

**MINUTES
WASHINGTON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
&
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS
Feb 02, 2017**

5:00 pm, Quorum Court Room, New Court House
280 N. College Ave.
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

DEVELOPMENTS REVIEWED:

ACTION TAKEN:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT HEARING

County

a: Meadows at River Mist CUP

Tabled

County

b: Aaron Tolbert Residential CUP

Tabled

(To be tabled at the request of the applicant)

County

c: Janne Green Residential CUP

Tabled

(To be tabled at the request of the applicant)

LAND DEVELOPMENT HEARING

County

d: Janne Green Minor Subdivision & Private Road Development

Tabled

(To be tabled at the request of the applicant)

1. ROLL CALL:

Roll call was taken. Members present include Robert Daugherty, Walter Jennings, Kenley Haley, Randy Laney, and Philip Humbard. Joel Kelsey and Daryl Yerton were not present.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: *Kenley Haley made a motion to approve the minutes of Jan 12, 2017. Walter Jennings seconded. All board members were in favor of approving. Motion passed.*

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: *Walter Jennings made a motion to approve the agenda. Kenley Haley seconded. All board members were in favor of approving. Motion passed.*

4. NEW BUSINESS

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT HEARING

County

a. Meadows at River Mist CUP

Conditional Use Permit Request

Location: Section 06, Township 17 North, Range 28 West

Owners: Bank of Fayetteville

Applicant: Jamal Parker, Parker Enterprises & Memphis Synder, FH&G Properties, LLC

Engineer: Charles Presley

Location Address: Intersection of E Hwy 412 and WC 386

Approximately +/- 65.35 acres/155 lots Proposed Land Use: Residential Subdivision
Coordinates: Latitude: 36.17437745, Longitude: -94.01026113
Project #: 2016-249 Planner: Courtney McNair email: cmcnair@co.washington.ar.us

REQUEST: Conditional Use Permit approval to allow a density of approximately 1 unit/ 0.38 acres on a parcel of land that is approximately 59.75 acres in size. The request is for a total of 155 residential lots, a decentralized septic system lot, a detention pond lot, and a fire station lot. The residential lots range in size from 8,029 sq. ft. or approximately 0.18 acres to 58,262 sq. ft. or approximately 1.34 acres. (Most lots fall between 8,000-10,000 sq. ft. in size. Six (6) larger lots were added north of Blue Springs Road.)

CURRENT ZONING: Project lies within the County's Zoned area (Agriculture/Single-Family Residential 1 unit per acre).

PLANNING AREA: This project is located solely within Washington County's jurisdiction.

QUORUM COURT DISTRICT: District 5, Joe Patterson **FIRE SERVICE AREA:** Nob Hill VFD
SCHOOL DISTRICT: Springdale

INFRASTRUCTURE: Water- Springdale **Electric-**Ozarks Electric **Natural Gas-** Black Hills Energy
Telephone- ATT **Cable-** Cox

BACKGROUND/ PROJECT SYNOPSIS:

STAFF IS RECOMMENDING THAT THIS PROJECT BE TABLED DUE TO MANY FEASIBILITY ISSUES. THE APPLICANT IS IN AGREEMENT WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION, BUT WOULD LIKE THE PLANNING BOARD/ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS TO REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE INFORMATION PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING.

The owner of this property is the Bank of Fayetteville. The applicants are Memphis Snyder, Jamal Parker, and James Mathias. This property is located off E. Hwy. 412, adjacent to Blue Springs Village Subdivision, and approximately 1,500 feet from Beaver Lake.

The Meadows at River Mist CUP is requesting approval to allow a density of approximately 1 unit/ 0.38 acres on a parcel of land that is approximately 59.75 acres in size. The request is for a total of 155 residential lots, a decentralized septic system lot, a detention pond lot, and a fire station lot. The residential lots range in size from 8, 029 sq. ft. or approximately 0.18 acres to 58, 262 sq. ft. or approximately 1.34 acres. (Most lots fall between 8,000-10,000 sq. ft. in size. Six (6) larger lots were added north of Blue Springs Road.) Washington County has a minimum lot size of 10,000 sq. ft.

The parcel may actually be a little larger to accommodate all proposed elements, it is not clear to staff.

