



**Town of Clayton
Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday, May 27, 2025 at 6:00 PM
Council Chambers, Town Hall
111 E. Second Street**

Board Members Present:

Jodie Dupree, Chair
Derrick Applewhite
Daniel Gleason
Mike Surasky
Anita Bland
Jason Carter
Deborah Hooker
Mark Hall
Tom McKearney

Staff Present:

Andria Archer, Council Member Liaison
Conrad Olmedo, Planning Director
Haley Downey, Assistant Planning Director
Heidi Holland, Town Clerk

Board Members Absent:

Ronald Williams

1 CALL TO ORDER

- a) Roll Call of the Planning Board
Presenter: Conrad Olmedo, Planning Director

Chair Dupree called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Olmedo provided the roll call. He introduced Assistant Planning Director Haley Downey.

2 ADJUSTMENT OF THE AGENDA

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a) Adoption of March 24, 2025 Minutes
Presenter: Conrad Olmedo, Planning Director

Adoption of March 24, 2025 Minutes

RESULT:	CARRIED 8-0
MOVER:	Mike Surasky
SECONDER:	Anita Bland
YES:	Jodie Dupree, Derrick Applewhite, Daniel Gleason, Mike Surasky, Anita Bland, Jason Carter, Deborah Hooker, and Mark Hall
NO:	None

4 PUBLIC MEETINGS

- a) Clayton on the Move, Town of Clayton Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)

Presenters: Leah Weaver, WSP USA and Conrad Olmedo, Planning Director

Mr. Olmedo introduced Leah Weaver with WSP, Transportation Planner working on this plan. This plan was presented to the board in March, and since then significant changes have occurred. He stated tonight she would present the final draft of this plan.

Ms. Weaver stated she has been working on this project since the beginning of August 2023. She stated community engagement has been a huge part of this process. Vision and goals were established in the beginning, existing and future conditions were looked at, and recommendations from previous plans and studies were consolidated. From the first round of public engagement, WSP consultants modified, removed, and added projects to the existing list of projects consolidated. Those projects were run through the travel demand model to validate the recommended projects. Throughout this process consultants have been with core technical team, stakeholder steering committee, and Town Council.

Share was the chapter layout page; she noted Appendix A contains enlarged maps for the project.

Shared were the changes made in each chapter. Highlights included: Chapter 4: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities discussed recommending multi-use paths on one side of major roads. 61 multi-use path network projects, 93 miles of new multi-use paths (one-side) and 23 miles of new multi-use path (both sides) have been recommended. Sidewalks have been proposed on one side for most recommendations; only a few have proposed on both sides. 88 projects, 80 miles of new sidewalks on one side, and 5 miles of new sidewalks on both sides have been recommended.

Bicycle facility recommendations are an on-road bike improvement to one side of the road. 34 projects in the Greenway network and 60 miles of new Greenways are being recommended. The crossing recommendations are designed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross the roads. Identified were intersections that lack appropriate crossing facilities. 130 crossing improvements have been proposed.

Shared were the proposed cross-sections for the bikes and pedestrians. Recommended and alternate dimensions were provided.

Chapter 5: Transit. Transit emphasis areas came from where transit user concentrations are higher. Demographic data, key destinations, future land use and zoning maps, and future transit system recommendations were reviewed to determine these areas. The recommended strategies that were developed as part of this plan are only preliminary and demonstrate there is a demand for transit in Clayton, but further study is needed to determine more details.

Chapter 6: Roadway. 13 miles of new roadway, 61 miles of road widening, and 9 miles of operational improvements which equals 144 lane-miles of new pavement. Shared were the 17 collector streets recommendations. Typical Sections were shared; the recommended dimensions are based on NCDOT standards; alternate dimensions were shared to provide flexibility.

Special Recommendation 1 along Clayton Boulevard was discussed. The exiting project with NCDOT is proposing to convert this section to a superstreet in the short term and a 6-lane road at 55 mph in the long term. The Town's vision for the road is for it to be a commercial corridor. Both scenarios were modeled and being proposed is keeping Clayton Boulevard as four lanes at 45 mph. This would have an impact on daily traffic volumes but not much of an impact to congestion in 2050.

The other special recommendation being made in the plan is a downtown one-way pair. The current NCDOT project on N. O'Neil Street is recommending adding a center two-way left turn lane. This would go through a historic district which would have limitations on right-of-way. Proposed is to convert O'Neil and Fayetteville Streets to a one-way pair that could address some movement concerns. This would be studied further.

