

---

**Town of Nags Head  
Planning Board  
November 19th, 2024  
- DRAFT -**

The Planning Board of the Town of Nags Head met on Tuesday, November 19th, 2024, in the Board Room at the Nags Head Municipal Complex.

Chair Vaughan called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. as a quorum was present.

***Members Present***

Megan Vaughan, Meade Gwinn, Molly Harrison, David Thompson, Gary Ferguson, Kristi Wright, David Elder

***Members Absent***

None

***Others Present***

Kelly Wyatt, Andy Joe Costello, Lily Nieberding, Andy Garman

***Approval of Agenda***

David Elder moved to approve the agenda as presented. Meade Gwinn seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

***Public Comment/Audience Response***

None

***Approval of Minutes***

Chair Vaughan asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. David Elder moved to approve the minutes as presented; Meade Gwinn seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

***Action Items***

***Consideration of a Special Use/Site Plan Amendment for the Soundside Event Site.***

Planning Director Kelly Wyatt presented a Special Use Permit/Site Plan Amendment submitted by Albemarle & Associates Ltd on behalf of the Dare County Tourism Board for the purpose of:

Inclusion of five additional properties as part of the approved site plan for the Designated Public Event Site, approval of Soundside boardwalk, gazebos, platforms, and docking facilities. and approval of the construction of ten (10) pickleball courts located on the former Pamlico Jacks Restaurant building site.

The existing land use is Designated Public Events Site and is zoned C-2, General Commercial Zoning District and within the Commercial Outdoor Recreation Overlay District as is the zoning classification of the surrounding properties. Properties associated with this request are located in the AE5, AE4 and Shaded X Flood Zones. Per the Town of Nags Head local Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, the property is subject to an RFPE/LES of 9 ft. msl. There are no buildings proposed as part of this SUP/Site Plan Amendment request.

Ms. Wyatt then reviewed the applicable Zoning Regulations:

- Use Regulations: Section 6.6, Table of Uses and Activities lists "Designated Public Events Site" as a Special Use within the Commercial Outdoor Recreation Overlay District, with supplemental regulations set forth in Section 7.58.

Ms. Wyatt reviewed the definition as a *Designated public events site means a parcel or contiguous group of parcels of acreage greater than five, owned by the public and designated by the board of commissioners for the purpose of creating a variety of opportunities for recreation, leisure, social or cultural experiences and special events in accordance with the regulations of this Code.*

Staff finds the requested approvals to be consistent and compliant with the use standards of Section 7.58 and Section 8.5.2.5 and the definition of "Designated Public Events Site".

- Total allowable lot coverage for this site is 55%. The proposed lot coverage associated with construction of the pickleball courts on the Pamlico Jacks Restaurant building site alone is 26.2%, therefore lot coverage compliant.
- The maximum allowable building height within the Town is 35 feet; however, pursuant to Section 8.2.1, Dimensional requirements, total height may be increased to 42 feet with the use of an 8:12 roof pitch or greater. There are no buildings proposed as part of this SUP/Site Plan Amendment request.
- Section 10.82 of the UDO, Applicability, states that Commercial Design Standards shall apply to all building construction or remodeling projects requiring a special use permit or site plan review. There are no buildings proposed as part of this SUP/Site Plan Amendment request.
- Pursuant to Article 10, Table 10-2, Required Parking by Use, for "Designated Public Events Site" parking is to be determined based on the requirements for the uses located on the site. The parking standard for tennis court is 1.5 parking spaces for each tennis court or sport court. The ten proposed pickleball courts would require 15 parking spaces, 91 parking spaces have been provided, therefore parking is compliant.
- Section 8.5.2.7 sets for the Buffering Requirements for Commercial-Outdoor Recreational Uses. Adjoining properties to the north and south are also zoned C-2, General Commercial, located within the Commercial Outdoor Recreation Overlay District, and developed commercially, therefore no additional buffering or landscaping is required at this time.
- A lighting plan compliant with the requirements of Article 10, Part IV of the Unified Development Ordinance will be required prior to the issuance of any development permits. In addition, a light audit will be required prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
- No additional signage is being proposed at this time.

The Dare County Health Department has reviewed and approved the proposal as presented. Note that patrons of the pickleball courts and boardwalk will have access, via connected sidewalks, to the restrooms inside the former Dairy Queen restaurant, as well as the restroom facilities located on the site of the aerial adventure park.