In July 2016, the engineer requested several variances regarding the interceptor tanks for the decentralized sewer system, the lot and block standards, and lot size minimums, and lot road frontage minimums. At this time, staff does not support these variances.

In August 2016, staff received a letter from the applicant asking to remove the requests for two of the variances. They stated that they added a street to address block length, and they planned to use the allowed gravity flow decentralized sewer system.

However, in January 2017, the applicants met with staff and appeared to be asking to use the interceptor tank decentralized sewer system again. Staff is unclear what the current request is for (the plans provided show the interceptor tank design), and the applicant has asked the County Attorney to clarify ordinance 2016-24 regarding community sewer systems. Staff will update you with any clarifications at the meeting.

History:

This project previously received Preliminary Subdivision approval in October 2005, and then revised Preliminary Subdivision approval in September 2006. Both of these approvals were prior to the County's Zoning code being adopted. Also, at that time, this project was within Springdale's Planning Area, it is not now.

Please see the attached staff report and approval letters from those approvals.

This project was never finalized, and has expired. Therefore, they must come back through the entire planning process. That process now includes zoning, so they must request a Conditional Use Permit to allow a density that is higher than that allowed by right.

Some infrastructure was constructed before this subdivision expired. They installed curb and gutter, waterlines, and the force mains needed for the DSS. The DSS proposes to use interceptor tanks, so the force mains are sized smaller for that type of system than they would be for a system without individual tanks. Systems with interceptor tanks are no longer allowed by County Code. None of the actual treatment portion of the DSS was installed, and none of the interceptor tanks were installed. There was some base material put down for the roads, but none of the roads were completed.

Staff does not know the current condition of any of this infrastructure as it has been sitting for over 10 years unused. The engineer has provided an infrastructure assessment for review.

While the previous information will be good for reference, due to approval expiration, this is considered a new project and should be reviewed as such.

TECHNICAL CONCERNS:

Decentralized Sewer:

The current proposal before you shows a decentralized sewer system. The applicant wishes to use a system that has interceptor tanks on each lot before connecting to the main system. It is staff's understanding that our current ordinances do not allow for this type of system. The applicant has asked for clarification from the Washington County Attorney on this matter. At the time of this staff report, there has been no definitive resolution.

The applicant submitted a variance request to allow the interceptor tanks, which is included in this packet.

Staff has concerns about the proximity of this proposal to Beaver Lake.

Staff has received correspondence from the State Health Department (attached) regarding this system. We have some concerns and would like to have a more in depth discussion about this system. **Staff is meeting with the Health Department on January 31, 2017, and will provide any updates to the Board.**

Water/Fire Issues:

The water provider is Springdale Water. There are serious concerns about the gpm fire flow and pressure available. The applicant submitted information to the Arkansas State Fire Marshal, and his response is attached. While it appears that the gpm fire flow may be able to qualify for an exemption, the pressure is still a concern.

The AR State Fire Marshal indicated that the local authority should have the final determination on the firefighting issue. This information should be reviewed by the County Fire Marshal and Nob Hill Fire Department.

Additionally, staff will need a copy of information submitted to the AR State Fire Marshal so that any proposed upgrades to the water line or alternatives are included as conditions if this project progresses in the future.

Drainage:

The engineer has submitted a Preliminary Detention Pond report for review. Staff will need a full drainage study if this project progresses.

Roads/Sight Visibility/Ingress-Egress/Parking:

This project accesses off WC 386, Blue Springs Village Road. Two entrances are proposed. Road improvements were part of the conditions of approval for the previous subdivision.

Listed below are the ORIGINAL (2005) conditions of approval in regard to streets:

1. *Springdale inspects roads. **This is no longer in Springdale's Planning Area, so County will most likely inspect the roads now.***
2. *Streets will include improvements per specifications.*
3. *Existing County Road must be improved, both sides, as per County Standards.*
4. *County Road 386 intersects with HWY 412- any improvements to this intersection within the HWY 412 ROW must be approved by the Arkansas HWY Dept.*
5. *Entrance will be through AHTD if it touches the state right-of-way. If not, county will review and insure safe entrance.*

The engineer for this proposal submitted a report detailing the current condition of the infrastructure that was previously installed. Some of it will need to be removed and replaced. Full review of the roads, road sections, and off site road improvements will be conducted once a full traffic study is completed.

Environmental Concerns:

At this time, no stormwater permit is required by Washington County; however, the applicant must comply with all rules and regulations of the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ).

