Citizens for Effective Communities (CCEC). I live at 12 Matchwood, Pittsboro, N.C. As you are aware, CCEC pays attention to the status of various development projects. Tonight, I would like to call your attention to some misinformation that was provided to you at the September 20<sup>th</sup> hearing for Polks Village.

If you recall, Mr. Luis Rocas, the representative of the Williams Corner developer, upon questioning by Commissioner Vanderbeck, indicated that the wastewater treatment permit for Williams Corner was valid.

The NPDES Permit for the construction of a wastewater treatment plant at Williams Corner was originally issued to Aqua North Carolina, Inc. under the name North Carolina Green Initiative, Permit No. WQ0030235. Please note this permit was for construction only and did not include provisions for any associated spray fields. On May 20, 2010 in a letter to the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources and signed by Trent Parker, Area Manager for Aqua North Carolina, it was indicated that this plant was never constructed and that there were no future plans for construction.

On June 10, 2010 the Department of Environment and Natural Resources responded to Mr. Parker's letter and notified him that the NPDES reuse permit No. WQ0030235 was rescinded effective immediately and that any future operation of a non-discharge system would require a new application and permit."

Debra Oldham, ABC Board Member, stated that would like to express support of the Polks Village conditional use permit amendment. The location of the Polks Village site will provide the opportunity to consider the much needed expansion of ABC Store #1. Locating the store to this site, gives them the opportunity to provide new products to the customers and also to consolidate the external warehouse. This would eliminate the additional cost of transportation, handling and storage. She thanked the Board for consideration of this request.

Commissioner Lucier asked if this new relocated store would replace the current one. Ms. Oldham replied that yes, the current store has outgrown its boundaries.

Brantley Powell, HBP Properties, LLC, submitted his comments and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"Good Evening Commissioners and Planning Board Members,

I am Brantley Powell. While I am not a Chatham Co resident, I am a "native neighbor", having lived in Wake Co and worked as a developer there all my life.

I have owned the Polks Village property since July 2005. Since I'm probably the only remaining person who has been involved with this project since the beginning, I would like to provide you a few brief facts in support of our Application to Amend Polks Village approved land uses.

The CUP zoning application for this property was submitted to the County under the working name of "Polks Centre" in May 2006. It was approved in October 2006 having 22 approved uses and 124,000 square feet. The Williams Corner project was approved nine months earlier in January 2006 having 26 approved uses and 348,500 square feet.

The same person represented both projects during their approval process and he also envisioned developing both projects. In the Polks Centre application on pages 1, 160, & 161 he spoke of the projects as "sister developments". This characterization arose from his vision that both projects would have similar design elements under his supervision. To infer any further meaning to this term is simply erroneous. Subsequent to Polks Centre's approval this person became disassociated with Polks Centre and I understand that he also became disassociated with Williams Corner.

Subsequent to the Polks Centre approval in 2006 we began to acquire the additional permits necessary to begin development. The approval process with the NCDOT became a lengthy 18 month process involving a new Traffic Study and finally concluding in an approval in December 2008. NCDOT's final approval then required Polks Centre to seek a site plan revision in Spring 2009 due to a CUP condition related to Polks Landing Road. At this point we were finally in the position of knowing our road layout and we could begin moving ahead with engineered drawings.

Since the Spring of 2009 we have made the following progress in preparation to begin development:

- The project's name was changed to Polks Village
- A Improvement Permit for Wastewater Systems was obtained from the Chatham Co Health Dept
- A Sewage Disposal Construction Authorization was obtained from the Chatham Co Health Dept
- The Water Service Availability form was obtained from the County
- NCDOT Commercial Driveway Permits were obtained
- The engineered roadway plans for our internal roads were completed
- All street names and addresses were approved by the County
- The Appearance Commission approved our revised Landscape Plan
- Our Lighting Plan was completed and submitted
- The Grading and Erosion Control Plans were drawn and approved by the County
- The plans for a 9000 square foot building and an auxiliary building were completed by our Architect

That represents a brief history of Polks Village and brings us to the inquiry earlier this year from UNC Health Care. Mr. Smyre mentioned in his remarks on September 20th our belief regarding the language in our original approval which we felt provided us flexibility regarding our approved uses. I also mentioned this and provided a quotation from the original application in paragraph two of my cover letter provided with this Amendment Application. However, the specificity of the Planning Staff's determination necessitated our need to seek additional approved land uses to accommodate the requests we have been receiving from prospective businesses.

