

Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the PLHOA
Sunday, November 9, 2008

Board President John Kempter called the meeting to order shortly after 4:00 p.m. at 207 Creeks Edge, the home of Board member Dave Meister. All other current Board members were present (Ann Edwards, Anna Marie Ambrose, Dave Meister, Staples Hughes). The following homeowners were present: Jill Adams, Jean Lauder, Art Cleary, Betty Ledford, Wider Horner, Dee Campbell, Ariana Jeske, Chris Occhipinti, Karen LeClair, Sarah Packer, Kelly Fuller. Also present and welcomed were Nichole Wachsman and Beas Arseneau, who live in Hidden Valley.

Discussion and adoption of the minutes of the Board meeting of May 8, 2008 was tabled due to the importance of the matters to be discussed at the current meeting.

The following agenda items were discussed briefly:

1. **The fall brush pickup went well.** No complaints were received, the current contractor having been responsive to past problems. The Board unanimously agreed to use the same contractor for the spring pickup in April. A homeowner noted that the announcement was potentially confusing and there was general agreement that the mail station sign should be posted sooner and should clearly designate the first day that the brush might be collected by the contractor. There was discussion of the fact that it was acceptable to put bamboo out for collection and that it would be a good idea to assemble volunteers for the next pickup to clear common areas of debris.

2. **The mail station upgrade project, a major undertaking of the current Board, has been completed.** An unanticipated cost was a complete rewiring of the structure. An electrician would not take on the obvious problem to be remedied, the deterioration of the service cable and mast at the point the cable entered the building, due to the dangerous condition of the interior wiring. The cost of the entire project will be set out in detail in the assessment notice to be mailed after the first of the year.

3. **Treasurer Anna Maria Ambrose reported on the account balances as of November 3, 2008.** Her written summary will be

attached to the approved minutes. The current total balance is \$2,221.01. All homeowners are current for 2007 dues. Assessment notices will be mailed approximately January 10, 2009, due February 15, 2009. The Board unanimously adopted a dues increase of 5% (\$5.00) to \$105.00 per year to cover anticipated increased costs in nearly every area of the Board's responsibility.

The main item for discussion was the Polks Village development at the northwest corner of the intersection of Polks Landing Road and US 15-501.

The discussion, led by John, is summarized as follows:

1. The development got initial approval from the Chatham Board of Commissioners several years ago. Relevant documents are available on the County's website. (A map of the current traffic plan, which is pending final approval, was distributed among those present.)
2. Nine months ago, the developers contacted the Board to inform it that the NC Department of Transportation wanted to mandate changes in the initial traffic plan for the development. The developers stated that the changes were necessary to maintain acceptable safety standards. They pledged to stay in contact with the Board as the approval process for the development progressed.
3. On the evening of October 22, 2008, Board members John Kempter, Anna Maria Ambrose, and Dave Meister met with the developer and others associated with the project. They were: Brantley Powell, the developer; Glenda Toppe who is the contact person for anyone with any questions or comments (851-7150); and Travis Fluitt and Kimley Horn, the engineers who are doing traffic studies, not only for Polks Village, but also for the development planned for the other side of 15-501, Polks Corner (roughly the large tract of land between "the Pit" and Lystra Church Road).
4. The following information and discussion occurred at this meeting:
 - a. When the development got initial zoning approval, final approval for the development was contingent on the completion of traffic studies.

- b. The developer obtained an extension from October 16, 2008 to October 16, 2009 for the final planning approval process.
- c. In October of 2009, he expects to get a building permit. Before he can get a building permit, the Chatham County Commissioners have to approve revisions made to adhere to the initial zoning conditions
- d. According to the developers, it has taken two years for the traffic studies to be completed and then reviewed by the NC Department of Transportation.
- e. NCDOT wants the main road through the development to be public, presumably so it will conform to state regulations. The developer wants it to be a private road, presumably so they will have primary control over its configuration. The County Commissioners have the final say on this unresolved issue.
- f. The county planning department forced the developers to modify their initial traffic pattern to add an entrance to the development off Polks Landing Road on the initial straightaway off 15-501 (before the first curve and across from the first house facing Polks Landing Road) so the intersection of Holly Ridge and Polks Landing Road would not be the only entrance to the development for traffic turning into the development from northbound 15-501.
- g. The developer wanted traffic lights at the main entrance to the development and at the intersection of Polks Landing Road, but the county planning department, apparently on the basis of NCDOT regulations, required that there be no light at the Polks/15-501 intersection, and that the intersection be modified so that traffic entering 15-501 from Polks Landing Road could only turn right. To go north on 15-501, Polks Landing resident will have to go straight at the intersection of Polks Landing Road and Holly Ridge and drive on the main road through the development to get the primary entrance to the development, where there will be a traffic light. To go north, we will turn left onto 15-501 at that light.