Electric/Gas/Cable/Phone:

Ozarks Electric, Black Hills Energy, and ATT service this area. As this project did not go through Tech Review for this review cycle, staff does not have current comments from these entities.

Signage/Lighting/Screening Concerns:

It is not clear to staff if there is any proposed signage or lighting. This will need to be reviewed prior to this project moving forward as well.

Generally, all outdoor lighting must be shielded from neighboring properties. Any lighting must be indirect and not cause disturbance to drivers or neighbors. All security lighting must be shielded appropriately.

COMPATIBILITY CONCERNS:

Surrounding Uses:

The surrounding uses are primarily agricultural and residential, with several nearby residential subdivisions. The densities of these surrounding subdivisions range from 1 unit/3.6 acres to 1 unit/0.3 acres. Blue Springs Village is adjacent and has a density of 1 unit/0.3 acres.

The proposed Conditional Use Permit request is to allow a density of approximately 1 unit/ 0.38 acres on a parcel of land that is approximately 59.75 acres in size. The request is for a total of 155 residential lots, a decentralized septic system lot, a detention pond lot, and a fire station lot. The residential lots range in size from 8,029 sq. ft. or approximately 0.18 acres to 58,262 sq. ft. or approximately 1.34 acres. (Most lots fall between 8,000-10,000 sq. ft. in size. Six (6) larger lots were added north of Blue Springs Road.)

The applicant has made some attempt at making the development more compatible. They have added a small park, potential walking trail (if allowed in the drip field area), and six one-acre lots to the north side of Blue Springs Village Road. However, while the adjacent subdivision has a comparable density, staff still has remaining concerns about the compatibility of adding this many additional residential lots in an area that is primarily agricultural and large lot residential.

County's Land Use Plan (written document):

According to the County's Land Use Plan

SECTION III. PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

A. LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS

RESIDENTIAL

Several goals surfaced as paramount in the PARA Task Force meetings and in a meeting held by the Quorum Court. These include:

- a. Provision of a safe living environment that offers quiet, privacy, and a rural flavor and atmosphere;
- b. Provision of quality residential development of good design, developed in a manner accessible by an adequate street system to avoid costly infrastructure extensions;
- c. Protection of residential areas from incompatible adjacent land uses;
- d. Protection of property values; and
- e. Provision of safe and adequate access to residential areas, installed in a manner to accommodate emergency and other services.

To achieve these objectives, it is essential to:

- a. Provide for development of residential areas at appropriate densities. Update, administer and enforce subdivision regulations; and develop, adopt, and enforce zoning and related regulations and codes;
- b. Require development to be connected to utilities and utilize zoning as a means to guide the progression of development;
- c. Protect the character and integrity, and property values, of single-family, residential areas;
- d. Protect residential neighborhoods from inappropriate non-residential influences through the use of regulatory controls;
- e. Ensure land use and development patterns which provide for the most efficient and effective use of available utilities and services, including fire protection; and,
- f. Maintain an adequate county road plan and standards to guide and accommodate traffic movement; to develop differing categories of roads; and to protect rights-of-ways for planned, future roads.

The proposed density is very high compared to what is allowed by right in this area. It is adjacent to an existing subdivision with a similar density, but the rest of the area is much less dense. While there is an adjacent subdivision of similar density, most of the feasibility issues with this proposal are due to a lack of available services, most notably water and sewer. The water pressure and gpm are very low, there is no city sewer, and the system proposed for sewer does not comply with County ordinances (the applicant has requested a variance to allow this type of system).

Future Land Use Plan

The Future Land Use Plan is a reflection of the City of Springdale's future plan for this area. This area is designated as Low Density Residential. The current proposal does not meet the Future Land Use Plan for this area.

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS/CONCERNS:

All neighbors within 300 feet of the boundary of this property were notified by certified mail of this proposed project in August 2016. They were sent a courtesy notice of this meeting.

At this time, Planning Staff has received several comments from neighbors, which are attached. Staff will update the Planning Board at the meeting if any additional comments are received.

SITE VISIT:

Staff has not completed a site visit to this site recently. A site visit will be completed if this project advances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicants and staff both recognize that there are several outstanding feasibility concerns. These include water, firefighting capacity, the design of the decentralized sewer, road improvements that require a traffic statement, the need for a full drainage study to evaluate the detention provided, and potential others. However, the applicant would like to discuss the concept of this proposal with the Planning Board/Zoning Board of Adjustments.

