CALL TO ORDER – 6 PM

INVOCATION – (Member Volunteer)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE – (Member Volunteer)

MISSION STATEMENT – (Member Volunteer)

I. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (*Procedures are attached*)
   Please sign up on the Public Comment Sign In sheet near the door

II. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
   All items listed below are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. No separate
   discussion will be held except by a member of the Planning Board:
   A. Approval of Meeting Agenda
   B. Approval of Minutes of August 6, 2015
   C. Consideration of Abstentions

III. PUBLIC HEARING
   1. Par 5 Development Group, LLC, is seeking a Special Non-residential Intensity Allocation (SNIA) to increase
      the maximum built-upon area to 47.3% on two adjacent properties (ParID 00030147 and 00015903), owned
      by R. Carter & Susan Grine, located on NC Hwy 211 near the intersection of Juniper Lake Road, to construct
      a retail building, driveway, and associated parking.
   2. David Garza, is seeking a two year vested Conditional Use Permit approval to operate a veterinary clinic in an
      existing building located at 125 West Plaza Drive, West End in Seven Lakes West on a parcel (ParID 97000323) owned by Phillip and Pamela Harrell as identified in the Moore County tax records.

IV. WORK SESSION
   1. Review Text Amendments to the Moore County Unified Development Ordinance.

V. OTHER BOARD MATTERS

VI. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORTS

VII. BOARD COMMENT PERIOD

VII. UPCOMING EVENTS
   - Tuesday, October 6, 2015 5:30 PM Board of Commissioners Meeting to be held at the
     Historic Courthouse in Carthage.
   - Tuesday, October 20, 2015 5:30 PM Board of Commissioners Meeting to be held at the
     Historic Courthouse in Carthage.
   - Thursday, November 5, 2015 6:00 PM Planning Board Meeting to be held at the Historic
     Courthouse in Carthage

VIII ADJOURNMENT
Special accommodations for individuals with disabilities or impairments will be made upon request to the extent that reasonable notice is given to the County.

Please see attached procedures for the Public Comment Period and public commend during Public Hearings

PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEDURES
MOORE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

The Moore County Planning Board is committed to allowing members of the public an opportunity to offer comments and suggestions for the efficient and effective administration of government. In addition to public hearings, a special time is set aside for the purpose of receiving such comments and suggestions. All comments and suggestions addressed to the Board during the Public Comment Period shall be subject to the following procedures:

1. The Public Comment period will be held at the beginning of the Board meeting. The comment period will be limited to a maximum of thirty minutes.

2. Persons who wish to address the Board during the Public Comment Period will register on a sign-up sheet available on the table outside the entrance door to the Meeting Room indicating contact information and topic. Sign-up sheets will be available beginning 30 minutes before the start of the meeting. No one will be allowed to have his/her name placed on the list by telephone request to County Staff.

3. Each person signed up to speak will have three (3) minutes to make his/her remarks. Each person signed up to speak will only be entitled to the time allotted to each speaker and one additional time period which may be yielded to him/her by another individual who has also signed up to speak on a particular topic.

4. Speakers will be acknowledged by the Board Chairperson in the order in which their names appear on the sign-up sheet. Speakers will address the Board from the lectern at the front of the room and begin their remarks by stating their name and address.

5. Public comment is not intended to require the Board to answer any impromptu questions. Speakers will address all comments to the Board as a whole and not one individual member. Discussions between speakers and members of the audience will not be allowed.

6. Speakers will be courteous in their language and presentation. Matters or comments which are harmful, discriminatory or embarrassing to any citizens, official or employee of Moore County shall not be allowed. Speaker must be respectful and courteous in their remarks and must refrain from personal attacks and the use of profanity.

7. Only one speaker will be acknowledged at a time. If the time period runs out before all persons who have signed up get to speak, those names will be carried over to the next Public Comment Period.

8. Any applause will be held until the end of the Public Comment Period.

9. Speakers who have prepared written remarks or supporting documents are encouraged to leave a copy of such remarks and documents with the Chairperson.

10. Information sheets outlining the process for the public’s participation in Board meetings will also be available in the rear of the Meeting Room.

