



**Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
June 10, 2025  
City Hall – 6:30 PM.**

**A. Call to Order**

Chair Lucille Launderville called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**B. Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Roll Call**

**Attendance:**

Lucille Launderville

Sharon Zakszeski

Travis Cruse

Carrie Moffett

Stephanie Bodmer

David Van der Vossen

Assistant Manager Nicole Morgan

City Clerk Tanya Shannon

**C. Approval of Agenda**

Chair Launderville called for an amendment to the agenda to include a discussion on adding foundation requirements for new builds. Ms. Zakszeski made a motion to approve the agenda as presented with the amendment to add a discussion on adding foundation requirements for new builds, and Mr. Cruse seconded the motion. ~~Vote 6-0~~; **Vote 5-0 ; Motion Carried.**

**D. Potential Conflict of Interest/Association Disclosure**

If any Board member knows of any conflict of interest or association with any item on this agenda, please so state at this time. None stated.

**E. Approval of the Minutes**

A motion was made to approve the April 22nd, 2025, by Ms. Moffett and seconded by Ms. Bodmer. ~~Vote 6-0~~; **Vote 5-0; Motion Carried.**

F. Public Comment—None

G. Old Business –None

H. New Business

1. **Text Amendment- UDO Article 5, Section 5.5**

Ms. Morgan provided an overview of the request. She explained that Ashley Turner, the applicant, has initiated a request to amend Article 5, Section 5.5 of the City's Unified Development Ordinance to allow restaurants without drive-thru service in the C-1A Commercial/Service District. Currently, restaurants without drive-thru service are permitted by right in the C-1 Commercial Mixed-Use District and the C-C City Center District. The C-1 Commercial Mixed-Use District is intended for retail, office, and multi-family residential uses, and it also allows for mixed-use. In contrast, the C-C City Center District allows for a mix of high-intensity, pedestrian-oriented uses and is intended to promote social activity. Similar to the C-1 Commercial Mixed-Use District, the C-1A Commercial/Service District also allows for mixed-use and is intended for commercial, retail, office, trades, and associated crafts. However, the C-1A Commercial/Service District does not allow multi-family residential uses. Staff recommends approving the proposed amendment based on research, current uses, the surrounding area, and the City of Boiling Spring Lakes' Comprehensive Land Use Plan (LUP).

Ms. Bodner was in favor of approval, stating that C-1A is affordable property and that the City needs more businesses. M. Moffett confirmed that all development standards would apply. Mr. Morgan agreed, noting that the only change would be to the table of permitted uses to allow restaurants without drive-thru service. The board's consensus was to approve the amendment.

Ms. Bodmer made a motion to approve the text amendment to UDO Article 5, Section 5.5 as presented and seconded by Ms. Zakszeski. ~~Vote 6-0;~~ *Vote 5-0; Motion Carried.*

A motion was made by Ms. Moffett to approve the Plan Consistency that recommends approval to the Board of Commissioners, seconded by Ms. Bodmer. ~~Vote 6-0;~~ *Vote 5-0; Motion Carried.*

2. **Discussion on Foundation Requirements for New Builds.**

Chair Launderville stated that many citizens have approached her with concerns about foundations, particularly those on slabs. They believe that requiring crawl spaces might reduce the severity of damages. Mr. Cruse noted that this is not the underlying issue. He

emphasized the need to be cautious when trying to enforce regulations beyond the building codes.

After conducting research on the ban on slab foundations, Ms. Morgan expressed her belief that the City cannot prohibit slab foundations. She explained that when an application is submitted to the Building Inspector and meets the building code requirements, the inspector is obligated to issue the building permit. However, she thinks it may be possible to create an ordinance outside of the building code. She mentioned that some municipalities manage this through their stormwater permitting process. However, the City of BSL stormwater permits are issued through NC DEQ.

Ms. Morgan pointed out that currently, if a structure is located in a floodplain, it must be built higher. If the structure is not in a floodplain, there are no specific foundation requirements. She concluded that there is no way to completely deny slab foundations, and this issue needs to be addressed differently.

Mr. Van der Vossen proposed establishing a freeboard above the floodplain, while Ms. Morgan clarified that this applies only to structures outside the floodplain and noted the absence of a base flood elevation. Mr. Van der Vossen suggested starting with floodplain levels and adding a margin, while Morgan stated that this is already being done. He emphasized that the focus should be on the first floor and proposed that if the freeboard is +3, nothing mechanical should be placed within that space. Ms. Morgan mentioned the City already enforces this for floodplain structures, but no baseline exists for those outside it.