Traffic circulation and Stormwater Management have been reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer

The project will be required to comply with all applicable NC Fire Prevention Code requirements as part of building permit application review and issuance.

The Public Works Director has reviewed and approved the proposed site plan as presented.

CAMA Major Permit 61-24 for the Soundside Event Site has been issued (amended by CRC Variance and included in the agenda packet).

Staff found that the proposal is consistent with the applicable use and development standards, as well as relevant land use policies and would recommend approval of the Special Use/Site Plan Amendment request as presented.

Applicant John DeLucia, Albemarle & Associates, addressed the Board. Mr. DeLucia presented some renderings of what the Boardwalk will look like. The Boardwalk will incorporate a structure that pays homage to the original, historical Dare County sign that was in place when the Wright Memorial Bridge was constructed.

Mr. DeLucia confirmed for Mr. Gwinn that the boardwalk will be constructed out of wood and there will probably be some low lights on the boardwalk and gazebo. The boardwalk will be accessible to the public 24/7.

Mr. DeLucia noted that the pickle ball courts will be a collaboration between the tourist bureau and Dare County. The courts will have a 6 to 10 ft high fence with a wind guard, sunshades and bleachers. The public will be able to operate the lights on the courts up to a certain designated time.

Mr. DeLucia confirmed for Ms. Harrison that the Aerial Park has a long-term lease.

Mr. DeLucia confirmed that the estimated cost for the project is about \$6 Million and they hope to put it out for bid in December.

The Board and Mr. DeLucia discussed potential future plans for the site as well as how this project might impact kiteboarding activities.

Mr. DeLucia confirmed for Mr. Ferguson that they are not planning on any new curb cuts and will probably be eliminating some in the future.

Mr. Elder noted that he did not see any issues with the project. Mr. Thompson agreed, noting that it's a nice amenity that will be enjoyed by both tourists and locals.

David Elder moved to recommend approval of the Special Use/Site Plan Amendment as submitted. David Thomspon seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

---

Consideration of a Site Plan Review for construction of a 8,305 square foot Dare County EMS Station and associated improvements. The property is zoned SPD-C Village Commercial-1 and is located at 105 W. Seachase Drive.

Ms. Wyatt presented a Site Plan Review submitted by Oakley Collier Architects on behalf of Dare County for the purpose of constructing an approximately 8,305 square foot Dare County Emergency Management Services (EMS) station and all associated site improvements. Ms. Wyatt noted that "Future Additions" shown on the site plan are not included as part of the Site Plan Review.

The property is located at 105 W. Seachase Drive. The existing Land Use is Office/Municipal Use and it is zoned SPD-C Village at Nags Head, Commercial 1 District and Ms. Wyatt outlined the zoning classification of Surrounding Properties in her Staff memorandum.

The property is located in an X Flood Zone, per the Town of Nags Head local ordinance, the property is subject to an RFPE/LES of 9 ft. The proposed first floor of habitable space will be elevated to or above 13 ft. msl and is therefore compliant.

The 2022 Comprehensive Plan classifies this property as General Commercial. While the use is more institutional in nature, it remains consistent with this land use classification and stated Land Use Policies.

Ms. Wyatt noted that pursuant to the text amendment adopted by the Board of Commissioners at their November 6, 2024, meeting, "County EMS Station" is now a permitted use within the Village at Nags Head Commercial 1 District and proceeded to review the zoning regulations:

- Pursuant to Section 9.21.8.5 of the UDO, Table of Development Standards within the Village at Nags Head the maximum allowable lot coverage is 80% of the district area. The Village Commercial 1 District is comprised of The Outer Banks Mall, including the outparcels for Urgent Care and Outback Restaurant, the subject property, 111 W. Seachase Drive (Rusty Crow Quilt Shop) and the 7-lot subdivision, Sandcastle Village. While we do not have an updated survey for all improvements within this district, the lot coverage proposed for the redevelopment of this property for the EMS Station is reduced from 69.7% of the total lot area, to approximately 51% of the total lot area. Lot coverage is therefore compliant.
- The maximum allowable building height within the Town is 35 feet; however, pursuant to Section 8.2.1, Dimensional requirements, total height may be increased to 42 feet with the use of an 8:12 roof pitch or greater. The applicant has proposed a structure with an overall height of approximately 34 feet measured from grade, therefore height is compliant. A height certificate will be required to verify overall height compliance during construction.
- Section 10.82 of the UDO, Applicability, states that Commercial Design Standards shall apply to all building construction or remodeling projects requiring a special use permit or site plan review. This project must adhere to the Commercial Design Standards set forth within Part VI of the UDO. As proposed this project will comply with standards set forth in Division II – Building Design including a human scale design, various roof articulations including a watch tower, residential style window, exterior masonry with board and batten and shingle siding, workable shutters, and gable brackets. This structure is located within the Village at Nags Head and as such should be reviewed and approved by their Architectural Control Committee (ACC). The applicant has provided the Village ACC with the architectural renderings and is awaiting their review comments.
- At their November 6, 2024, meeting the Board of Commissioners adopted a parking standard for EMS Stations of one (1) parking space per employee on duty and one (1) parking space per 200 square feet of training facility and customer service areas. The applicant has noted a maximum of 12

employees at shift change, requiring 12 parking spaces, no training areas and approximately 100 square feet of customer service area, requiring one parking space. This use is required to have a minimum of 13 parking spaces, 22 spaces have been provided, therefore parking is compliant. Section 10.92.14.4 of the UDO, Surface Materials Appropriate for use, requires that a minimum of twenty (20) percent of the surface area of the parking area and drive aisles be constructed using permeable surface materials. The applicant has proposed 22.6% of the parking area be provided in an approved permeable surface therefore this requirement is compliant.

- Ms. Wyatt noted that there are several sections of the Unified Development Ordinance that speak to Buffering and Landscaping as it applies throughout this proposed site and proceeded to review each one. Staff found the project to be compliant with all provisions noting that the applicant has proposed to preserve all the existing mature vegetation onsite, resulting in 11% of the total lot area, in addition to the proposed new plantings, therefore vegetation preservation requirements are compliant.
- A lighting plan compliant with the requirements of Article 10, Part IV of the Unified Development Ordinance will be required prior to the issuance of any development permits. In addition, a light audit will be required prior to issuance to occupancy permits.
- No additional signage is being proposed at this time.

The Village at Nags Head is served by a wastewater treatment facility. The applicant has indicated that Carolina Water Supply has been contacted and has indicated that they would allow the continued use of the existing connection. Authorization of connection in writing will be required prior to the Board of Commissioners meeting.

Traffic circulation has been reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer as presented, noting that an NCDOT right-of-way encroachment agreement will be required prior to issuance of the building permit.

Stormwater management is not required for this project, given there is no net increase in built-upon area and no importation of fill-material.

The Deputy Fire Chief has reviewed and approved the proposed site plan as presented. The project will be required to comply with all applicable NC Fire Prevention Code requirements as part of building permit application review and issuance.

The Public Works Director has reviewed and approved the proposed site plan as presented.

Ms. Wyatt noted that Planning staff finds that the proposal is consistent with the applicable use and development standards, as well as relevant land use policies. Based upon staff's review of the proposal, Staff would recommend approval of the Site Plan Review as submitted. Ms. Wyatt stated that she as well as Engineer Mike Robinson and representatives from Oakley Collier were available to answer any questions for the Board.

Mr. Robinson and Mr. Gwinn discussed the median and line of sight as it pertains to those turning in and out of the station with Mr. Robinson confirming that whatever they plant on the median will have to stay very low.

Mr. Robinson confirmed for Mr. Elder that they do not have anything yet from NCDOT. Their hope is to coordinate the light at Seachase with the flashing lights by the fire station.

David Elder moved to recommend approval of the site plan as presented. Meade Gwinn seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

## ***Report on Board of Commissioners Actions***

Ms. Wyatt gave an update on the Board of Commissioner Actions, of note: the Earl Murray Jr Employee of the Year Nominees were presented by Dept Heads and Town Engineer David Ryan was chosen by the Board. On the Consent Agenda was a Request for Public Hearing to consider amendments to UDO re: Hotel Parking Standards. Two Public Hearings were held, one to Consider a Special Use/Site Plan Review for the Construction of a Two Story, Eight Bedroom Dormitory; the Board approved the site plan as submitted. The other one was to consider amendments to the UDO within the SPD-C, Village at Nags Head Commercial-1 Zoning District to accommodate a new use, EMS Station; the Board adopted the amendments to the UDO, as well as the consistency statement, as presented.