A chart comparing the 2020 Official Model with the 2050 Modified Model, which is the base case for future travel metrics. In comparing those two, there would be approximately 1,000 fewer hours of daily delay than the base line scenario. That reduction in delay would result in 10,000 additional auto daily trips but considering the population is projected to triple by 2050, these changes are not significant.

As part of the parking analysis, they found that parking demand may double between now and 2050. Recommended strategies include add lane striping on Second Street where parking is already, provide additional paved surfaces for parking in Downtown areas behind buildings or within the NCRR corridor, and to conduct a Downtown parking study.

Chapter 7: Safety. The intersection recommendations were based on intersections with safety issues. Shared were designs that came out of identifying those intersections. Short-term and long-term improvements are being proposed.

Chapter 8: Prioritization. As part of this process, CTP goals and objectives and converted them into performance measures. Projects were then assessed using those performance measures to prioritize. Shared was the list. Policy implementation strategies were developed; these correlate to the roadway projects, studies, and policies. These policies were put into an implementation matrix that shows where the policies fall as far as meeting goals.

Next steps are to present this at the June 2, 2025 Work Session meeting and adoption at the June 16, 2025 regular meeting.

Board Member Hooker stated the study on roadway capacity and travel demand was done in 2020 which would have been a low volume time due to the pandemic, correct? Ms. Weaver stated she is not sure if the 2020 model is necessarily reflecting what the traffic was at that time, but that's when the latest travel demand model came from. She stated she could get further clarification.

Board Member Carter stated he thinks the vision lines up well, but he does not see goals here; he sees a mission and not something that is measurable. He thinks this is important when putting a plan this comprehensive in place to have metrics. Ms. Weaver stated as part of the prioritization process, performance measures were created that align with each goal. He stated there needs to be something so that at a future date Council could say did they accomplish what they hoped to.

Board Member Hall asked if there was a plan when dealing with houses that are close to the right-of-way? Ms. Weaver stated that would be dealt with situation by situation. Board Member Gleason stated it would be nice if the plan showed the type of transportation should be prioritized.

Board Member Applewhite asked if the plan recommended more parking is needed, or does it recommend that we need an understanding that parking is available through marking spots or designating specific spots primarily Downtown? Ms. Weaver stated they see there is a demand that is going to increase in the future primarily Downtown. Board Member Applewhite stated acknowledging parking is available, and there would be a greater need in the future but understanding what the inventory is for today, is it sufficient for what we have today? Ms. Weaver stated that's where they are recommending a parking study beyond the CTP in the future to get the full picture of parking.

Board member Applewhite stated regarding sub-streets, there's an implementation step to include that in the UDO, he asked if that is already included in there? Mr. Olmedo stated the CTP's UDO recommendations are not currently in the UDOTA 1-25 that would be presented tonight. Board Member Applewhite asked if there are currently requirements in the UDO for stub outs for development that is happening around other developments that could connect to streets? Mr. Olmedo stated there is a required minimum number of connection

points for a development based on the units; a stub out could qualify as one of the connection points to connect at a later date from an adjacent property. Board Member Applewhite stated transit is a conversation that is continuing to happen, particularly around a transit study for the ETJ, does map in the study lay out potential routes to see if it's feasible, Ms. Weaver stated yes, she stated this is basically a proof of concept that there is a demand and this is what the Town could do. He stated he is glad this is being considered.

Board Member Surasky asked how this plan tie into the other plans in the Town? Ms. Weaver stated they took all existing plans and all recommendations and ran those and projects through the travel demand model and refined the list from there. There would be a lot of projects from previous plans and studies but there would be some that did not make sense anymore based on information gathered. There may be some plans that did not make it into the CTP but were considered in the process of creating the CTP. He asked Mr. Olmedo if any land use maps would need to be changed because of this plan. Mr. Olmedo stated it's bound to be updated soon, and he feels this plan would inform that plan in terms of land use.

