

**Board Chair:**  
Rodney Cheek

**Planning Director:**  
Matthew Hoagland



Commissioners' Meeting Room  
124 W Elm Street  
Graham, NC 27253  
February 12, 2026 at 7:00 PM

# ALAMANCE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

## February 12, 2026 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

**Members Present:** Rodney Cheek, Amie Perkins, Lee Isley, Lee Kimrey, Richard Tom King, Henry Chandler, Mac Jordan

**Members Absent:** Ernest Bare, Stephen Dodson

**Staff Present:** Planning Director Matthew Hoagland, Planner 1: Keyshawn Haith, Assistant County Manager: Brian Baker, County Attorney: Rik Stevens, Assistant County Attorney: Kwame Opat.

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by chair Rodney Cheek at 7 p.m.

### **II. ROLL CALL**

### **III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

January 8, 2026 Regular Meeting

Mr. Isley motioned to approve the minutes. Seconded by Tom King and approved unanimously.

### **IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS\***

Matt Kirkpatrick addressed the board regarding concerns related to a proposed LCID landfill application in the Coble Township area. He stated that residents remain opposed to the proposed use and expressed concerns about truck traffic, roadway classifications, and public safety along local roads. Mr. Kirkpatrick referenced prior discussions about potentially amending the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to restrict heavy industrial uses from accessing lower-classification local roads. He requested clarification on the process for initiating such an ordinance amendment and asked whether the matter could be expedited outside of the broader UDO revision process.

### **V. BOARD/COMMISSIONER RESPONSES**

Chair Rodney Cheek responded to Mr. Kirkpatrick's comments and explained that while the board understands the concerns raised, amendments to the UDO must follow a structured review process. He noted that the Planning Board meets once per month and does not impose formal time limits on its meetings but must carefully manage the volume and sequencing of ordinance revisions currently under review. He emphasized the importance of allowing staff to present where the board currently stands in the broader revision process, how the board arrived at that point, and what steps remain. The Chair acknowledged that residents may be seeking an immediate resolution; however, he clarified that no final action or definitive resolution could be provided at that meeting. He stated that the board would continue to follow the required amendment procedures under state law, which

include Planning Board review, recommendation, public hearing, and final consideration by the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Lee Isley made a motion to amend the agenda by moving the Announcements and Discussion section to take place prior to Old Business so that Mr. Hoagland may address some of the UDO revision issues raised. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tom King. Upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously. The agenda was amended accordingly.

## **VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS/DISCUSSION**

Planning Director Matthew Hoagland then presented an informational recap of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) revision process and timeline. He noted that several Planning Board members are relatively new and that the board began the comprehensive review process in January 2024. He stated that the purpose of the presentation was to provide context regarding how the Board arrived at its current position in the review process and to outline the anticipated path forward. He further explained that, because state law requires a public hearing before the board of Commissioners for each UDO amendment, staff has intentionally retained all proposed changes in draft form. The intent is to present a consolidated final document for a single public hearing rather than requiring multiple hearings for individual amendments.

Board members discussed various aspects of the review process and Mr. Hoagland introduced the idea of creating a subcommittee to finish the process in the interest of time. He also introduced the idea of moving the board's meeting start time earlier so that they may have more time for review each meeting and hopefully not go so late into the night. Board members hesitated on the idea of a sub-committee as a few would feel more comfortable if all members actively worked on the UDO revisions. They did not immediately approve of the time change idea, but Mr. Jordan and Mr. Cheek floated around the idea of moving the meeting earlier during the winter months and keeping the time the same during the summer months. They asked Mr. Hoagland to draft a proposed change for meeting times and bring it back for consideration at the next meeting.

