

Planning Board Meeting – July 20, 2015 Minutes

Members Present: Harold Broadwell, Ruth Van der Grinten, Errol Briggerman, Ashley Anderson, Judy Silver, Kathe Schaecher,

Members Absent: Billy Bryant, Gilda Wall

Staff Present: Planning Director David Bergmark, Planner Allison M. Rice

1. Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Broadwell called the meeting to order.

2. Welcome and Recognition of Guests

Mr. Broadwell welcomed the public, as well as Commissioner Gray.

3. Swearing in of New Members

Only one of the two new members were present, Kathe Schaecher.

Mr. Broadwell swore Kathe Schaecher in to the Planning Board, and she signed her oath.

4. Election of Chair and Vice-Chairperson for the Planning Board (1 year term)

Mr. Briggerman nominated Mr. Broadwell for the position of Chair. Ms. Silver nominated Ms. Anderson for the position of Vice Chair. Ms. Van der Grinten made a motion to accept the nominations. Mr. Briggerman seconded the motion. The motion passed.

5. Chairman and Board Members' Comments

There were no comments by the Board.

Mr. Broadwell told the public that any decisions made by the Planning Board regarding the Transportation Plan were not final. They were recommendations that were sent to the Town Board for approval or disapproval.

6. Adjustment and Approval of Agenda.

Ms. Silver made a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Schaecher seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Public Comments

Five people had signed up for public comment:

- J.W. Dunn, 1116 Hunters Grande Trail, Wendell
- Harvey Murphey , 808 Eagle Rock Road, Wendell
- John Anderson, 2449 West Lake Drive, Raleigh
- Mike Dunn, 6601 Celebration Court, Wendell
- David Anderson, 3320 White Oak Road, Raleigh

Mr. J.W. Dunn –

Mr. Dunn said he would like to make his comments at the end of the meeting, if that was agreeable. Mr. Broadwell said that the public comment period was scheduled for the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Dunn said he wanted to know what happened at the meeting before he made his comments. He asked if that was unreasonable. Mr. Broadwell said he wanted to give the public every opportunity to be heard. He said he didn't know what would happen during the meeting, but if they could accommodate Mr. Dunn and there was no objection from the Board, he would keep Mr. Dunn in mind.

Mr. Harvey Murphey –

Mr. Murphey said that he had been in and around Wendell his whole life. He said he didn't mean any disrespect to any one person, but he had a lot of disrespect for what the Board was trying to do. He said he was highly disappointed by the meeting last week. He pointed out that one of the new members was not present at this meeting. He said at the meeting last week, two Board members left while the public was still speaking. He said that meeting that was held without telling anyone they were going to have it.

Mr. Murphey said his daddy always told him be sure to never take what wasn't yours, and be extra sure not to let anyone take what wa yours. He said he had a little bit of property out there, and he said you were not going to take it. He said you could run your roads wherever you wanted. He said he built his subdivision out there and he built the roads. He said if you wanted to have a road, build where you own some property. He said you were not going to run a road through his property. He said he owned property in several counties from here to the coast, and Wake County was the only one who ever tried to take anything from him. He said Knightdale did it when they put his property in their ETJ. He said he had no rights in their ETJ. He said when you were getting ready to run a road through his property, be sure to check the name on the deed.

Mr. Broadwell said he thought there was some misunderstanding among the public about what they were doing. He said all they were doing was updating a plan. He said there was no taking of land involved. He said they weren't going to force a road across anyone's property. He said in his view, a road wouldn't be put across a person's property unless they developed it. He asked the public to try to look objectively about what they were looking at, to read the plan, and to pay attention to it.