- h. The developer's intent is to have a drug store sited at the southwest corner of the development (northwest corner of the Polks Landing Road/15-501 intersection); a bank in the center of the development, and a fast food outlet on the north side of the development (the far side from Polks Landing Road). This was stated as their intention. It apparently is not a requirement imposed so far in the development zoning and approval process.
- i. No tenants have committed to the development.

5. The Board members present at the meeting with the developers came away with the distinct impression that we as a community have some leverage in the situation. The developers clearly want to minimize conflict with the neighbors and want to work with us insofar as possible (from their point of view) to prevent organized resistance in the final approval process.

6. During the discussion at the November 11, 2008 annual meeting, it came to light that homeowner Arianna Jeskey, who was present, is a professional traffic engineer with a civil engineering firm in Chapel Hill. The substance of her work includes review of development plans for compliance with traffic planning regulations. Arianna stated that her firm had no connection with the development. She and her husband, Chris Occhipinti, live at 113 Polks Landing Road, a few doors west of the intersection of Holly Ridge and Polks Landing Road. They have a strong interest in keeping the development from degrading their quality of life.

7. Arianna had reviewed the modified traffic plan and said that it is consistent with current traffic regulations and that the developers' representation that NCDOT or the county planning department had mandated the changes was accurate. She stated that the current plan is consistent with applicable safety standards and that modification of the current plan is unlikely bordering on the impossible.

8. She stated, however, that it would be advisable for PLHOA to lobby for some changes, such as (1) the widening of Polks Landing Road, (2) clear centerline and shoulder painted pavement markings, (3) clear signs directing traffic into the initial entrance to the development off Polks Landing Road so non-resident traffic coming off the highway would not clog the Polks

Landing Road/Holly Ridge intersection, and (4) planning and accommodation for the turning of school buses.

9. The discussion then turned to other modifications for which we could lobby, including

- a. Sidewalks along the road into the development from the Polks Landing Road/Holly Ridge intersection so we could walk into it safely.
- b. A thick evergreen buffer along the north shoulder of Polks Landing Road to screen the development from us, including the screening of dumpsters.
- c. Lighting designed to minimize light pollution.
- d. Bike parking.
- e. Posting of a bond for site remediation should financing collapse after the site is cleared or the development partially built out.

10. It was agreed that it would be advisable to contact the Chatham Coalition on Effective Communities to get their feedback on how to positively affect the course of the development, that the Board should stay in contact with the developer, and that we as a community needed to have a plan to present our demands for positive changes and additions to the developer, the county Planning Board and the Commissioners.

11. There was discussion of the possibility of mounting a campaign to block the development altogether. It was generally agreed that the following factors militated against such a campaign: (1) The Commissioners gave initial zoning approval several years ago, i.e. the horse is out of the barn; (2) the reality is that we live in one of the areas in the county that planners have targeted for the most intense commercial development; (3) that if we stonewall, we lose our leverage to lobby for positive changes that will mitigate the impact of the development on our lives and on the value of our property

12. It was further agreed that the Board secretary, Staples Hughes, would promptly circulate the minutes of the meeting to homeowner by email, soliciting reactions, feedback, and suggestions.

The final item of business was the election of new Board members. The Board's nominating committee put forth the current board members for reelection. No nominations were made from the floor. The board voted proxies received before the meeting and voting by those present was by secret ballot. The current Board members were unanimously reelected.