11. Action on items brought up during the Public Comment Period will be at the discretion of the Board.
MOORE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARINGS PROCEDURES

The Moore County Planning Board serves the public as well as the Board of Commissioners. During each public hearing a special time has been set aside for the purpose of receiving comments and suggestions. To insure that comments and suggestions are productive and not unnecessarily long, procedural rules for conducting public hearings are necessary. The following procedural rules will be utilized during public hearings of the Moore County Planning Board:

1. Anyone who would like to address the Board during a public hearing should register on the appropriate sign-up sheet indicating their name and address. Sign-up sheets will be available on the table outside the entrance door to the Meeting Room 30 minutes before the start of the meeting. Information sheets outlining the process for the public’s participation in Board meetings and public hearings will also be available. No one will be allowed to have his/her name placed on the list by telephone request to County Staff.

2. Each speaker will be called by the Chairman to the lectern, will state their name and address clearly into the record before providing their comments.

3. Speakers will address all comments to the Board as a whole and not to any one individual member. Speakers will be respectful, courteous, refrain from personal attacks and the use of profanity.

4. Any applause will be held until the end of the public hearing.

5. Speakers who have prepared written remarks or supporting documents are encouraged to leave a copy of such remarks and documents with the Secretary.

6. Action on items brought up during the public hearing will be at the discretion of the Board.

Adopted on the 5th day of May, 2011 by a 9 to 0 vote of the Moore County Planning Board
CALL TO ORDER

Planning Board Chairman Rich Smith called the meeting to order.

INVOCATION

Board Member Buck Mims offered the invocation.

MISSION STATEMENT

Vice Chairman Aaron McNeill read the Moore County Mission Statement.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Meeting Agenda
B. Approval of Minutes of May 7, 2015
C. Consideration of Abstentions

Board Member Gene Horne motioned to approve the Consent Agenda and the motion was seconded by Board Member David Lambert. The motion passed unanimously (8-0).
The Town of Pinebluff has requested to extend their extra-territorial jurisdiction (ETJ). The expansion area is located to the west of Pinebluff including a two (2) mile buffer from Parcel ID 00056458.

Planning Director Debra Ensminger explained that the meeting is being held tonight because the Town of Pinebluff has requested an extension of their extra territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) to the west of Pinebluff including a 2 mile buffer from Parcel ID #0056458.

Ms. Ensminger turned over the item to the Pinebluff representative Mr. David Rooks.

Mr. David Rooks introduced himself as the Attorney representing Pinebluff. He referenced the map and stated that it represents a lengthy history that started 4 to 5 years ago when Pinebluff had a request of the county to expand on all sides. Since Pinebluff and the Town of Aberdeen overlap, the County requested that Aberdeen and Pinebluff come to terms first, which has since been completed. Mr. Rooks continued to explain that after the agreement between Aberdeen and Pinebluff the Town of Pinebluff made an application to the County which they thought was approved but at this time there is currently no agreement. Mr. Rooks stated that in the interim something changed that changed everything. The legislature in 2011 adopted a change to the annexation ordinance. There are no involuntary annexations anymore and the only way an annexation can occur is with the consent of the majority of folks being annexed. Mr. Rooks explained that this really changed Pinebluff’s perspective because they were originally planning to annex to the east to the intersection of 15-501 but now they are interested in going to the west. The reason they want to go to the west is there is a parcel that is the town’s water tower which is directly above the starred parcel. Mr. Rooks explained that the starred parcel is the measuring point in which the annexation request comes. The ETJ expansion is based on the distance from the town’s last annexation. Mr. Rooks further explained that there was a change in a local bill in 1999 that allows Pinebluff to annex automatically from its last annexation point. As indicated by the map Mr. Rooks stated that Pinebluff is not going the full two miles out and the rationale is to primarily protect their water and to just be sure of what type of development is going to occur on its west side. Mr. Rooks stated that the Town of Pinebluff informed him that their intentions are to remain zoned as it is now or low intensity residential agricultural. They have no interest in becoming industrial or something that might threaten their water. Mr. Rooks further explained that there is a creek that is called Horse Creek that runs across Roseland Road and runs pretty much along the eastern part of the annexation and is also part of what they are trying to protect. Mr. Rooks concluded by stating that at this point the only issue that is being discussed is an extension of the ETJ to the west based on the annexation that occurred on the starred lot. There is no interest in annexing to the east and the only annexations that may occur from this day forward is if someone has a public
health emergency due to failed septic systems and wells and they have to get into a municipal system.