Upon deciding to request approval for additional land uses, we first sought a meeting with the Polks Landing Subdivision Homeowners Association. We met with several of their Board members and explained our situation and provided them a list of the additional uses we were planning to request. On August 18<sup>th</sup> we filed the Amendment Application with the County. The next day we mailed a letter to all nineteen adjacent property owners informing them of our filing and including a list of the additional land uses we were requesting. I am providing a copy of that letter for the record. Also, in the letter we provided both Mr. Smyre's and my contact information. Neither of us have been contacted by these adjacent property owners, with the exception of Williams Corner. Williams Corner contacted me and requested a meeting at which they offered their support in exchange for dropping the Medical and Food uses from our requested uses. I declining their request, telling them I didn't believe that would be in the best interest of either project, the County or the community and its citizens.

I would like to briefly provide some additional facts related to Finding #2 beyond which was included in our Amendment Application. Finding #2 reads "The requested conditional use permit is either essential or desirable for the public convenience or welfare." The original CUP Application contained the following quote in support of this Finding, "The best proof of need for any development is the confirmed interest of buyers and prospective tenants." The Application later stated "Need and Desirability must be heavily weighted towards market conditions and it is ultimately the responsibility of the developer to provide for current and future markets." It concluded by stating "It is paramount that the Staff and Board understand that placing businesses is market driven, and that businesses choosing locations are best at making this determination."

During the discussion related to Finding #2 at the Planning Board meeting on October 3, 2006, according to the minutes I quote "Ms. Kost stated that it doesn't seem fair, (with talking about commercial development in 2011-2012), that it is holding applicants like Mr. Blake hostage because it is so far down the road, but yet we consider this when evaluating finding #2." Later, in response to an opportunity to comment, "Travis Blake, applicant, stated that individual market studies were made; that he is also developing Williams Corner; that he would be monitoring the competition between Williams Corner and Polks Centre; that there would be no duplication of services unless the two services think that they are compatible;". In other words, competition in the market place is the best barometer of market demand for a service.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that Polks Village was approved four years ago and nine months subsequent to the Williams Corner approval. That approval included 23 approved uses, 18 of which were duplicated in Williams Corner. The information, reasoning and logic utilized at that time were the best available. However, the market place and our economic environment today is far different than what was envisioned at that time. That is the reason we are before you today. We are being both reactive, and proactive by seeking to accommodate business requests we are currently experiencing and using current information to enable us to anticipate future needs. I submit to you that a duplication of approved uses between Polks Village and Williams Corner does not mean that you will have a duplication of services, unless the market dictates and supports a duplication. It does insure that an important use, such as medical will not continue to be held hostage, and the monopoly which currently exists will be eliminated thus enabling competition to function in the market place. These services will then be afforded the opportunity to come to the market with a more affordable service or product and a higher probability of success which is in the community and its citizens best interest.

I therefore urge you to approve our CUP Amendment Application and the additional approved land uses listed therein. I would be glad to answer any questions you might at this time.”

Commissioner Lucier asked Mr. Powell if he had a letter from UNC Health Care stating their interest in establishing a medical facility.

Mr. Powell responded that they were contacted verbally by UNC’s state broker. He added that he does not have a formal letter, but does have e-mail correspondence and a formal proposal.

Commissioner Lucier asked Mr. Powell if he would like to include this proposal as part of the public record.

Mr. Powell responded that he does not mind sharing it as long as some of the figures shown are redacted.

Jep Rose, County Attorney, stated that this request goes beyond the scope of the request being discussed. Commissioner Lucier stated that Mr. Powell refers to that specific document in his comments which determines the need for such a use on this property.