Board Member Surasky stated the downtown plan included aspects like the train station, he asked how does this plan affect the density that's needed for a train station downtown? Ms. Weaver stated she is unable to answer that question. He stated the only way a train station is going to work downtown is with density. He stated on the land use side, the stakeholders discussed a village concept, he asked if this plan allows for more of those village concepts. Ms. Weaver stated she is not able to answer that question. He stated now that Ranch Road is open, he would like to see more bike and pedestrians specifically from the Community Center across 70 on Shotwell and with Ranch Road open he thinks crossing 70 in general should be a top priority. Ms. Weaver stated the Clayton Boulevard corridor study they are proposing is a top priority which would include looking at those connections.

Board Member Bland stated regarding Fayetteville and O'Neil Streets becoming one-way, she wanted to clarify that they are still two-lane but one way. She asked if there is a possibility of a time restriction, Ms. Weaver stated she thinks that is something that could be considered if a future study is conducted. Board Chair Dupree stated this has been noted as a public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. No one wished to speak.

Mr. Olmedo stated staff has been taking notes of tonight's comments and those would be presented to Town Council.

Motion was made by Board Member Surasky, seconded by Board Member Gleason to recommend this plan to Town Council.

Board Member Surasky stated you cannot get anywhere without a plan and he stated regarding the 2020 model that was used in this plan, it's a year, so the 2020 model base year looked at 2045.

Motion To Recommend This to Town Council

RESULT:	CARRIED 8-0
MOVER:	Mike Surasky
SECONDER:	Daniel Gleason
YES:	Jodie Dupree, Derrick Applewhite, Daniel Gleason, Mike Surasky, Anita Bland, Jason Carter, Deborah Hooker, and Mark Hall
NO:	None
ABSENT:	Ronald Williams

- b) Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendments (UDOTA 1-25)
Presenter: Conrad Olmedo, Planning Director

Mr. Olmedo stated this is the 4th round of amendments; there are over 107 changes organized into six groups. Shared was an overview of the six groups.

Discussion began on the changes.

Procedural Changes:

- §2.3.2 Alternative Plans (Pg. 57, 554, 608, 651)
- §2.3.5 Building Permit (pg. 66)
- §2.3.7 Conditional Rezoning (pg. 73-75)
- §2.3.9 Construction Drawings (Pg. 81, 113, 136)
- §2.3.19 Subdivisions (Pg. 113, 116)
- §2.3.20 Performance Guarantee (Pg. 124-129)
- §2.3.21 Sign Permit (Pg. 130, 152)
- §2.3.22 Site Plan (Pg. 137-138)
- §2.3.25/26 Street Renaming/Closure (Pg. 148-151)
- §2.3.28 Text Amendment (Pg. 154)
- §2.3.29 Transportation Impact Analysis (Pg. 158)
- §2.3.33 Zoning Compliance Permit (Pg. 173)
- §2.4.5 Application Fees (Pg. 179-180)
- §2.4.10 Conditions of Approval (Pg. 188)
- §2.4.12 Concurrent Processing (Pg. 189)
- §2.2.3 Procedural Flowcharts (Pg. ~)
- §7.6.2 / 7.6.4 Violations (Pg. 722)

Density Changes:

- §3.2.12 – 3.2.17 Residential Districts (Pg. 230-248)
- §6.17.4 Sustainable Development Incentives (Pg. 708)

Dimensional Standards Changes:

- §3.2.11 PUB District (Pg. 228)
- §3.4.3.C Flag Lots (Pg. 261)
- §3.4.7 & § 6.9.4.G Unified Developments (Pg. 263, 388, 612)

Use Type Changes (Principal)

- §4.2.5 Principal Use Table (Pg. 310-316)
- Simplifies Some Use-Specific Standards
- §4.2.5 Adds Governmental Maintenance or Storage Facility Use (Pg. 315)
- §4.3.45 Family Care Home (Pg. 330)
- §4.3.113 Large Format Retail (Pg. 352, 494, 616)
- §4.3.121 Solar Energy Conversion (Pg. 355)
- §4.3.131 Triplex/Quadplex (Pg. 373, 499)

Use Type Changes (Principal)

- §4.5.5.S Adds Membrane Structure Use Type (Pg. 385)
- §4.5.5.HH Adds Urban Archery Use Type (Pg. 403)
- §4.5.5.N Flagpole (Pg. 391)
- §4.5.5.Q Home Occupation Level 1 (Pg. 392)
- §4.5.5.T Outdoor Dining and Seating (Pg. 396)

Use Type Changes (Temporary)