## ***Town Updates***

None

## ***Discussion Items***

### ***Continued Discussion of Hotel Overlay District***

Deputy Planning Director Joe Costello led a continued discussion regarding the Hotel Overlay District and whether it remains in line with the Town's vision and development goals. Mr. Costello explained that the staff report has been updated to address feedback from the Planning Board. Key changes include clarifying the hotel overlay process, adding discussions about density and lot coverage, and introducing a section on recent hotel trends. A draft ordinance proposing the removal of the hotel overlay district has also been included for review.

Mr. Costello noted that the hotel overlay district was originally established in 2004 in response to concerns about hotels being demolished and replaced by large single-family rental homes. At the time, changes were made to the C2 district, including reducing the maximum height for buildings to 35 feet. However, within the hotel overlay district, setbacks were reduced, the 60-foot height limit for hotels was maintained, and lot coverage allowances were increased to 60%.

Over the past two decades, only one hotel, the Inn at Whalebone, has been approved within the hotel overlay district, receiving site plan approval just recently. This highlights the limited use of the overlay district.

When it comes to approval processes, hotels in the C2 district must go through a special use permit process. In contrast, the hotel overlay district allows hotels to be built by right, as long as they meet the conditions outlined in the ordinance and any supplemental regulations.

Mr. Costello drew a comparison between the new multifamily development ordinance and the hotel overlay district. While the multifamily ordinance includes density controls, the hotel overlay district does not, despite its allowances for larger, high-density developments. The lack of density control, combined with the 60-foot height allowance and 60% lot coverage, raises concerns similar to those addressed in the multifamily ordinance discussions.

Mr. Costello presented a table, created in 2017, showing housing trends as part of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update. Review of this table revealed no significant changes in the number of hotels. At the time the plan was drafted, there were 15 hotels, and that number has remained unchanged.

No demolitions or removals occurred during this period; in fact, the town has introduced provisions allowing legacy hotels not located on the oceanfront to rent units on a long-term basis. For example, Owens Motel recently underwent renovations and rebranded as Mia's Boutique Hotel, although its units continue to be rented on a short-term basis. Additionally, the 87-room Whalebone Inn received site plan approval and is progressing toward construction.

Mr. Costello stated that he had also included some policy considerations for the Board to consider as well as a draft text amendment which basically shows the removal of the hotel overlay districts and would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Harrison noted that she was ready to let it go. Hotels would still be allowed so she does see a need to have a special district with looser regulations.

Mr. Elder agreed, noting the time frame (20 years) when they did not have any, or very few applications. Mr. Elder stated that there were probably several reasons, market trends, etc., for hotels not coming here.

Chair Vaughan agreed noting the increase in large family dwellings during that time, and in more recent years the introduction of short-term rental has introduced alternative accommodations. Chair Vaughan noted that she would not be inclined to keep the hotel overlay, and the ordinance could always be revisited if they suddenly had an influx of hotels wanting to be built, and unable to adhere to the existing C-2 standards. Chair Vaughan stated that at the very least it needs to be a special use permit rather than permitted by right.

Mr. Thompson stated that ROI generally determines if a hotel will be built or not and with the current price of land and the price of construction a hotel is not going to be built.

Mr. Ferguson was also in agreement that the hotel overlay should be removed from the ordinance. Mr. Ferguson does not believe there is a huge desire for hotels in Nags Head.

Ms. Wyatt confirmed that staff will bring back the ordinance for the Board to vote on at their December meeting.

Continued Discussion related to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

Ms. Wyatt led the Board through a continued discussion on Accessory Dwelling Units and their place in the town. Ms. Wyatt explained that at their October 15th meeting, staff provided the Planning Board with an update on the status of discussions surrounding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and summarized themes from the two public input sessions held in September.

Planning Board members noted concerns about the perceived inequity in current ordinances, which allow partial-home short-term rentals for short-term stays only, precluding long-term stays. This limitation was highlighted as a barrier, particularly in addressing the community's workforce housing needs. Additionally, the Planning Board expressed agreement that the current terminology surrounding short-term rentals and accessory dwelling units is confusing and should be clarified moving forward.