Washington County Senior Planner, Courtney McNair, presented the staff report for the board members.

Kenley Haley, Planning Board Member, asked, "When was Blue Springs built?"

Courtney McNair, Senior Planner, answered "In the 1970's."

Kenley Haley asked about the density.

Courtney McNair, replied "Its 1 unit per 0.38 acres. That's including the area that the decentralized sewer system it is on."

Memphis Synder, Partner of the Project, stated, "Charley Presley was the original engineer on the project 10 years ago. He's a little hard of hearing. So I will go over the project. We have this under contract last year around June. Its bank owned. We have it under contract subjected to getting it approved through Washington County. The subdivision was around 85% to 90% complete when the recession hit in 2006. The curb and gutters are in. The asphalt was never put in. So we're basically trying to take it and see if we can come up with something that works to finish the project. We made a submittal last July and staff recommended that we table it four months for traffic studies, water studies, or sewer. We just want to see if there's a way to take this existing subdivision and find a way to finish it. At this point we want to come before the board for discussion. We want to see what the board has to say about the project. I think its real nice subdivision. It's done near the old one that was built in the 1970s. It can help the value in the whole area. I think the minimum lot size has changed since then. Different laws were passed. What was okay then isn't okay now. The step system is a big issue. The water we thought was an issue but we submitted our studies to the fire marshal and he called last week stating that for this size home the pressure was adequate. The water we thought was going to be a big issue hopefully it's not an issue now. The step system is an issue. The previous planner was pretty adamant about not doing the step system. Tom Bartlett is the expert that we hired on to work with us. We looked into gravity sewer. It's not going to be feasible doing that. It's going to be a million dollars more to do that. We have high hopes that the step system is something you guys can entertain. A couple of the problems they had earlier was one of the streets were too long. We took out a couple of lots and put a connector in there to solve that. She wanted some green space. We did away with 3 lots and made it into a little park area. Then we added the bigger lots on the north with a walking trail around the drip fields. I think they added the detention pond. Engineering wise if that is not enough we can certainly take out a lot or two to solve that. Bottom line is that we would like the board's input. We want to know if we have a chance at getting this done or you guys rather not see it done. The alternative would be for the lot to sit there for years and it'll be a place for people to dump garbage. I'll appreciate if you guys can give me a little feedback on your thoughts. Also Courtney has been very helpful on this. We can't appreciate her enough."

Randy Laney, Planning Board Chairman, stated "Me and Bob Daugherty were on the board when this project came through. We had almost no rules back then. Some of the reactions of the County were specifically to try set up guidelines for this rural subdivision with smaller lots. This is one of the reasons we

do have regulations today. As a board we really don't have any bias. We just try to apply the rules based on what staff recommends. When you come in and you are less than one acre you have a presumption of incompatibility because the law clearly says if you have less than one acre lots you are incompatible. We entertain things smaller than that. The smaller the lots the higher the hill you have to climb. As far as having a bias against it, I never heard anybody on this board express a bias that we won't do something. That's not our job. Our job is to try to apply the law as best as we can. We try to consider your property rights and the neighbor's property rights. In that past we turned some projects down with a lot of small lots that didn't seem to have any compunction to come up with a ways to make it more compatible with everybody. We have turned those down and we have approved some with small lots. Without staff completing their studies we can't make a recommendation."

Robert Daugherty, Planning Board Vice Chair, added "We would like to see larger lots if it's feasible. Like Randy said, that was a reason that the law was enacted to start with. I know what it amounts to if you can economically do this with larger lots. I think it'll be an easier hill to climb if you can do that."

Memphis Synder, stated "The connections are in and everything. I don't know how we can make it bigger. The only way to make it bigger combining 2 lots. I don't think it would end up being feasible. If it has to be this size lot is everybody oppose to that?"

Kenley Haley stated, "I don't like the project as this point. Like Randy said. Those regulations were put in for a purpose. We had issues in the past. Without the recommendation and research of staff we can't make a decision. We do like to see larger lots."

Randy Laney stated, "I heard there was a decentralized sewer issue. I know they are not solved yet. The water pressure would have to a lot do with it."