- §4.6.4 Temporary Uses (Pg. 407-408)
- §4.7.2 Use Category Descriptions (Tables) (Pg. 416-427)

Development Standards

- §6.1.4 & § 6.9.7 Driveway/Parking Lot Surfacing (Pg. 450, 451, 627)
- §6.1.4.E Driveway Depth (Non-residential) (Pg. 456)
- §6.1.5 Pedestrian Circulation (Pg. 458)
- §6.3.2.B & §6.3.3 Fences & Walls (Pg. 506-507)
- §6.5.9 Clarifies the Town must utilize the most-recently adopted uniform **Fire Code** SL2024-49 (Pg. 531)
- §6.5.10.B & §6.5.12.B Removes **minimum distance** rules for potable water and sanitary sewer extension in favor of all new development (except individual SFD) connecting to potable water and sanitary sewer (Pg. 532-533 & 548-550)
- §6.5.10.G Private **water lines** may not cross lot line boundaries (only public lines may cross lot boundaries) (Pg. 534)
- §6.5.11.H Clarifies that the Town must accept **curb and gutter** designs consistent with NCDOT standards SL2024-49 (Pg. 546)
- §6.6.16 **Sidewalks** within a NCDOT ROW serving 20 or fewer lots in the ETJ must be maintained by the Town SL2024-49 (Pg. 587)

- §6.6.7 & §6.6.12.D Defines **mass grading**, and requires doubled perimeter buffers (width and plant count) and slope limitations within 100 feet of lot lines when mass grading is proposed (Pg. 556, 573-576)
- §6.6.11 Clarifies **credits** towards landscaping are 2:1 and applied as aggregate caliper inches required (Pg. 564)
- §6.6.16 Removes **street tree** requirements (in favor of streetscape landscaping) in the NCM, CZM, and CZR districts; establishes more clarity regarding street tree spacing standards (Pg. 587)
- §6.3.2 Signage Applicability (Pg. 644)
- §6.3.3 Signage Exemptions (Pg. 645)
- §6.3.7.C Signs in Public Street Rights-of-Way (Pg. 647)
- §6.13.9.C Flags (Pg. 660)
- §6.13.9.D Ground Signs (Pg. 661)
- §6.13.9.I Walls Signs (Pg. 669)
- §6.13.10.A Banners (Pg. 673)
- §6.13.10.C Short-term Signs (Pg. 676)
- §6.13.10.D Sock Signs (Pg. 678)
- §6.13.10.E Walkway Decal Signs (Pg. 679)

There was board discussion on various items such as construction drawings, performance guarantee, citizens having the ability to request text amendment changes, density changes, sustainable development incentives, urban archery, outdoor seating, and subdivisions.

Board Chair Dupree stated this has been noted as a public hearing and asked if anyone from the public wished to speak.

David Stewart was present to speak about property at 101 Best Wood in Clayton, located in the ETJ. He stated he has had a shipping container for about 3 years. He stated they had an event where they were working with Wake Tech and their students who were using the container, and he received a citation. The citation was initially about the construction of the container and now it is about the container itself. He stated his company is a construction company that may have 40/50 projects going on at once. Lately he has used this container as a recycling unit; last year he recycled 60 appliances to those who could not afford new appliances. Last year he saved 600 tons of construction material that instead of it going to the landfill it went back into the recycling. Aesthetically the container is behind the building, he stated he can stand in his parking lot and look at 15 other containers on other people's property. He stated the enforcement is pick and choose.

He is requesting permission for understanding. He stated the shipping container is behind the dumpster and he has a construction waste container that matches the brick of his building. Aesthetically you cannot see it. He stated he is trying to do the right thing by recycling and supporting the community. He is looking for some verbiage that could go into the exemption that would cover them or give

them some flexibility. Board Chair Dupree asked Mr. Olmedo what makes the container temporary? Mr. Olmedo stated there is not a building permit with it, it's not meant to be a permanent structure.

Mr. Stewart stated there are 18 wheelers that have been sitting there for over a year because the engine has been blown. Mr. Olmedo stated he invited Mr. Stewart tonight to discuss the aspect of a shipping container; he stated it comes up frequently; how do we treat these as temporary structures, do we allow them on the property, do we allow them to get building permits to remain on the property as permanent structures?