Board Member Shilling asked for clarification on what they are allowed to annex because the resolution that the board received states they are able to annex within two miles of their corporate limits.

David Rooks stated yes this is correct but did not understand the question.

Board Member Shilling asked for clarification from a previous statement that the expansion is allowed from their current ETJ.

David Rooks stated it is from the corporate limits not the ETJ.

Board Member Mims stated that he wanted to make it clear that he is on the town board of Aberdeen and asked Mr. Rooks if there were any issues.

David Rooks stated that the agreement between Pinebluff and Aberdeen was honored in all respects so there should not be any issues.

Board Member Shilling asked the rationale to include portions of parcels in the ETJ and not whole parcels.

David Rooks explained there are a couple of parcels where this is the case and in these circumstances it is unavoidable.

Board Member Shilling at the time thought the boundary was a farther distance and the split parcels could be included as a whole in the expansion. This boundary was indicated as the black line on the map. Mr. Rooks explained that red line is boundary and that is why some parcels were split and ultimately they just want to protect their water.

Board Member Mims stated that the concern with the county is relinquishing control and making sure the people within these areas are protected.

David Rooks stated that there are probably constitutional limits that governments can promise things.

Board Member Mims asked if there are any plans to develop any water and sewer lines in the undeveloped areas.

David Rooks stated no.

Board Member Joe Garrison asked if the proposal is approved does Pinebluff have to notify everyone and would the people have the same apparatus to express their concerns.
David Rooks stated that yes Pinebluff would hold a public hearing and go through a process of public participation.

Board Member Garrison asked for clarification regarding the intention of the expansion. Mr. Garrison understood that is to protect water and to keep zoning the same.

David Rooks stated yes this correct.

Board Member Garrison asked if the county already has it zoned, is the Town of Pinebluff saying the County is too relaxed.

David Rooks stated no it’s just a matter of intergovernmental relations because you cannot always count on it being wisely ruled as it is today.

Board Member Mims asked if there are any water issues right now.

David Rooks stated no, it is more that they want to make sure of what is going to happen around their well.

Board Member Garrison had a question for Ms. Ensminger. Mr. Garrison asked if there are current protections for watersheds and water.

Ms. Ensminger stated yes there are watershed regulations that protect all of unincorporated Moore County.

Board Member Mims asked Ms. Ensminger if she knew of any issues in that particular area.

Ms. Ensminger stated that she did not.

Board Member Garrison asked Mr. Rooks if the decision is ultimately no, if there is a lawsuit or potential legal action the town would take.

David Rooks stated that the County Attorney Ms. Leland and himself have different views on the Senate Bill from 1999 and we are hoping it can get resolved without exploring those different views.

Board Member Garrison further asked if there are any cases that court would use to make a decision.

David Rooks stated that he and Ms. Leland have asked outside sources and have found people that agree with each side.

Chairman Smith asked that if Pinebluff gains control of the zoning of the proposed parcels would they infringe on peoples’ property rights to protect the well. Mr. Rooks
asked for further clarification and Chairman Smith stated that this seems to a protection of the well I just don’t know individual property rights to be of a concern.

David Rooks explained that this would have to be addressed to the town board in Pinebluff.

Chairman Smith opened the public hearing.

Chairman Smith opened the floor to opponents of the proposed request.

Mr. Cliff Belcher of 725 Thunder Road asked for clarification regarding the protection of the water source. Mr. Belcher wanted to understand why it needed to be changed when the water source was already protected by Moore County. Mr. Rooks explained the water source is not the county’s water supply it is Pinebluff’s and they want to protect it. Mr. Belcher asked if citizens would still go through Moore County and Ms. Ensminger explained that if this request is approved individuals would still have to go through the county and Environmental Health for well and septic approval but building permits would go through Pinebluff. Mr. Belcher concluded that he doesn’t understand why this request is necessary when we would still go through the county.