Mr. John Anderson –

He said they owned the old Anderson property on Old Battle Bridge Road, and that it had been in the family for over 100 years. He said he attended some of the meetings to understand what was going on. He said by the Board's own standards, the decisions should be responsible and fair. He said this plan put a majority of the burden on a small number of landowners to update Wendell's transportation, which he hardly found fair. In addition, Wendell wanted to put the expense on the developers of the tracks that these lines had been drawn across. He said he was told that this would enhance the value of his property and that it wouldn't fall on the shoulders of the taxpayers. He said on his plot of land, the Transportation Plan called for a 4 lane divided road that would cost approximately \$700,000 to construct, a 3 lane road that would cost approximately \$500,000 to construct, a portion of a bridge that would cross a swamp, on which he wasn't sure if there had been an environmental survey. He said in 2010 when Battle Bridge Road bridge closed, DOT estimated that it would cost between \$700,000 and \$1.2 million to repair. He said the Andersons would lose 5.3 acres to the roads, at a cost of \$500,000 to the family.

Mr. Anderson asked that Wendell slow down, look more at the costs of these projects, and let public have more input into the plan.

Ms. Anderson asked for clarification of some of the numbers that Mr. Anderson had given.

Mr. Mike Dunn –

Mr. Dunn said, since there was confusion about this Transportation Plan, it would be good to have public comments at the end. He said he knew a lot of people attended the meeting last week hoping to get some information and nothing really came of that meeting, so they came back to this meeting. He said if they had to discuss it up front, then they didn't have anything specific to say.

Mr. Dunn reminded the group that they didn't operate in a bubble and these weren't just lines on a map.

Mr. Dunn said, at the meeting last week, that when a Board member had asked if a person was required to upgrade the road when building a house on their property, someone had said that they could pay a fee instead of upgrading a road. Mr. Dunn said that it wasn't right to charge something without having to do any real work. He said if they didn't have to do any work, they're acknowledging they didn't want any work in the first place – they just wanted the check.

Mr. Dunn said that he believed the Board and Mr. Bergmark had a difference of opinion on the role of government in his life. He said he didn't move to Wendell to get a small street with wide sidewalks. He said last week Mr. Bergmark had told the Board to look at their role in planning these neighborhoods that could have an effect on society. He said one comment was that narrower streets will slow traffic and wider sidewalks will make people want to move to Wendell. He said that was not necessarily why people moved to Wendell. He said he moved to Wendell because it was two lane roads and tobacco fields. He said he was looking for things in Wendell that the Planning Board didn't like. He said his biggest problem was the comment that as a Planning Board, they could impact social issues. He said if the Board saw their role and the government's role as one that could influence people's weight through the way they plan the town, that was just messed up. He said somebody needed to take a look back at what their job really was. He said obesity was not the Planning Board's problem. He said it was his personal choice if he wanted to gain weight, lose weight, get out and walk on the street, if he wanted to join a gym. He said it wasn't your place to design a town around the idea that they could influence social issues.

Mr. Dunn said he agreed with what Mr. Murphey had said. He didn't think anyone should lose their property, and he didn't want a highway in his backyard. He said the Board was going to move forward no matter what anyone said, but he wanted them to know that their decisions affected real people and real properties.

Mr. David Anderson –

Mr. Anderson said he was there to ask the Planning Board to slow down and take a look at all the repercussions and consequences of the Transportation Plan as it was currently drawn.

Mr. Anderson said Mr. Bergmark had said last week that one of the duties of the Planning Board was to protect significant cultural resources like historic and natural features. Mr. Surasky and his associates had freely admitted to him in the past that they had drawn up the Transportation Plan from a very abstract point of view without taking any of these into account. He said for example, Mr. Surasky had no idea that the Anderson Farm had been on the National Register since 1999. He said that the Anderson Farm was the most complete antebellum farm complex to have survived in all of Wake County, with a 19th century general store and post office, the remains of a cotton gin, and a blacksmith's shop. Architectural historians have said how important it is to maintain the spacial relationships between the historic structures. He said in addition, Buffalo Creek, which runs along the western edge of the property, had one of the westernmost stands of bald cypress in North Carolina, with old growth trees that were probably over 300 years old. He said they didn't want to cut those trees down for any reason, including a bridge that might save you four minutes.