Board Chair Dupree stated the board does not have a say so from that standpoint, they only make recommendations to Council. He stated he thinks there would be some type of recommendation they could make being he uses this to the public good. Board Member Applewhite stated he thinks it would be appropriate for staff to come up with a recommendation that would be appropriate for another text amendment; in the meantime, look for ways beyond a variance process to accommodate. Board Chair Dupree asked who has the authority to suspend any penalties until this has been studied, Mr. Olmedo stated staff does. He stated staff would stay the fines and that would give staff time to look into a text amendment and see how they can change the standard.

Mr. Olmedo stated with Board Member Williams absent tonight, Board Member McKearney would be able to vote.

Board Member Carter motioned to accept proposed changes but exclude certain sections for further discussion. These sections are 2.3.19 which includes the exclusion or removing minor subdivisions, section 2.3.28 which are text amendments for the public, and 4.5.5.HH about urban archery. Second by Board Member Hooker.

Board Member Surasky asked if we need to be specific? He stated his suggestion would be to make a motion and remove those three items from the text amendments knowing they would be discussed later. He stated he would take the discussion part out of the motion and say to motion to approve this item for recommendation to Council and take those three changes out of the motion.

Board Member Carter agreed. The motion is to recommend these amendment changes to Council, removing sections: 2.3.19 about subdivisions, section 2.3.28 which are text amendments for the public, and 4.5.5.HH about urban archery. Board Member Hooker seconded the motion.

Mr. Olmedo stated of the three, 4.5.5.HH is gone and would be approached again. He would like to give Council the version that the board is comfort with. Regarding 2.3.19 about subdivisions, he stated if the board wants to table that, he would like to have a follow-up; perhaps the board could provide staff with

more specific direction regarding minor subdivisions. Staff could then evaluate that and provide something to Council.

Board Member Carter shared his concerns about the amendment on subdivisions. He stated he does not know how to word it, but he feels how it is currently worded is not right.

Board Dupree stated the motion to recommend this to Council with these three items removed.

Board Member Surasky asked to clarify, regarding section 2.3.19, that it sounds like it's specifically to the amount of lots that can be subdivided; that's the only difference between minor and major. Board Member Carter stated it relates to the number of lots but the amendment is asking for so many more steps in the process.

Motion to recommend these amendment changes to Council, removing Section 2.3.19 Subdivisions, Section 2.3.28 Text Amendment, and Section 4.5.5.HH Adds Urban Archery Use Type.

RESULT:	CARRIED 9-0
MOVER:	Jason Carter
SECONDER:	Deborah Hooker
YES:	Jodie Dupree, Derrick Applewhite, Daniel Gleason, Mike Surasky, Anita Bland, Jason Carter, Deborah Hooker, Mark Hall, and Tom McKearney
NO:	None
ABSENT:	Ronald Williams

5 NEW BUSINESS

- a) Board Member Surasky asked about the opportunity to bring in a speaker. He stated he spoke with Representative Donna White about the growth of the area. He stated it would be beneficial for her to come to a future meeting.

Motion by Board Member Surasky to have Rep. White at the June 23, 2025 meeting; seconded by Board Member Hall.

Motion to have Rep. Donna White at the June 23, 2025 meeting as a speaker.

RESULT:	CARRIED 9-0
MOVER:	Mike Surasky
SECONDER:	Mark Hall
YES:	Jodie Dupree, Derrick Applewhite, Daniel Gleason, Mike Surasky, Anita Bland, Jason Carter, Deborah Hooker, Mark Hall, and Tom McKearney

NO:	None
ABSENT:	Ronald Williams

6 INFORMAL DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- a) Clayton citizen, of 268 Steeplechase. Spoke about his concerns of the turning lane into Steeplechase Blvd. It was stated that the road is an NCDOT road. Mr. Olmedo stated he would get the citizens contact information and see if there is anything staff could do.

7 ADJOURN

- a) With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Motion To Adjourn


RESULT:	CARRIED 9-0
MOVER:	Derrick Applewhite
SECONDER:	Daniel Gleason
YES:	Jodie Dupree, Derrick Applewhite, Daniel Gleason, Mike Surasky, Anita Bland, Jason Carter, Deborah Hooker, Mark Hall, and Tom McKearney
NO:	None
ABSENT:	Ronald Williams

Duly adopted this 23rd day of June 2025.



Jodie Dupree
Board Chair

ATTEST:



Heidi L. Holland, MMC, NCCMC
Town Clerk