Mr. Powell stated that he has e-mails that he can provide and added that UNC’s broker has also met with the Planning Department staff. He stated that he did not have the information with him, but would be able to provide it tomorrow.

Chair Kost stated that as long as everyone is in agreement, this information can be provided the following day.

Mr. Rose asked Chair Kost to obtain the consent of the opposing party.

Karen Kemerait, Attorney from Law Office of Styers and Kemerait, stated that she had no objection.

Jack Smyre, Planner and Principal from the Design Response, submitted his comments and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“Good evening. My name is Jack Smyre, and I am the principal for The Design Response, the planning firm that HBP Properties has retained as its planning consultant for this Conditional Use Permit Amendment application.

At this continued Public Hearing, we are submitting three sets of documents, the details of which are provided in the cover letter that transmits them to you, in response to questions, comments, and feedback offered to us at the September 20<sup>th</sup> portion of the hearing.

In particular, we are submitting:

- First, a revised set of the land use lists that were previously submitted at the September 20<sup>th</sup> hearing. These lists sort the 79 land uses permitted within a General B-1 Zoning District into what is being requested as a conditional use for Polks Village, what is already an approved conditional use for Polks Village, and what would NOT be permitted as a conditional use at Polks Village.
- Secondly, a traffic impact analysis comparison between the previously approved development program for Polks Village and the development program as modified by the revised Conditional Use Permit Amendment application.
- And, thirdly, an analysis of the requested additional uses and their impact upon the approved wastewater treatment system.

As detailed within the cover letter, the land uses have been tweaked for HBP Properties' revised application to eliminate two land uses that had previously been requested:

- Amusement Enterprises
- and, Day Care Centers

Furthermore, in response to comments made at the September 20<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing, three previously requested land uses are now proposed to be more tightly described and limited than they are within a General B-1 Zoning District.

In particular, two previously requested conditional land uses now expressly exclude manufacturing as a component, now reading:

- Cabinet shops (excluding manufacture)
- and, Leather goods sales and service (excluding manufacture) for retail sales on premises

Also, as an additional voluntary clarification and restriction, the previously requested "Food stores, retail" land use has now been modified to read:

- Food stores, specialty retail (12,000 of maximum)

The intent of this clarification and size restriction being to clearly establish that a "grocery store", at least as we know them today, is not the intent of HBP Properties, particularly since there is only slightly over 27,000 square feet total of retail square footage available within Polks Village.

It is far more a mixed use campus than a retail center, with that 27,000 square feet of general retail square footage being only roughly a quarter of the total built environment within this employment center.

Instead, as stated at the last hearing, it is the intent that Polks Village at least be able to accommodate one or more boutique food vendor outlets, such as one that functions as a retail outlet for a small segment of locally-grown produce.

There are smaller food outlet uses that are specialized in nature that are springing up in other locations, including Raleigh, that a mixed use employment base campus SHOULD be able to accommodate in order to cut down off-site trips and to provide neighborhood services at a walkable scale.

Polks Village can do all of these good things with this requested land use, particularly as now modified and further restricted in size.

I'm going to wrap up by noting that we have also submitted an analysis memo prepared by Agri-Waste Technology, Inc. addressing questions directed to us at the

September 20<sup>th</sup> portion of the hearing as to what the requested land uses would mean for the approved and permitted wastewater treatment system for Polks Village.

All uses would be permissible, according to that analysis, and there are industry-accepted methods of dealing with the portion of the waste stream that should not be in ANY wastewater treatment system, including public systems.

And, I'm going to cede the podium now to Mr. Richard Adams, a professional engineer with Kimley-Horn and Associates, the traffic engineering firm originally retained by both Polks Village and Williams Corner.

Richard will be sharing with you the results of a comparative traffic impact analysis we asked his firm to conduct, comparing Polk Villages's previously approved development program's traffic impact with the development program as modified by the amended Conditional Use Permit.

What you will hear is that because of the shift of development program square footage formerly allocated for general office uses to medical office uses, coupled with the elimination of Day Care Centers from the list of requested land uses for Polks Village, that the peak hour impact for Polks Village is significantly lowered from the peak hour impact of the previous development program, and that the projected daily trip generation for the amended development program is essentially unchanged.