## **VII. OLD BUSINESS\***

1. Second Consideration of UDO Article 6.12 Amendments
2. Second Consideration of UDO Article 6.13 Amendments

(Abandoned, Junked, Nuisance Motor Vehicles & Auto Graveyards)

Mr. Hoagland confirmed that this was the second consideration of proposed amendments to Articles 6.12 and 6.13 of the UDO, relating to abandoned, junked, and nuisance motor vehicles and automobile graveyards. For the benefit of newer board members, Mr. Hoagland explained the draft formatting conventions used throughout the UDO revision process. He stated that any proposed new text will appear underlined, while text proposed for deletion appears with strikethrough formatting. He reiterated that all revisions remain in draft form and will be consolidated into a final document for a single vote at the conclusion of the review process. Mr. Hoagland explained that the draft before them combines the current Part 12 and Part 13 into a single consolidated section, as both addresses abandoned, junked, nuisance motor vehicles, and auto graveyards.

Mr. Hoagland outlined the revisions made since the board's previous consideration:

- Section 6.12.8 – A newly underlined paragraph was added to clarify regulatory language.
- Subsection 6.12.8.2(A) – The required fence height was increased from six (6) feet to ten (10) feet.
- Section 6.12.9 (Stream Buffers and Flood Zones) – New language was added prohibiting the storage of automobiles or automotive parts within any portion of a Special Flood Hazard Area, as defined by the ordinance, when junkyards or auto graveyards operate on such properties.

Mr. Lee Kimrey referenced Section 6.12.2 and raised a question regarding the provision allowing individuals to store up to three (3) junked motor vehicles on their property. He asked how that allowance would apply to properties located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Mr. Hoagland responded that, as currently written, the ordinance does allow individuals to store up to three (3) junked or hobby vehicles on their property, including within areas that may be designated as flood-prone. He clarified that the existing regulatory framework separates individual vehicle storage from business operations.

He explained that Article 6.12 primarily addresses the storage of junked or hobby vehicles on individual residential properties, whereas Article 6.13 governs commercial operations such as auto graveyards and junkyards. The newly proposed prohibition on storage within Special Flood Hazard Areas applies specifically to commercial junkyard and auto graveyard operations.

Mr. Kimrey also inquired about the exemption language for antique motor vehicles included within the ordinance. He asked what age threshold qualifies a vehicle as an antique motor vehicle under the current regulations. Mr. Hoagland responded that the definition of an antique motor vehicle is contained in Article 7 of the UDO. Reading from that section, he said they are defined as a motor vehicle, not including a reproduction, that was manufactured more than twenty-five (25) years prior to the current year. He further noted that antique motor vehicles are typically registered as such with the County Tax Office and maintained on file accordingly. He acknowledged that staff have previously addressed compliance issues involving antique motor vehicles on private properties and indicated that tax registration status is one factor considered in determining whether a vehicle qualifies for the exemption. Mr. Kimrey asked whether, under the current language, an individual could theoretically store an unlimited number of antique motor vehicles on a property located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Mr. Hoagland responded that, hypothetically, if the vehicles meet the definition of antique motor vehicles—being more than twenty-five (25) years old and properly registered with the County Tax Office—and appear to be undergoing restoration, they could qualify under the exemption. Board members noted that the requirement that vehicles be “undergoing restoration” introduces a degree of subjectivity in enforcement. It was observed that determinations regarding whether a vehicle is actively being restored can be difficult to verify and may rely heavily on individual interpretation. Members further acknowledged that property owners often believe their vehicles to be valuable, which could complicate consistent enforcement. The discussion highlighted a potential regulatory gap whereby multiple antique vehicles could be stored within flood-prone areas without triggering the same restrictions applicable to commercial junkyard operations.

Mr. Tom King suggested that the issue could potentially be addressed within the County’s flood damage prevention regulations. He asked whether the County could specify certain materials or items that are prohibited from being placed within Special Flood Hazard Areas. Mr. King noted that other jurisdictions have adopted provisions identifying specific items that may not be located within flood-prone areas. He suggested that the County could consider whether junked or inoperable vehicles should be explicitly prohibited within Special Flood Hazard Areas, regardless of antique classification.