Mr. Anderson said he moved back to North Carolina in the hopes of restoring his Great Great Grandfather's house and living there. He said in order to afford to do that, he agreed to develop parts of

the property to get money to restore the old house. He said they could have sold the property outright, but they decided instead to partner with a developer so they could continue to exercise stewardship over the land. They decided to pursue density of development in order to preserve the natural features of the landscape. He said the Wendell Planning Board was concerned about the same thing in 2007, which is why they also annexed in the historic structures with the rest of the property. He said he and the Planning Board went into great detail to develop a zoning agreement in 2007, which included a road plan. He said they specifically didn't put roads in places that would affect the natural and historic characteristics of the property. The southern connector road and two bridges may derail everything that he had planned.

8. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Briggerman made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Van der Grinten seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Discussion, Consideration, and Action on the Following Items:

Item 9A – Discussion, Consideration, and Action on an Updated Transportation Plan for the Town of Wendell.

Mr. Bergmark made a few comments in response to some of the items brought up during public comment. He said, in regards to the comments both of the Mr. Andersons had brought up regarding Old Battle Bridge Road, so long as the rezoning agreement remained in place, a 3 lane cross-section would not be required. He said in response to Mr. Dunn's comment about something that was said during the Planning Board's general training session. Mr. Bergmark said that he wasn't trying to suggest that it was the Planning Board's role to solve obesity, but to be aware that there is a connection there. He said that the Board should look at how standards have requirements that provide the opportunity, not the requirement, to exercise. He said in response to the National Register nomination on the Anderson property, if the property developed, the nomination would have to be amended.

Mr. Bergmark said that the Planning Board had met the previous week for training and to discuss the transportation plan. He said the map had not changed since that meeting, but the literature associated with the plan had been provided for this meeting. Mr. Bergmark showed the Planning Board CAMPO's traffic projections for Wendell in 2040, and pointed out very high loads of traffic on very few roads, which made the transportation plan necessary. He said most of the funding for road development would come from development as development occurs. He said some of it might come from state or federal funding, but there was very little money for that.

Mr. Bergmark said there would be a few updates to the UDO as a result of this transportation plan, such as some of the cross sections in Chapter 9, the sections that call for bikeways, and the gateway overlay section.

Mr. Bergmark said one of the things that came up during public comment was concern over the impact the plan would have on rural farm land. Mr. Bergmark looked at ways to mitigate some of the road development requirements that might be triggered when small property owners build a single home on their properties. Mr. Bergmark suggested adopting something similar to Knightdale's Family Subdivision ordinance, and he gave the Planning Board suggested language to adopt. Mr. Bergmark said that in previous meetings, they had discussed adding language that exempted previously vacant properties that were being developed with one house, so he had added that language.

Mr. Bergmark said that a few changes had been made to the written Plan report, such as study area requirements and a section on Complete Streets. Mr. Bergmark went over some of the updates on the map from the plan that was adopted in 2007.

Mr. Bergmark said that a section on fee in lieu of construction would be updated. He said that someone had brought this up during public comment and he wanted to address this. He said the Town rarely wanted fee in lieu of construction. It was there as an option to try to help out the property owner when there is some kind of obstacle of their making the improvement. He said it made sense in cases where the road frontage is only 100 feet, where it wouldn't make sense to only improve a small section. He said it would make more sense to collect a fee until you get a few fees in lieu together, but in general, the Town would want the actual construction. He said the developer actually would have to request the fee in lieu and get approval from the Board.