But, I will let Richard give you the specifics of that comparative analysis."

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated that his question about wastewater at the previous hearing was dealing more with flow from a laundromat.

Mr. Smyer stated that the establishment must be able to handle this kind of flow and that these sorts of issues are discussed during the lease negotiations.

Jim Hinkley, Planning Board Member, stated that 70-80% of the land has been dedicated to automobile parking and access, but he does not see any sidewalks specifically dedicated to Polks Village.

Mr. Smyre responded that this site plan is not his, but it is his understanding that the site plan was approved with the condition that the sidewalk be extended to Polks Landing Road on the main boulevard to provide direct pedestrian access.

Angela Birchett, Land Use/Zoning Administrator, asked if Reuben Blakely had responded to his letter dated October 14<sup>th</sup> stating that he accepts the calculations and no other modifications need to be made. She stated that the Health Department has asked that they have a separate unit for sewage. She asked if they have land that is acceptable for this or have they been determined for a perk site system or are they prepared to have food prepared elsewhere and brought in for sale only, items in the boat shop prepared elsewhere and trucked in, same with dairy bars, etc.

Richard Adams, Traffic Engineer with Kimley-Horn and Associates, stated that he spoke to Reuben Blakely, who was receptive to the approach taken, but he would not be able to have a response ready in time for the hearing.

Chair Kost asked Mr. Rose if this response from Mr. Blakely, on the traffic generation rate, would be something that needs to be included in the hearing.

Mr. Rose responded that the information requested is an administrative approval by NCDOT. The Board can decide to approve the permit amendment pending approval from NCDOT.

Mr. Adams stated that their firm prepared both traffic studies for this development and Williams Corner. He added that they were asked to evaluate the impact of the changes in land uses discussed today, which are mostly retail and office type uses. In looking at the uses and the amount of traffic they would generate, the daycare was eliminated from the list due

to being a high trip generator per square foot especially in the peak hours. The grocery store use was also seen as a high trip generator. In order to endure that traffic not highly impacted, they recommended that the square footage of the store be reduced. They prepared an analysis which includes a table comparing the original and current traffic studies. With the elimination of the daycare, the reduction in square footage in retail and the addition of close to 30,000 square feet of medical use, the net result is a decrease in peak hours. The difference between a medical office and regular office is not the peak hours, but the daily traffic generated. The peak hours in the morning were reduced by about 10% and the evening peak hours by about 17%.

Chair Kost asked if the food establishments were sit down restaurants or only fast food. Chair Kost referenced the comparison table that only shows the traffic rate for a fast food restaurants.

Mr. Adams stated that the plans have not changed to only include fast food. They tried to be consistent with the original study, which listed fast food because they are high trip generators.

Commissioner Lucier asked what the parameters were for internal capture and pass-by capture.

Mr. Adams responded that internal capture is the capture that is assumed between the different land uses in the study. If someone goes from a fast food restaurant to one of the offices in the development, that is considered an internal capture trip. The raw trip generation looks at everything separately and then looks at the capture between the uses. The pass-by is the calculation of the trips on 15-501. Pass-by generation only applies to retail because they are not spontaneous trips.

Jim Elza, Planning Board Member, stated that the traffic generation from a post office use concerns him and asked how this would be factored in the study.

Mr. Adams responded that this was seen as a use that is part of the overall shopping center. If there is a postal facility it will likely be part of another facility, not a full scale post office.

Chair Kost agrees with Mr. Elza in that a post office would generate high traffic just like retail and if so, it needs to be addressed separately.

Mr. Smyre stated they were trying to capture the trend where the post office locates smaller operations within franchise stores, making this an accessory use. He addressed the question from Ms. Birchett regarding the wastewater issue. He added that they are aware of the regulations in place and know that anyone leasing space will have to control their food preparation waste through a private contractor, since all they can accept is human domestic waste.