Ms. Perkins asked what practical difference exists, in the event of a flood, between a junked vehicle and a non-junked vehicle. She questioned whether floodwaters would treat both similarly and

whether the environmental risks differ based solely on a vehicle's operational status. She referenced prior flood events, noting that after a significant storm event like Tropical Storm Chantal, junkyards located near flood-prone areas experienced substantial disruption and debris issues. She observed that those situations involved significantly more vehicles than the three-vehicle allowance for individuals but raised the broader question of whether regulating only junked vehicles in flood zones would create inconsistency. Mr. Hoagland responded that the general assumption may be that operable vehicles are typically parked closer to the residence or under some form of shelter. He noted that, in anticipation of a storm event, a vehicle owner would likely move or park an operable vehicle in a safer location. He contrasted that with situations involving older or inoperable vehicles—such as a classic vehicle stored farther back on a property—which may not be relocated prior to a storm. He suggested that this practical difference may be part of the reasoning behind distinguishing between regularly used vehicles and those stored long-term.

Mr. Jordan asked for clarification on the terminology used in the draft language, specifically the phrase “Special Flood Hazard Area.” He noted that he was more familiar with terms such as floodway, 100-year floodplain, and 500-year floodplain, and asked whether “flood-prone” or “Special Flood Hazard Area” was defined within the ordinance. Mr. Jordan commented that floodways typically involve high-velocity water where development is strongly restricted, and he wanted to better understand how the term “Special Flood Hazard Area” compares to those more commonly referenced floodplain designations. Mr. Hoagland clarified that “Special Flood Hazard Area” is a specific, defined term used in the County’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance and is derived from state’s model ordinance. That model ordinance is what the county used to craft ours.

Mr. Hoagland referred the board to Article 6.4 of the draft UDO and summarized how “Special Flood Hazard Area” is defined and applied within the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.

He explained that the section applies to all Special Flood Hazard Areas within the jurisdiction of Alamance County and any municipalities that adopt the County’s regulations. He noted that these areas are identified through FEMA’s Flood Insurance Study (FIS) and Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (DFIRMs), which are adopted by reference as part of the ordinance. He further stated that future map revisions that do not change flood hazard data are also adopted by reference.

Mr. Hoagland explained that the ordinance requires a certificate of compliance with the County’s flood damage prevention regulations before any building permit or other development permit may be issued for structures located within designated flood hazard zones. He stated that the purpose of these provisions is to protect public health, safety, and general welfare and to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions. He then asked whether that clarification addressed the board’s questions regarding the terminology. Mr. Kimrey stated that, in his view, the discussion should focus specifically on junked vehicles rather than all automobiles. He noted that attempting to regulate all vehicles within flood-prone areas could create enforcement challenges, particularly when a vehicle is registered, tagged, and otherwise operable. He emphasized that his primary concern was with junked vehicles, especially in flood-prone areas. Mr. Kimrey expressed concern that, under the current language, antique vehicles could be stored in unlimited numbers so long as they meet the 25-year age requirement and are registered with the Tax Department.

County Attorney Stevens provided additional context regarding antique vehicle classification and tax valuation. He noted that the Tax Department does not determine status based on whether a vehicle is considered “antique” for zoning purposes but rather assigns value according to its established valuation schedules. Mr. Stevens explained that vehicles over a certain age and in certain conditions are often assigned very low taxable values. He referenced a prior situation involving an older model vehicle that was valued at approximately \$500 for tax purposes. He stated that, as a practical matter, if a vehicle meets the UDO’s definition of an antique motor vehicle (25 years or older) and is registered for tax purposes—even at a minimal value—it could qualify under

the current exemption language. He acknowledged that this could, in theory, allow a property owner to maintain multiple such vehicles on a property, including within a flood-prone area.

Mr. Hoagland said he can add a provision to the draft to exclude both junked motor vehicles and antique motor vehicles from flood zones in the final draft. Mr. Kimrey agreed that he would like to see that language added. There were no objections to Mr. Hoagland adding that language.

Mr. Cheek acknowledged the board would now move onto New Business.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

### 1. Consideration of Draft UDO Article 6.14 Amendments

Mr. Hoagland introduced proposed revisions to Article 6.14 of the Unified Development Ordinance relating to Recreational Vehicles and RV Parks. He started by explaining that the draft proposes renaming the section simply “Recreational Vehicles” to better capture the broader range of uses addressed within the ordinance. An index has also been added at the beginning of the section for clarity and ease of navigation and explained the following for each draft section:

Purpose and Applicability: He stated that Section 6.14.1 is a new section establishing purpose and applicability. He explained that this addition clarifies what the ordinance regulates and why, consistent with formatting updates for all previous sections in the UDO.