Ms. Van der Grinten asked what were the criteria used to upgrade a road to a divided road. She said some roads, like Lake Myra Road and Turnipseed Road, were changed from two lane undivided to divided, and she wanted to know the reasoning behind that. Mr. Bergmark said it is a more aesthetically pleasing way to provide a center turn lane, since the median would sometimes disappear and allow a turn lane to come in. Mr. Surasky from AMT said that they limited the ability to turn, which made traffic flow better. He said ideally you wouldn't want to have direct driveway access to a collector street. Ms. Van der Grinten said her concern was that some of the roads were already in residential neighborhood, and she was concerned about the safety of forcing people to do u-turns on such a small road. Mr. Surasky said that a lot of studies have found that it was actually easier and safer to exit on a 2 lane divided road than a 3 lane undivided.

Ms. Anderson said Wendell needed roads because they needed connectivity, but it was more expensive for developers to build roads with medians, which would cause a hit to the property owner. She said also, no one would want to live with their homes backing into divided roads. She asked if anyone knew how many divided roads there were on the map. Mr. Surasky said he didn't have that information. Ms. Anderson asked if this map was broken down by zoning. Mr. Bergmark said it was not. Ms. Anderson said that would have been helpful.

Mr. Briggerman said he understood the point about divided roads helping with safety when there was increased traffic. He pointed out that it was very difficult and dangerous to make a left hand turn on Wendell Boulevard in the afternoon, and he could see how a median could help with that. Ms. Van der Grinten said it didn't explain it for her, because there were much busier roads that were three lane undivided. Mr. Briggerman asked if people are backing out of their driveways on those roads. Ms. Anderson said you couldn't tell what was going on in those areas because there wasn't any zoning on the map. Ms. Van der Grinten said she didn't understand why some of the more rural roads were divided even though there were some roads in town that were undivided. Ms. Schaecher said she could see traffic being an issue on roads that were coming off the 4 lanes roads, but she can see some roads listed as divided that were not coming off the 4 lane roads. Ms. Schaecher said she didn't see where there was consistency. Mr. Surasky said they wanted to be conscious of what was there now. He said there were more 3 lane roads in town because there was more need for access with greater density of driveways and commercial, etc.

Ms. Van der Grinten said her other concern was on Marshburn Road, as it came into Town past Hanor Lane, there were so many homes there that she questioned whether it was possible to make that a 3 lane road. Mr. Surasky said first, these were recommendations so the Board had every right to make changes. He said his thought process behind that section was that Marshburn Road was going to be one of the major connectors into Town and would be getting a lot of traffic in the future. He said, compared to Wendell Falls Parkway, which has a lot of dispersal of traffic as it entered Downtown, there was no dispersal on Marshburn. He said that may change as the grid would develop in the North side of Town.

Ms. Anderson said she noticed in the supporting material, on page 13 it talked about Old Battle Bridge Road. She asked if Old Battle Bridge Road would include sidewalks if it were to remain 2 lane. Mr. Bergmark said the section she was looking at was a part of the literature review from CAMPO's NorthEast Area Study, so that wouldn't be in place. He said what would be in place would be whatever would be adopted as a result of this. Mr. Bergmark said his comment earlier was that the conditional use rezoning for that area would override the new transportation plan until the section was rezoned. Ms. Anderson asked if the rezoning applied to the existing road or the proposed road. Mr. Bergmark said it applied to the existing road. Ms. Anderson asked if that meant that there would be a three lane undivided road turning into a 2 lane agricultural road. Mr. Bergmark said yes, but reminded her that the third lane was not a travel lane, it was a turn lane. Mr. Surasky said two lane roads and three lane roads were very closely related, so they could definitely discuss making some changes there if the Board liked.

Ms. Anderson said during public comment, one gentleman had said that they would lose 22 developable lots due to the transportation plan, which amounted to \$500,000 in addition to the cost to build the roads. She said this specific property also required a bridge with an estimated cost of \$1.2 million 5 years ago. She said 3 bridges were needed according to this plan, which meant that 3 landowners would have a huge impact to their property values. Ms. Anderson said she had expressed some concerns on Tuesday's meeting about never hearing of a developer building a bridge. She said she investigated this herself and talked to the developer of Wendell Falls. She said Newland had a huge amount of money to work with, and they had said they would walk away from any project that required a bridge to be put in and that they wouldn't even consider it. She said we needed development and roads, but at what cost to the people of Wendell.