Ms. Kemerait stated they have two concerns. One concern is that the amendment not undue the careful planning that went into both projects. Both projects need to be complimentary developments for the success and survival of each. She also asked that staff look very closely at the actual need and desirability of the uses. On a letter she presented on September 30<sup>th</sup>, she included information that states that the proposal is contrary to that represented during the approval process in 2006. Polks Village did not meet the requirement of showing need and desirability. The statements that were made include one that says that a current review of the uses and space reveal that the uses for the Polks Village are unique for that space. Secondly, the Polks Village does not intend to have direct competition businesses. She is asking that the Board consider the need of the request very closely. She is also asking that if any additional changes are made, that this is the responsibility of Polks Village and not Williams Corner.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair Kost stated that this issue will be referred to the Planning Board for recommendation and then brought back to the Commissioners.

### **COURTHOUSE UPDATE**

Charlie Horne, County Manager, stated that the county has been approved to hire a project manager to be paid from insurance proceeds and that he will begin work soon. The insurance company has already deposited 2 million dollars to continue the work on the courthouse.

Chair Kost asked if the project manager will have other duties in addition to overseeing the construction.

Mr. Horne responded that staff will be as mindful as possible on the particular projects that this person will undertake.

Commissioner Lucier asked if an architect has been selected.

Mr. Horne responded that an architect has not been selected at this point. He added that staff will be recommending that Taylor Hobbs stay on board, but this staff is not prepared to do it tonight.

Chair Kost stated that it is nice to see the roof on the building and the vents are in place to start the process of drying out the building.

Mr. Horne stated that fans were being put in place to begin the process of drying the building out, but he is not prepared to say that the fans are operational.

### **MANAGER' S REPORTS**

The manager had no reports at this time.

### **COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Lucier stated that he has met with county commissioners, municipal officials and people from the state on a directive from the governor about how different state agencies, such as the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Transportation, can be streamlined to save money.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated that he received a press release from Century Link stating that they have expanded access to affordable broadband to 135 more customers in Chatham County.

Mr. Horne stated that Congressman Price and possibly Congressman Etheridge will be at the courthouse at 12:30 PM on Friday in case any of the Commissioners would like to attend.

Chair Kost asked that a meeting notice be posted in case the majority of the Board decides to attend.

Chair Kost stated that as part of the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP), she will meet with Melissa Guilbeau, Transportation Planner, and district representatives the second week in November. As part of this meeting, they will be requesting a study of the 751 corridor to look at potential safety and road improvements. The original suggestion was to conduct a study that only looked at making the road four lanes, but she would like the study to be broadened to include other improvements, including bike lanes. She will be advocating for this unless she hears otherwise from the other Board members.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated that he agreed with Chair Kost. He met with Ms. Guilbeau today. There is a resolution prepared by the Rural Planning Organization for approval on Wednesday that adds support for this proposal.

Chair Kost stated that she appreciated the work and support of Ms. Guilbeau on this proposal.

Chair Kost stated that this Board considers public art important in enhancing the community. The Board knows how valuable the art community has been to Chatham County and to the economic development efforts. She stated that if the county will continue to have public art in the future, it will be helpful to establish a public arts taskforce. She proposed that the Board establish a taskforce that can branch off from the arts cluster in the Economic Development Corporation. This taskforce can include representatives from Chatham Arts, Siler City incubator and the Studio Tour, who will look at establishing criteria for evaluating art. A charge needs to be developed for this committee, but it needs to include the development of policies and procedures and appropriate topics for future public art. She suggested that once the taskforce is established, they can evaluate the current art in the library to see if it meets the evaluation criteria. She proposes that any policies/procedures developed by the taskforce be brought to the Board for a public hearing and for approval.

Commissioner Lucier stated that next step is to set up guidelines for selecting members and also the lifespan of the taskforce.

Chair Kost stated that she will work closely with staff and come back to the Board with a proposal.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Lucier moved, seconded by Commissioner Vanderbeck, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried four (4) to zero (0), and the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 PM.

---

Sally Kost, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Sandra B. Sublett, CMC, NCCCC, Clerk to the Board  
Chatham County Board of Commissioners