Memphis Synder, "It sounds like the lot size is a major issue with the board. If the step system meets the requirements will there be any opposition?"

Randy Laney replied, "If staff recommends it we don't reengineer it. That's not our job. We just review it to make it sure it's to the standards set by the county. When it gets to technical standards like roads and sewer, and water we're not going to reengineer it. We're going to listen to staff's engineer tells it."

Robert Daugherty added, "We're definitely not against the decentralized sewer system as long as it works, functional and recommended by staff."

Randy Laney stated, "If it's legal we can't say no."

Memphis Synder asked if Courtney has thoughts or inputs to add.

Courtney McNair replied, "We're waiting on some study and facts. We're waiting on Brian to make some decisions on his end as far as ordinance goes. Staff is not opposed to decentralized sewer systems. I need some guidance from my counsel."

Randy Laney stated, "I can recall one project out west in Fayetteville that was caught in the downturn. They had their streets laid and everything. They just didn't have this many lots. Try to take into account that you need to utilize the investment in the ground. At some point it's all about price. I can understand the numbers. If you can only build on every other lot because that's just the density. Somebody's going to have to write that off. That's not our concern but on the other hand we do understand. We don't want the property to lay there forever."

Robert Daugherty added, "If you can look at making them somewhat larger and then you may have get into a negotiation point with the owner. You'll have to explain what you're dealing with number wise and maybe you can come to some kind of agreement that'll work for everybody. We would like to see the project development. We're not quite comfortable with that kind of density."

Randy Laney asked how many lots are under an acre.

Courtney McNair replied, "150 are under 10,000 sq ft. Most of them are under .25 or less."

Memphis Synder asked, "What would be a comfortable feel for the density? Maybe they can take three lots and make two. If you guys can give a little bit of guidance on what would be a comfortable lot size that would be helpful."

Courtney McNair stated, "Currently they are asking for several variances as well. Variances always make staff extremely uncomfortable since they do set precedents. I think part of the resolution could be reconfiguring so that the variances are not needed. The variances are for less than the minimum county lot size of 10,000 sq ft and less than 75 ft of county road frontage. I'm not going to say that's the breaking point but look at Hughmount subdivision. They preserved a lot of their green space and it has varying lot size. It turned out well."

Randy Laney stated, "I wish it was that scientific but I'm not in a position to tell you a magic number."

Memphis Synder asked about the county width.

Courtney McNair answered, "75 is the width required by county code. You guys were asking for a couple of variances and that adds another layer of review."

Memphis Synder stated, "What were the other variances?"

Courtney McNair replied, "The 10,000 square feet lot size. You have several that are below that. The other variances that you fixed were the road length variance by adding the other road. The other variances are for the interceptor tanks system. We're not clear legally on where we stand on the sewer system."

Memphis Synder asked, "If a solution can be figured out. Would taking a group of lots and making into a park better received? If we were just strictly talking lot sizes."

Randy Laney replied, "One of the solution staff has brought in the pass is larger green space. Again it's going to be a total project. Staff will work with you. They're not bias either. They're just trying to do their job which is to enforce the rules. It's going to be a give and take."

Memphis Synder stated, "No, I understand. That's the engineer's job. On the decentralized sewer system, have you had a chance to come up with a decision Brian?"

Brian Lester, County Attorney, replied, "I don't have a definitive answer at this point. We're still looking into what we talked about at this meeting. I will work on getting something written out to everybody so that'll be some guidance on that."

Randy Laney reminded the applicant, "We are not talking about technical review. That will be with staff. We're not going to follow much of anything we go very far."

Kathy Barlett, Contractor for the project, gave a brief history on her company AquaTech systems who worked with the original developer Gil Bryant for River Mist. "He had originally planned in the subdivision to have interceptor tanks or step collection system. For the developer now to go in and change into a gravity system is going to cost quite a bit of money. I think of the stinky point we're having is the debate are interceptor tanks allowed in the county or not. We did extensive research reading the ordinances and getting their interpretation. I did not see in here a wording in the county and codify that says interceptor tanks are allowed within the county. In ordinance 2014-1406 it states that any subdivision that is within two miles of a incorporated city has to have gravity collection, which is interceptor tanks. This subdivision is within 4 miles from Springdale."

Courtney McNair replied, "That part of the code has been replaced with the new ordinance 2016-024."