Mr. Bergmark said he understood the concern expressed, which is why they were looking in to putting in a cap that would say that developers would only be responsible for spending the amount of 10% of their total development costs for their infrastructure. He said some of those concerns might also be addressed during development negotiations. He said he didn't want to get too much into hearsay from someone who wasn't present, but a bridge could mean a couple different things. He said there was a small bridge at the entrance of Briar Chapel. Ms. Anderson said the person from Newland had clarified that it was different when you chose to put one in. Ms. Anderson said she wouldn't have asked except she was told to go ask – and she never got a response from Wake Forest. Mr. Bergmark said that he actually had heard back from Wake Forest, and had done a little digging to find some answers to some of the questions she asked last week. He said that the Wake Forest project didn't actually exist anymore, but he had talked to a planner in Apex who gave him examples of developers paying for bridges. Mr. Bergmark started to read through the list. In Apex, a private developer built a bridge over a creek in Salem Village subdivision, which had about 350 homes. Ms. Anderson asked if she could ask something before Mr. Bergmark read the list. She asked if he knew if any of the developers put in the bridges because they elected to put them in or if the town required them to put the bridges in. Mr. Surasky said that, while most of the bridges probably weren't on a plan and the developer could say that it was because of a choice they made, the choice was made as the result of the development processes. The development negotiations and processes usually dictate what kind of infrastructure is necessary to support the number of units they wanted to put in. He said someone had said earlier that building this bridge would only save 4 minutes. He said if someone worked emergency services, then they might say 4 minutes made a huge difference. He said bridges are typically required for two reasons: for safety purposes and because of federally mandated FEMA requirements. Ms. Anderson said she understood the safety concerns. She asked if DOT didn't understand the safety concern and repair the Old Battle Bridge bridge, why were they shifting the responsibility to the developer.

Mr. Surasky said his thought process about bridges in this plan was the following: when you had one part of town broken off from the other part of town due to a creek, safety should be a big concern for the town,

even if it wasn't DOT's concern. He said secondly, they didn't expect developers to pay for bridges if they weren't developing property that encompassed the entire area. He agreed that was unreasonable. He said that if a developer developed property on either side of the creek and there was plenty of access from a safety perspective, then they may not be required to put in a bridge. He said it would depend on development patterns. He said, however, if they didn't put the bridge on the map and the only way to get into that area was through that bridge, how could they ask DOT for funding for that bridge if they didn't even have it on the plan. He said if you didn't have a plan, there was no way to get other funding sources to make this work, because that was always the first question that was asked.

Ms. Anderson asked if there was discussion with Wendell Falls to put emergency infrastructure in that area. Mr. Broadwell said he was on the board of the Wendell Fire Department. He said there were ongoing discussions about locating a fire/ems/police station in Wendell Falls. He said they were trying to find an appropriate site that was large enough and that met County's requirements. Ms. Anderson said that her point was that as Wendell grows, so would our emergency capabilities. She said she didn't think it was responsible to use those as an excuse to make road connections. Mr. Surasky said he was also part of a group that was building a fire station in Raleigh, and new fire stations were more expensive than building a bridge.

Ms. Anderson said her fear was that they were making the burden so great that no developers would want to come in, especially since Wendell was already known for being unfriendly to developers. She said she didn't want to see the landowners shoulder the burden for something that, in the end, would only benefit Wendell. She said some of the intersections on the map were very close together which would cause landowners to lose out of even more developable lots. Ms. Van der Grinten asked if Ms. Anderson was talking about any specific property. Ms. Anderson said it was hard because she couldn't tell where the property lines were on the map or who owned the properties. Ms. Anderson said she was looking at the realignment of Martin Center at Knightdale-Eagle Rock Road. She asked what that realignment would do to the surrounding properties. Mr. Bergmark said that they had talked about changing some of those connections. He said that the landowners could also shift the lines somewhat to make sure that they still had developable lots.