The term "Accessory Dwelling Unit" (ADU) encompasses both attached and detached units. Public-input sessions revealed that community members generally felt more comfortable with attached ADUs (e.g., internal ADU, accessory apartment) compared to detached ADUs (e.g., backyard cottages). Creating separate terminology for these two types of units may help with clarity and public

understanding. As such Staff has drafted some revised definitions, with Ms. Wyatt stating that the proposed new language was shown in red in her staff report. Ms. Wyatt then proceeded to review these for the Board.

Ms. Wyatt acknowledged that given that partial-home short-term rentals function similarly to attached ADU's, it is important to develop clear and concise language for these two terms moving forward. Ms. Wyatt then reviewed these possible revised definitions for the Board.

Ms. Wyatt then reviewed several options for consideration with regard to how to approach the allowance of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) moving forward.

Option A - Do not proceed with any recommendation to allow accessory dwelling units (ADU's) within the town. Instead, recognizing that partial home short term rentals effectively function as attached ADUs, focus on establishing regulatory parameters for short-term rentals to ensure that we are not continuing to permit them.

Option B - Allow Detached ADU's/Backyard Cottages townwide, on (all lots/lots greater than 16,000 sq. ft. in area). Allow (short-term rental/long-term rental/both) Limit the area of the detached ADU (to a percentage of the principal structure, a set maximum area limit, or both – for instance, no greater than 50% of the area of the principal structure, or 800 square feet, whichever is greater). Allow Attached ADU's/Accessory Apartments townwide, no limitation on lot size. Allow (short-term rental/long-term rental/both) Limit the area of the attached ADU to (percentage of the principal structure, a set maximum area limit, or both – for instance, no greater than 50% of the area of the principal structure, or 800 square feet, whichever is greater)

Option C - Allow Detached ADU's/Backyard Cottages east of US 158 only, same as above regarding lot size, short or long-term rental and size of cottage. Allow Attached ADU's/Accessory Apartments townwide, same as above regarding lot size, short- or long-term rental and size of apartment.

Option D - Allow Detached ADU's/Backyard Cottages east of US 158 only, restricted to long-term rental only, same restrictions as above regarding lot size and size of cottage. Allow Attached ADU's/Accessory Apartments townwide, both long and short rental, leaving detached ADU's for long-term only, same restrictions as above regarding lot size and size of apartment.

Option E - Detached ADU's/Backyard Cottages – prohibited townwide. Attached ADU's/Accessory Apartments allowed townwide, short- and long-term rental, same as above regarding lot size and area of apartment.

Option F - Detached ADU's/Backyard Cottages – prohibited townwide. Attached ADU's/Accessory Apartments allowed east of US 158 for short-term purposes only. Those partial home STR's on the west side would become nonconforming for short-term use. East side partial home STR's could switch to long-term rental use, effectively becoming an attached ADU.

Ms. Wyatt then reviewed some pending, possible legislation. Noting that in North Carolina the Town can currently regulate STR's however, Senate Bill 667 is lingering, if enacted it would prohibit local governments from adopting ordinances that regulate a variety of things: required to allow short-term rentals, could not restrict to long-term rental only, could not set limits on length of stay, could not require owner occupancy, etc.

The town could consider developing a permit process/procedure to regulate short-term rentals, understanding that short term rentals and attached ADU's would be treated synonymously, however,

that raises many questions. It seems in most places with attached ADU's and attached STRs, the primary distinction revolves around the intended use (long-term residential and housing supply versus short-term rental and tourism management). However, due to our location and economy based on tourism, it seems that restricting to long-term only would be difficult.

Ms. Wyatt also noted that in North Carolina the town can currently regulate ADU's, however House Bill 409 is still out there. The last action on NC House Bill 409 – referred to Commission on Rules and Operations of the Senate. This proposed legislation would prohibit requiring owner occupancy, regulating parking, regulating utility connections, etc.