RV Park Development Standards (6.14.2): He noted that Section 6.14.2 has been renamed “RV Park Development Standards.” Dimensional requirements were rewritten for clarity, and watershed standards were revised to align with existing watershed regulations. He explained that the current language appears to shift between RV park standards and mobile home park standards and he wasn’t really sure why. The revised draft simplifies this by applying the same built-upon area limits that apply to other nonresidential developments in watershed areas, consistent with the county’s watershed ordinance. Under ‘Road Standards,’ the language was clarified to mirror the format of the Mobile Home Park Ordinance and align more closely with Fire Access Road standards. Under Subsection D (Parking), dimensional standards were revised to comply with N.C. General Statute 160D-702(c), which limits a local government’s authority to impose parking requirements beyond state parameters. Under Subsection E, the section was renamed “Setbacks, Landscaping, and Buffering.” The prior table was removed due to duplicative and lengthy language and replaced with narrative standards intended to provide clearer guidance.

Land Use Spacing (Subsection F): He told the board that he would really like their guidance on the land use spacing requirements of this section. He explained that the current ordinance imposes spacing standards similar to those for High Impact Development (HIDO), including separation from “protected facilities.” He expressed concern that the spacing requirement may be difficult to administer, as it depends on uses located on neighboring properties—something an applicant cannot control. He further noted that, unlike HIDO developments, RV parks do not have a minimum lot size requirement, which could create complications when requiring an adjustment to property lines.

Using a visual example from the ordinance, Mr. Hoagland explained that compliance could require creating irregular parcel configurations or “slivers” of land, which may conflict with subdivision regulations or require a variance. In his opinion, the way the ordinance is currently worded could push property owners in the direction of creating non-conforming lots or having to request a variance for approval.

Accessory Uses (6.14.3): Next, he highlighted the addition of a new section addressing accessory uses within RV parks. He explained that the ordinance currently really lacks any guidance for

common features within parks such as management offices, recreational buildings, or bathhouses. This new section would provide development standards for those uses.

RVs on Individual Lots (6.14.6): He also described a new section clarifying how RVs on individual lots would be regulated. He explained that the revisions distinguish between RVs used as personal property and those used as temporary residences under an active temporary residence permit. If not actively permitted as a temporary residence, the RV would be seen as simply personal property and potentially as a junk vehicle, if applicable. He concluded by saying that the intent is to simplify the structure and make the ordinance more consistent and easier for the public to understand.

Mr. Hoagland then opened the floor for any board member questions.

Mr. Kimrey stated that he had questions regarding the land use spacing section, specifically the definition of “protected facilities.” He asked whether a standalone community swimming pool would qualify as a protected facility under the ordinance. He further inquired whether such a determination would be an interpretation made administratively by staff, or whether the ordinance language should more clearly define what is included within that category. Mr. Kimrey noted that the ordinance language references public or privately owned parks and playgrounds as protected facilities. However, he stated that he did not see any specific reference to community swimming pools and questioned whether such a use would be included within that definition. Mr. Hoagland noted that this is a great question. In his view, stepping back from the specific wording, the larger question is whether the land use spacing requirement makes sense in the context of RV parks generally. He noted that RV parks are typically located in more rural areas, often preserve existing trees, and do not generate high-speed traffic or intense activity. He described the use as generally quiet in nature, with individuals camping for short durations. He asked the board to think about whether it is appropriate to require the same type of land use buffer from neighboring properties that is required for high-impact or heavy industrial developments.

Mr. King stated that he did not have personal experience living near or spending time in an RV park and was trying to better understand the typical activities and impacts associated with that type of use. He asked generally what types of activities occur within an RV park and whether those activities would justify the same spacing requirements applied to higher-intensity developments. Mr. Hoagland shared an example of his experience at an RV park style campground. He recounted arriving before sunset to set up a tent, cooking outdoors, and participating in some recreational activities the following day. He noted that many RV parks include small community amenities and organized activities, but overall he assumes the use is generally recreational and low-intensity in nature.