Mr. Greg Sasser property owner of 320 Whippoorwill stated that he and his wife purchased the property to live in the county and they would like it to remain the same.

Mr. Howard Beal of 128 Ryder Cup Blvd had three questions for Pinebluff. First why has the circle been moved from the center of town and Chairman Smith explained this is due to the last annexation regulation that was adopted and allowed this change. Secondly Mr. Beal asked why some properties are skipped over and finally Mr. Beal asked what benefits they would receive because he feels this is taxation without representation.

John Darlington of 201 Murphy Drive North stated that he is the President of his subdivisions Homeowners Association and has some concerns regarding the minimum square footage that is required in Pinebluff. Mr. Darlington stated he assumes current homes will be grandfathered but has concerns about vacant lots in his subdivision and the minimum square foot requirement will not be beneficial for the demographic. Chairman Smith asked what will happen to the existing subdivision and County Attorney Ms. Leland stated she and Ms. Ensminger has never seen this before. Mr. Rooks explained he has seen this before and the existing homes would be considered nonconformities. Ms. Leland stated that a developer would probably run into the most issues. In conclusion Ms. Ensminger stated that Moore County does not regulate the size of structures.

Karen Reese May stated that she owns property in Addor and her property is divided by this request as well as other areas of Addor.

John Bright owns property on the north of side of Addor and is concerned about the exclusion of Addor and the ability to set up a mobile home. Mr. Bright concluded that he is concerned about the way business is being conducted.
Nancy Malone of 24E Persimmon Drive stated she is the President of the Homeowners Owners Association and is concerned the way Pinebluff conducts business. Ms. Malone explained the issues with water costs and that nothing is provided by the Town of Pinebluff. Ms. Malone concluded that she against being controlled by Pinebluff in anyway shape or form.

Amy Kirk of 416 Rose Ridge Road is concerned about having the neighborhood being cut in half and does not want to be part of Pinebluff and would like to remain part of the Roseland neighborhood. Ms. Kirk concluded by stating that she believes this is just one step before annexation will occur.

Dale Daken 137 Ryder Cup Boulevard stated he doesn’t have much too say because everyone has said pretty much what he wanted to say. Mr. Daken concluded by asking for a show of hands for those in favor of being taken over by Pinebluff.

David Rooks wanted to address the concerns of Ms. Kirks and that there will not be an annexation unless a majority is in favor of the change.

James Stancil of 420 Kirk Road stated that he pays extra for insurance because he is more than 5 miles from a fire department and he stated the statute 160(A)-360.

David Rooks stated that the reading of the statute does not take into account the local bill.

Bill Zell stated he is the Town Manager of Aberdeen and he said that he as one comment and one request. First Mr. Zell said his request is to allow Aberdeen to review this request before approval and his comment is they have 20 wells and have not completed any expansions.

Charles McKnight stated that he is always skeptical when land is involved and there is selective inclusion. Mr. McKnight would like some more explanation regarding why and the intent of the request.

Board Member Schilling asked Mr. Rooks about the request by Mr. Zell to include comment from the Town of Aberdeen. Mr. Rooks stated he would have no problem if they would like to provide comments.

Board Member Lambert asked Mr. Rooks asked if the lots that are not included pose no threat to the water. Mr. Rooks explained that he could not answer that question.

Board Member Mims asked Mr. Rooks if the Town of Pinebluff has explained specifically how this would protect the water source. Mr. Rooks explained that this is a matter of protecting the future of the water source. Board Member Mims explained that he is having a hard time understanding what they would do differently.

Board Member Eddie Nobles asked if there have been any studies completed to show how this would protect it in the future.
John Cook of 143 Sunnyview Road stated the reason the water has been brought up is to have a comparable case if it is denied.

Board Member Mims asked Mr. Rooks if there has been any studies completed that Mr. Nobles asked about previously. Mr. Rooks stated that he is not aware of any completed.

Chairman Smith asked if anyone else would like to speak.

Fred Goins of 1407 Current St stated that everyone works hard and feels it is very unfair and that the community was blindsided by Pinebluff.

Hugh Madison of 195 Sunnyview Road stated that he believes everything Pinebluff has done is underhanded.

Jean Frye of 348 Kirk Road stated that Horse Creek is very well maintained by the local church.