Ms. Wyatt then reviewed some other considerations to keep in mind as they move forward:

- Existing STRs and Legal Nonconformity:
  - o STRs that exceed any newly established area restrictions would likely be considered legally nonconforming.
  - o Enforcement of these nonconforming uses would be difficult and would require a comprehensive inventory and documentation process.
  - o Legally nonconforming STRs could transition to long-term rentals but once transitioned, would not be permitted to revert to short-term rental use.
- Enforcing Long-Term Rentals:
  - o Enforcement would be relatively straightforward if annual lease agreements are required as proof.
  - o However, monitoring rentals with minimum durations of 91 days could be labor intensive and challenging to enforce.
- Detached ADUs/Backyard Cottages:
  - o If detached ADUs are allowed town-wide, should a minimum number of architectural design points be required to ensure consistency with neighborhood character?
  - o Detached ADU applications should require Dare County Health Department (DCHD) approval, particularly for septic system compliance.
- Parking Standards:
  - o A review of existing parking standards will be necessary to account for any new ADU and STR options.
  - Create threshold for "subordinate". As an example, we have used 50% of the area of the principal dwelling, or 800 square feet, whichever is greater, but this needs further discussion.

Ms. Wyatt stated that depending on the direction given, staff may need to do an inventory to gauge what is currently in the town in an effort to create minimal nonconforming scenarios. She noted this would by no means be a comprehensive inventory.

Ms. Wyatt stated that Mr. Costello had done some GIS work and provided an analysis of lots within the town that are equal to, or greater than 16,000 square feet in area. This may be helpful for the Board as part of their considerations.

Chair Vaughan asked that they review the definitions as this seems to cause a lot of confusion both for the Board as well as the public emphasizing the need to clearly distinguish between attached and detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

Mr. Elder – how about a mother-in-law suite attached to the primary structure by a breezeway, would that be considered attached or detached? Ms. Wyatt confirmed if it's underneath the same roof area it

would be considered attached. Habitable space over a detached garage would be considered a detached ADU.

Mr. Thompson reminded the Board that when listening to the public input, the two things that most people had an issue with were detached ADUs and the perception that they increase density and the inequity of being able to rent short-term and not long-term. Mr. Thompson also reminded the Board that some people rent out their ADUs to traveling nurses or other professionals which don't really fall under either category.

Chair Vaughan asked the Board how they felt about the inequity between long-term and short term. The Board was generally in agreement that there should not be a distinction between long-term and short-term rentals.

Chair Vaughan then discussed the idea of preventing duplexes by looking further at the idea of creating a threshold for a dwelling making it subordinate to the primary structure.

Mr. Elder noted that putting in an interior stairway might emphasize the idea of a subordinate.

The Board then discussed where ADUs might be allowed, and if they should be prohibited in certain areas of town. Mr. Elder stated that he believes they should not be limited to only one section (east or west) of the town.

Chair Vaughan then discussed detached ADUs and noted that if they were to allow them there should be minimum lot size requirements. Chair Vaughan stated she was partial to the 16000 SF threshold.

Chair Vaughan noted that the reason people are less in favor of detached ADUs is because they think they are going to be every where when in fact there are other factors such as lot coverage, setbacks and septic requirements which would also be a limiting factor for ADUs, especially detached ones.

Ms. Wyatt confirmed for Ms. Harrison that the map that Mr. Costello created was only showing the East side of the Bypass. She also noted that the way it's being proposed (Lots 16,000 SF and over) is only looking at residential right now.

Chair Vaughan noted that when deciding on regulations they need to keep in mind some of the proposed legislation.

In general, the Board was in consensus that ADUs shouldn't be limited to short-term or long-term only. They were more in favor of attached ADUs that are clearly subordinate to a principal structure, rather than detached but willing to consider detached ADUs for lots that are 16000 SF or larger in size. The Board was also in general agreement that they should be allowed townwide.

Mr. Ferguson discussed covenants and deed restrictions and expressed concern over how these things play into zoning regulations. Ms. Wyatt confirmed that while zoning does require covenants for new subdivisions it is up to that subdivision's HOA to enforce them. Staff does encourage property owners to look at their covenants, but the Town does not enforce them.

Ms. Wyatt noted that the conversation had been helpful and that staff would take the information received and draft more revised options for future discussion.

*November 6th, 2024, Director's Report*

Ms. Wyatt briefly discussed her Director's Report with the Board which included an update on the Estuarine Shoreline Management Plan, upcoming events at Dowdy Park and an upcoming event to showcase a new mural at the skate park.

***Planning Board Members' Agenda***

None

***Planning Board Chairman's Agenda***

None

***Adjournment***

A motion to adjourn was made by David Elder. The time was 11:15 AM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lily Campos Nieberding

DRAFT