Mr. Bergmark said that the developers would need to put in roads regardless, since they would need to get access to the lots to develop them. He said you couldn't look at the right of way and say you were losing that much acreage, since roads would be built on that land regardless. Ms. Anderson said any plan a developer submits would have to have roads in it. She said the difference was the planner drawing the road versus the developer submitting what would work best for themselves and the landowner. Mr. Bergmark said there would be some back and forth between the town and the developer, but the developer wouldn't be looking at a simple loss of acreage.

Mr. Broadwell said that this plan was developed for safety, traffic movement, and accessibility. He said buyers wouldn't buy homes or property if they didn't have the ability to get to point A to point B in a timely manner. He said that was the appeal of Wendell Falls, where you could get to downtown Raleigh in 15 minutes. Ms. Anderson asked how far Wendell Falls was from a fire station. Mr. Broadwell said the closest one was probably Wendell's, which was difficult to get to in part because of Old Battle Bridge bridge was out. He said that was already an issue in Wendell Falls, and that there had already been a fire out there. Ms. Anderson said that everyone said that they needed the transportation plan for public safety, but here was a very large development coming in that didn't have access to emergency services. Mr. Surasky said she had made the perfect point as to why a plan for the future was needed, since a plan was probably not in place when Newland first came in. Ms. Anderson said you could plan for the future, but you couldn't say that lack of access and safety would keep developers from coming in. Mr. Surasky said that was a good problem to have, for people to want to come to Wendell. He said the plan was trying to encourage growth that still allowed for movement for the rest of the community. He gave Smithfield

Road in Knightdale as an example of this not being done. He said that we had to learn from the mistakes that had been made in the past. Mr. Broadwell said Smithfield Road was a huge problem, and it was starting to cause an increase in traffic on Eagle Rock Road.

Ms. Schaecher said she was new at this, but at what point does the Planning Board start negotiating some of the problems identified, such as Old Battle Bridge Road. Mr. Bergmark said this was the fourth meeting the Planning Board has had on the Transportation Plan. Ms. Schaecher said they had bounced all around the map and identified the major conflicts on the map.

Ms. Anderson asked if they had to adopt the plan as is or if they could make changes. Mr. Bergmark said the Planning Board could make a recommendation with some amendments. Ms. Anderson asked if the Board of Commissioners needed a simple majority vote to approve the Planning Board's recommendations. Mr. Bergmark said that a supermajority vote was only required if the Planning Board denied it outright.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Planning Board had the ability to ask for another plan or changes to the plan. Mr. Bergmark said the Planning Board had that ability, but that the Board of Commissioners had the ability to take up an issue for public hearing 45 days after the Planning Board had been presented with it, regardless of the Planning Board's recommendation. He said, since the Planning Board had been discussing this for 4 meetings, they were well over the 45 day mark.

Ms. Anderson said some changes had already been made to the map since it was first presented. Mr. Bergmark said that was correct, some changes had been made as a result of some of the public comments. Mr. Broadwell asked Mr. Bergmark to explain the difference between the corporate limits, ETJ, and the urban service area. Mr. Bergmark said the ETJ is the zoning district that extends past the corporate limits. In terms of the roads, there wasn't a distinct difference between the ETJ and the corporate limits. The urban service area was the area that was still within Wake County's municipal control but was viewed as one day being the ultimate corporate limits of that town. He said the Town didn't have any power to enforce any plans on the urban service area unless they wanted to develop and receive town water and sewer. Mr. Broadwell said he brought that up because Turnipseed Road and Lake Myra Road were both in the urban service areas.