Ms. Morgan stated that the City must comply with the State's standards and requirements, and that any regulations beyond the State's requirements are supplementary. She mentioned that the City's Ordinance will not specify that only X zones will be regulated; instead, it will summarize how these zones will be managed. She may not require three elevation certificates, but just one. Ms. Morgan is currently engaged in discussions with the State regarding these matters. Additionally, she noted that the City will be hiring an engineer soon, and she plans to discuss potential options with them as well.

Ms. Moffett asked, "Is this a problem looking for a solution or a solution looking for a problem?" Ms. Morgan mentioned that she is not aware of many municipalities that regulate foundations, but there are a few. There was a discussion about whether additional foundation requirements would matter if the issues stem from building in low-lying areas or regions with poor stormwater drainage. The consensus was that the best solution would be to first address the stormwater drainage problems.

Further discussion revolved around whether homeowners are aware that they live in flood-prone areas and if they have the option to elevate their homes. Chair Launderville inquired

about the additional cost of building an elevated home. Mr. Cruse explained the different types of foundations, noting that for every 8 inches of elevation, the cost ranges from \$3,500 to \$5,000, depending on the size of the house. Therefore, if homeowners choose to elevate their homes around 3 feet, they should expect an additional cost of approximately \$15,000.

Mr. Cruse noted that most builders are not currently elevating homes, but some do for grade slab constructions. He also expressed concern that trying to enforce more regulations than those required by the State Code might be met with resistance from some builders. Having worked in the area for 27 years, Mr. Cruse stated he has never seen flooding like what occurred in the Highlands area. He mentioned that bridges and roads that have existed for fifty years have washed out. He understands the community's frustration and the desire to be prepared, emphasizing that sometimes certain issues are beyond control.

Mr. Van der Vossen inquired whether a survey had been conducted to determine which homes and zones experienced flooding after PTC #8. Ms. Morgan responded that she does not have elevation certificates for structures not located in a floodplain. Ms. Moffett asked if there was a way to find out how many homes are in the X zone compared to those that are not. Ms. Morgan indicated that this information is available on the NCEM Flood Risk Information System (FRIS) website. She noted that the majority of properties in the City are situated in the X zone.

There was also a question regarding the amount of buildable land remaining. Ms. Morgan stated that she was unsure but mentioned that if sewage services were expanded to the City, it was estimated that approximately 9,000 parcels would be available for development.

The discussion included concerns about rapid growth and its impact on infrastructure capacity, schools, and medical treatment facilities. Chair Launderville acknowledged that these are difficult questions and expressed his concerns.

## **I. Other Business**

Ms. Moffett requested an update on the establishment of a Tree Committee. Ms. Morgan informed her that she has passed the information to the City Manager and is currently awaiting his response. Ms. Zakszeski expressed uncertainty about whether forming the committee is a good idea. While she acknowledged that it is not necessarily a bad idea, she pointed out that it places a significant burden on the committee members and that they may not be welcomed as the 'Tree Police'.

Ms. Morgan added that enforcement is a challenging job for Code Enforcement, especially given the numerous legalities involved, such as property rights. She noted that regulations and requirements frequently change, and she is constantly reviewing proposed bills. Given

that the staff is currently short-handed, Ms. Morgan indicated that it would be difficult to train a committee effectively.

Ms. Moffett inquired whether the committee's role would focus more on identifying trees or assisting with the mitigation process. Ms. Morgan responded that approval for the tree mitigation fund is on the agenda for the July 1st Board of Commissioners (BOC) meeting. It was discussed that a Tree Committee might be better utilized as part of the mitigation process. Once funds are allocated to purchase trees and replant them on city property, the committee could assist in selecting the appropriate trees and determining suitable planting locations. Ms. Morgan emphasized that once those funds become available, it would definitely be worthwhile to discuss the committee's role further.

**J. Announcements:**

None

- K.** There were no further comments. Chair Launderville requested a motion to adjourn. So moved by Ms. Zakszeski and seconded by Ms. Bodmer. ~~Vote 6-0; Vote 5-0; Motion~~ **Carried.**

**Adjourned –7:11 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by Tanya Shannon, City Clerk.