Kathy Barlett stated, "That's where the debate is. I don't see anywhere in 2016-024 where it says specifically that 2016-024 amends 2014-06. It's a completely different ordinance relating to responsible managing entities. It has nothing to do with the writing in 2014-06. If 2014-06 is not in place. You don't have to have a backup generator or skater systems. Those are all part of 2014-1406. So if you take it out then you're taking it all out."

Courtney McNair, responded "Those all part of ADEQ's regulation now."

Randy Laney stated, "I just want to be clear. We're going to take advice of council and they're going to tell us what rules to follow. Then the quorum court passes the rules at the county level. If they want to amend or change it that would be their job. All we do is apply the law that tell us that is applicable. We're not going to decide which law is applicable. We're going to be told what law is applicable."

Robert Daugherty, Planning Board member, added "What I would suggest is that you work really close with staff. Try to find a way to make staff comfortable with this project. Then we can become comfortable with it. I would recommend that you work close with staff to come up with a resolution. I would have to lean on the attorney for the counsel on the ordinances."

No Public comments.

Public Comments Closed.

Robert Daugherty made a motion to table the **Meadows at River Mist CUP**. Walter Jennings seconded. Joey Kelsey and Daryl Yerton were not present. Board Members Philip Humbard, Robert Daugherty, Walter Jennings, Randy Laney, and Kenley Haley were in favor of approving. Motion passed.

County

b. Aaron Tolbert Residential CUP **(To be tabled at the request of the applicant)**

Conditional Use Permit Approval Request

Location: Section 31, Township 14 North, Range 32 West

Applicant: Aaron Tolbert

Location Address: 3398 Torrey St

Approximately 5.0 acres / Proposed Land Use: Residential

Coordinates: Latitude: 35.90065928, Longitude: -94.26370050

Project #: 2016-431 Planner: Nathan Crouch e-mail at ncrouch@co.washington.ar.us

Walter Jennings made a motion to approve the agenda. Kenley Haley seconded. All board members were in favor of approving. Motion passed.

County

c. Janne Green Residential CUP **(To be tabled at the request of the applicant)**

Conditional Use Permit Approval Request

Location: Section 26, Township 18 North, Range 29 West

Owners: Janne Green

Surveyor: Blew & Associates / Wes Luker

Location Address: 17476 Pleasure Heights Rd

Approximately 1.18 acres/ 2 lots. Proposed Land Use: Single Family Residential

Coordinates: Latitude: 36.20761913, Longitude: -94.03991345

Projects: 2016-434 and 2016-436 Planner: Nathan Crouch email: ncrouch@co.washington.ar.us

Walter Jennings made a motion to approve the agenda. Kenley Haley seconded. All board members were in favor of approving. Motion passed.

LAND DEVELOPMENT HEARING

County

d. Janne Green Minor Subdivision & Private Road Development **(To be tabled at the request of the applicant)**

Preliminary and Final Minor Subdivision & Private Road Development Approval Request

Location: Section 26, Township 18 North, Range 29 West

Owners: Janne Green

Surveyor: Blew & Associates / Wes Luker

Location Address: 17476 Pleasure Heights Rd

Approximately 1.18 acres/ 2 lots. Proposed Land Use: Single Family Residential

Coordinates: Latitude: 36.20761913, Longitude: -94.03991345

Projects: 2016-434 and 2016-436 Planner: Nathan Crouch email: ncrouch@co.washington.ar.us

Walter Jennings made a motion to approve the agenda. Kenley Haley seconded. All board members were in favor of approving. Motion passed.

5. Other Business

- Discussion of Current Development and Planning Department Activities.
- Discussion of 2017 schedule.
- Reminder of upcoming Planning Board meetings:
- White River Landing appeal dates Feb 9, Feb 16, and Feb 23.
 - March 2
 - April 6
- Any other Planning Department or Planning Board business.

Justice of the Peace Harvey Bowman had some questions about the White River Landing project. The Board members answered Mr. Bowman’s questions concerning the project.

6. Old Business

7. Adjourn

Kenley Haley moved to adjourn. Robert Daugherty seconded. Motion passed. All Board members were in favor of approving.

Planning Board adjourned.

Minutes submitted by: Phuong Pham

Approved by the Planning Board on:

_____ Date: _____
Randy Laney, Planning Board Chairman