Ms. Anderson said she wanted to say for the record that she didn't know how many people attended the public information session, but Tuesday's meeting had 16 members of the public attend just to hear what would be said about the transportation plan, knowing that it wasn't an actual meeting, because they were concerned. She said tonight they had 25 people attending. She said that we had made one change based on a comment made at the public information session, but they hadn't made a single change based on the concerns of the 25 people present tonight.

Mr. Broadwell said he would ask the Board what their pleasure was. He said they could look at that in terms of not adopting the plan, a motion with suggested changes to the plan, or no action at all, in which case the plan would go to the Town Board for the decision to be made. Mr. Briggerman said they could sit there forever and never come to a consensus among them. He said that the Planning Board's purpose was to make a recommendation, not to adopt anything or to give direction. He said he would like to hear the Board of Commissioner's discussion about the plan. He said what often happened was that the Board of Commissioners sent it back to the Planning Board with more direction. Ms. Silver said she agreed.

Mr. Briggerman made a motion to send the Transportation Plan with David's changes to the Board of Commissioners with no recommendations. Ms. Silver seconded it. Ms. Anderson said she didn't believe they had given this issue enough consideration. She said that they had only just identified the issues, and public had only started attending the last meeting and they weren't afforded much of an opportunity to

say anything. Ms. Schaefer said that she wanted to work on finding solutions to those issues identified before it is sent to the Board of Commissioners. Ms. Van der Grinten asked if Mr. Bergmark's recommendations regarding family subdivisions were included in the motion. She moved to amend Mr. Briggerman's motion to include the family subdivision ordinance. Mr. Briggerman accepted the amendment. Ms. Anderson asked if they had any recommendation about the cost-sharing. Mr. Bergmark said that they had included the 10% cap in project costs, which was already included in the street plan documentation. Mr. Broadwell called the motion to a vote. The motion passed 4-2 with Ashley Anderson and Kathe Schaefer opposing.

Mr. Bergmark addressed the public, asking them to fill out information sheets with comments. He said if anyone wanted to be contacted about the public hearing or wanted more information, to please put their contact information on the sheet and he would follow up with them.

Mr. Briggerman made a motion to reopen the public comment period for Mr. J.W. Dunn. Ms. Van der Grinten seconded it. The motion passed.

Mr. J.W. Dunn returned to speak. He thanked the Board for allowing him the opportunity to rebut some of what had been said. He told the Planning Board that he was disillusioned by what he had seen tonight. He said that David Bergmark seemed to be the only person that was designing Wendell. He said David made a lot of comments that sounded more like preferences. Mr. Dunn said he worked at Southeastern Freewill Baptist College for 23 years, and lived in Wendell 15 years. He said he was concerned about 2 years ago when CAMPO's plan was presented, but that had gone away. He said judging from the discussion tonight, it obviously had not gone away. He said he sat at the meeting for 2 hours and was leaving without knowing anything more than last week at the meeting. He said he had considered joining the Planning Board and filling the vacant ETJ slot, but now after watching the Planning Board he didn't want anything to do with it. He said he thought Wendell was in trouble as far as the planning was concerned. He said he preferred for Wendell to stay like it was, like it was 15 years ago. He said he had never been involved with Wendell, but he planned on paying more attention in the future. Mr. Dunn asked to be able to access the proposed transportation map online. Mr. Bergmark said anyone could call him for help, but he would also post it online.

Ms. Van der Grinten said she understood that Mr. Dunn was disillusioned. She asked what specifically he was unhappy with since the Board was trying to address everyone's concerns. She said he understood he was disillusioned with the process, but they couldn't take his issues to heart unless he gave some specific problems he had with the plan.

Mr. Dunn said he had a problem with the way the proposed road cut through Southeastern Freewill Baptist College property. He said he would like to see that particular road moved. Ms. Anderson asked if the College was aware of the transportation plan. Mr. Dunn said they never had been aware, only through him. He said they didn't pay taxes so they didn't matter.

10. Adjourn to Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting

Ms. Silver made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Briggerman seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.