Mr. King. asked whether similar land use spacing requirements exist for manufactured home parks, in order to compare how those uses are regulated relative to RV parks. Mr. Hoagland responded that there is not.

County Attorney Rik Stevens noted that, during his prior experience in law enforcement, he had spent time responding to incidents at RV parks. He stated that while many RV parks operate quietly, they can also involve situations requiring law enforcement response.

Mr. Hoagland added that building code regulations may also affect how RVs are used, particularly with respect to long-term occupancy. He noted that, in a prior jurisdiction where he worked, there was a cap on the length of time an individual could occupy an RV within an RV park—only 180 days within a calendar year.

Ms. Perkins asked where tiny homes would fall within the ordinance framework and how they are classified in relation to RV parks and manufactured homes. She questioned whether tiny homes would be treated similarly to RVs or regulated under a different section of the UDO. Mr. Hoagland

responded that a tiny home is intended to be placed on a permanent foundation, connected to utilities, and permitted as a single family dwelling under the current ordinance. He noted that it would not be regulated as a mobile home or an RV if it meets the requirements of a permanent structure. Ms. Perkins noted that, in her experience, many so-called “tiny homes” are not placed on permanent foundations and remain movable. Mr. Hoagland stated that, based on prior discussions with the County’s Building Inspections Department, tiny homes that are intended to function as dwelling units should be placed on permanent foundations and regulated as single-family residences.

Mr. Hoagland explained that the current land use spacing requirement applies when a neighboring property contains a designated “protected facility,” such as a religious institution, manufactured home park, another RV park, playground, school, or dwelling unit. He stated that, under the current language, the applicant would be required to create a buffer by effectively redrawing or adjusting property lines to maintain the required separation from the neighboring protected use. He noted that this approach measures spacing from uses located on adjacent properties rather than solely within the applicant’s property boundaries. Chair Cheek stated that the issue may be more about how the ordinance is worded rather than the intent itself. He suggested that the “outside perimeter” should remain the property boundary, and that required buffers should be accommodated within the property rather than requiring the creation of new parcel lines. Mr. Hoagland responded that the buffer requirements and land use spacing requirements are not identical under the current ordinance. He stated that, as written, the land use spacing language appears to be borrowed heavily from the High Impact Development Ordinance. He noted that the HIDO framework contemplates larger tracts of land and, in some cases, requires the creation of new parcel lines to establish separation from protected facilities. He expressed concern that applying that same structure to RV parks—without a minimum lot size requirement—may create unintended complications. Chairman Cheek asked for clarification, stating that under the current structure, if a property consisted of 100 acres and a required spacing area was imposed around the perimeter, the applicant could effectively lose a significant portion of usable land—potentially reducing the developable area to 70 acres or less.

Mr. Hoagland stated that, if the board wishes to maintain some form of separation between RV parks and neighboring protected uses, the simpler approach may be to rely on the existing buffering standards rather than maintaining a separate land use spacing requirement.

Mr. King read from the draft language, noting that the land use spacing “shall be measured in a straight line without regard for intervening structures or objects from the closest edge of the property line of the tract on which the RV park is located to the nearest improvement currently in use of a protected facility.” He stated that, as written, this would mean the measurement is taken from the property line of the proposed RV park to the nearest improvement on the neighboring protected property. In the case of a dwelling unit, he noted that the measurement would be from the RV park property line to the house itself, as the “improvement.” Mr. King continued reviewing the draft language, emphasizing that the spacing requirement is measured in a straight line from the property line of the proposed RV park to the nearest improvement in use as a protected facility. He explained that, for example, if there is a dwelling located on a neighboring property, the measurement would be taken from the RV park property line directly to the house. If that distance falls within the required separation—such as 300 feet—the RV park use would not be permitted within that portion of the property. His comments underscored that the restriction is triggered by the location of improvements on adjacent properties and could significantly limit where an RV park may be developed on a site.

Ms. Perkins offered an example to clarify how the spacing requirement would work in practice. She stated that if she had a house on her property and parked an RV on it, and that use extended a certain distance toward the property line—such as 75 feet—this could potentially trigger the spacing requirement for a neighboring property owner proposing an RV park. She questioned

whether that scenario would effectively restrict the RV park owner's ability to develop their property based on activity occurring on an adjacent parcel. Mr. Hoagland responded that, under the current language, it is possible that an RV park could be rendered nonconforming if a protected facility were later established on adjacent property. Mr. King stated that this illustrates the broader problem with separation requirements tied to neighboring properties. He noted that if a property owner next door establishes a new protected use, it could automatically place the RV park in a nonconforming position. He questioned whether it is fair for one property owner's future actions to directly affect the compliance status of another property owner.

Mr. Kimrey asked for clarification regarding nonconforming status. He noted that if an RV park were rendered nonconforming, it would generally be considered grandfathered. However, he questioned whether, if the use were discontinued for six months or more, it would lose that status and be unable to resume as the same nonconforming use.

Chairman Cheek stated that, in his view, if a 300-foot separation is required, the measurement should be taken inward from the applicant's own property line. He suggested that the developable area should begin 300 feet inside the boundary, rather than tying compliance to improvements located on neighboring parcels. He explained that under this approach, if the required 300-foot area cannot be accommodated within the applicant's property, then the site would simply not qualify for the use. However, once established in compliance, the RV park would not be affected by future development on adjacent properties. Mr. Cheek stated that this method would prevent a neighboring property owner's actions—such as constructing a building close to the shared property line—from placing the RV park out of compliance.

Mr. Isley offered an alternative reading of the draft language. He stated that if an RV park is developed in compliance with the spacing requirements at the time of application, and a neighboring property later adds an improvement, that subsequent change should not retroactively create a violation. He pointed to the language referencing the "nearest improvement currently in use as a protected facility," and suggested that the term "currently" indicates the measurement is made at the time of application and approval. He stated that, in his view, any improvements constructed on adjacent property after approval would not affect the RV park's compliance status.

Mr. Hoagland asked the board's opinion on simply basing the measurements on internal setbacks and buffering rather than external land use spacing. He summarized the new draft language requiring all RV park operations to maintain a 40-foot internal setback from property lines. He further explained that if any portion of a building is located within 50 feet of a public road, a landscaped buffer of at least 30 feet must be maintained along the perimeter. He noted that the buffer could exist within the 40-foot setback area and may be satisfied either through landscaping in accordance with Appendix B of the ordinance or through the preservation of natural vegetation. He said that if natural vegetation is proposed to satisfy the buffer requirement, staff would conduct a site visit to determine its effectiveness, similar to the review process used for cell tower buffering. He emphasized that this draft language was newly presented at the meeting and that the specific measurements could be adjusted at the board's discretion. He clarified that the numerical standards largely reflect the table previously included in Section 6.14, but are reorganized into clearer narrative form.

Chairman Cheek noted that this was the board's first review of the revised internal setback and buffering language and that members would have the opportunity to review and consider the proposal further before taking action at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Hoagland stated that the Board could provide feedback or request revisions to the proposed setback and buffering language, and staff would incorporate those changes for further review at the next meeting. He noted that the timing of the next discussion may depend on whether a public hearing for the LCID landfill is scheduled for that meeting.

Ms. Perkins suggested simplifying the language by requiring that no dwelling or RV unit be located within a specified distance from the property line. Mr. King suggested that the ordinance could specify that RV spaces are permitted only within a certain number of feet from exterior property lines.

Mr. Hoagland stated that he could remove the land use spacing language and instead rely on the internal setback and buffering standards discussed by the board. He indicated that staff would revise the draft accordingly and bring it back for a second review at the next meeting.

## 2. Consideration of Draft UDO Article 7 Amendments

Mr. Hoagland introduced Article 7 (Definitions), explaining that the agenda packet includes only the modified or newly added definitions rather than the full document. He clarified that the revisions do not replace all existing definitions but instead reflect targeted updates and additions. He stated that he would move through the list of definitions and pause where additional explanation or board guidance was needed. His list included the following definitions:

- Agricultural Preservation District
- Board of Adjustment
- Board of Commissioners
- Building Setback Lines (clarified that they only apply to permanent structures)
- Clearway (made applicable to both Mobile Home and RV Parks)
- Clerk
- Comprehensive Plan/Land Development Plan
- Construction Activities
- Data Center (upon recommendation of State Senator Galey)
- FAA (Federal Aviation Administration)
- FTA (Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996)
- Farm District
- FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency)
- Fence (both solid and perforated)
- Governing Board
- Health Department
- Industrial Development
- Jordan Reservoir, Watershed & Jordan Nutrient Supply/Water Nutrient Strategy
- Major and Minor Variances (watershed clarification)
- Manufactured Homes (Class A, B, C, and D)
- N.C. Department of Transportation
- Open Space
- Perennial Waterbody
- Quasi-Judicial Decision
- Right of Way

- Site Plan
- Solar Energy Systems
- Subdivision (clarified major vs. minor as well and defined classes of minor subs)
- Variance (generally applicable)

Board members discussed the proposed changes to the definition of “Construction Activities,” particularly the language addressing clearing, grubbing, and grading. Members expressed concern about striking the right balance between allowing legitimate preparatory work and preventing premature site disturbance prior to permit approval. It was noted that surveying often requires limited clearing to establish sight lines or access points, and soil testing may require temporary disturbance in specific areas. Board members stated that the ordinance should not unintentionally prohibit necessary surveying or environmental testing required to submit a complete application.

Mr. Kimrey asked for clarification regarding the fence definition. He questioned whether, if a site plan includes a proposed fence, it would automatically be required to meet a six-foot height standard. Mr. Hoagland responded that fence height requirements are regulated within specific ordinance sections where applicable. For example, the Junk Vehicle Ordinance includes fence height standards, and the Heavy Industrial Development Ordinance also regulates fencing in certain contexts. However, he clarified that if a property owner simply installs a fence at a single-family residence, the county does not impose any fencing regulations.

The board discussed the proposed fence definition, particularly whether including a specific height requirement in the general definition could create conflicts with the North Carolina Building Code. Members noted that under the Building Code, guardrails on elevated walkways are typically required to be 42 inches in height when there is a drop exceeding 30 inches. It was discussed that the Building Code distinguishes between a “guard” or “guardrail” and a “fence,” and that guardrails are commonly constructed using fencing materials. Concern was raised that if the UDO’s general fence definition included a minimum height requirement—such as six feet—it could unintentionally require a six-foot guardrail in situations where the Building Code only requires a 42-inch guard. Members expressed concern about placing planners in a position of interpreting whether a structure qualifies as a fence or a guardrail. The board discussed whether the general definition should avoid specifying a height and instead leave height requirements within the individual ordinance sections where fencing is explicitly required (such as junkyard or industrial standards). Members also discussed language referencing four-by-four square openings and gauge thickness, noting that those specifications relate to Building Code standards for open fencing and safety. After discussion, there was general agreement that the fence definition should focus on describing solid versus perforated fencing and remove blanket height limitations from the general definition. Height requirements would instead be addressed within specific ordinance sections where necessary. Mr. Hoagland indicated that staff would revise the language accordingly that takes out the required height of a fence.

Ms. Perkins stated that she would like to see a clearer and more straightforward definition of “Direct Access” within the ordinance. She expressed interest in ensuring that the term is defined in a way that is easy to understand and administer, particularly given its importance in evaluating site access and roadway connections.

In closing out the discussion on definitions, Mr. Hoagland said the Planning Department and property owners would really benefit from definitions and guidance around emerging residential development types. In particular, he displayed proposed draft definitions for the following:

- Secondary Residences

- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
- Short-Term Rentals

Board members briefly discussed these terms and the way in which they are currently regulated and how they could be regulated. Mr. Hoagland explained that these uses are becoming more common and that clearer definitions would help ensure consistency in interpretation and enforcement. He concluded by saying that staff would prepare draft definitions for future discussion so the board will have more opportunities to consider these before a final vote.

As the meeting neared the end, the board again discussed the option of a subcommittee to finish out the UDO review work but did not take any action on that item.

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Kimrey made the motion to adjourn; it was seconded by Ms. Perkins and approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.