Mary King of 158 A King Lane stated that we do not desire to be a part of this ETJ and would like to be left alone.

Joel Stancil stated that he was concerned about not being notified and that it should be left alone to future generations.

Chairman Smith closed the public hearing.

Board Member Garrison stated that he would like to make a brief comment before providing a motion. In my opinion there is no immediate threat to the water source and it would be callous of any board to ignore the concerns of its citizens.

Board Member Joseph Garrison made a motion to endorse the Moore County Board of Commissioners to deny the request for expansion of extraterritorial jurisdiction by the Town of Pinebluff. The motion was seconded by Board Member Eli Schilling. Chairman Smith asked for any discussion and Board Member Schilling stated that there are concerns of citizens that are legitimate. Board Member Mims stated there is not a specific problem to address or a specific plan that the County of Moore would do differently. Vice Chairman appreciated Mr. David Rooks for being present and requested a representative of Pinebluff to be present to explain their decisions. Chairman Smith asked for all those in favor of the motion and the motion passed unanimously (8-0).

Ms. Ensminger explained to the citizens present that this decision is not the final decision. A Call to Public Hearing will take place on September 1st and the actual Public Hearing will take place on September 15th.
OTHER BOARD MATTERS

Board Member Mims congratulated Chairman Smith of his appointment to Chairman. Chairman Smith in return thanked Board Member Mims for his leadership during the last year.

Board Member Schilling welcomed Board Member David Lambert to the Planning Board.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORTS

Planning Director Debra Ensminger explained that the UDO work sessions will continue during the September Planning Board meeting.

BOARD COMMENT PERIOD

No Board comments were given.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further comments Board Member Schilling made a motion to adjourn, the motion was seconded by Board Member Garrison. The motion passed unanimously (8-0).

Respectfully submitted by,

Lydia Cleveland
MEMORANDUM TO THE WATERSHED REVIEW BOARD

FROM: Debra Ensminger
Planning & Transportation Services Director

DATE: September 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Special Non-residential Intensity Allocation (SNIA) Request

APPLICANT: Par 5 Development Group, LLC

PRESENTER: Theresa Thompson

REQUEST:
The applicant, Par 5 Development Group, LLC, is seeking a Special Non-residential Intensity Allocation (SNIA) to increase the maximum built-upon area to 47.3% on two adjacent properties (ParID 00030147 and 00015903), owned by R. Carter & Susan Grine, located on NC Hwy 211 near the intersection of Juniper Lake Road, to construct a new retail building, driveway, and associated parking. This case was properly advertised.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
- Tract one (1), identified as ParID 00030147, is 0.93 acres and is currently undeveloped.
- Tract two (2), identified as ParID 00015903, is 0.99 acres and is currently undeveloped.
- The total acreage is 1.92 acres.
- The applicant is requesting to increase the total built-upon area to 0.91 acres (39,550 sq. ft.) or 47.3% of the project site.
- The property is within the WS-III-BW Nick’s Creek Watershed which limits non-residential development to 24% built-upon area except approval of a SNIA authorizes up to 70% built-upon area.
- Ten (10) SNIA’s have been issued in the Nick’s Creek Watershed for a total of 36 acres leaving a balance of 326.77 acres for future allocation.

If this SNIA request is approved the Allocation Remaining for future projects will be 324.85 acres. The allocation set aside for public projects is 40.34 acres.

Staff Report – SNIA – NC Hwy 211
OVERLAY DISTRICTS:
- Highway Corridor Overlay District – The property is located within the Urban Transition HCOD.

WATER AND SEWER:
- The property will be tapped onto County Water.
- A new septic system will be installed.
- Per the Fire Marshal, installation of a fire hydrant is not required.

TRANSPORTATION:
- NCDOT approval will be required before permits are issued.

UDO REQUIREMENTS MET:
- The applicant has submitted a site plan that proposes engineered methods to minimize water quality impacts and incorporating Best Management Practices.
- The property is uniformly zoned Highway Commercial (B-2) and allows for the proposed use of Retail.
- The submitted application and site plan meets all required standards and conditions set forth in the Moore County Unified Development Ordinance.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:
Staff recommends the following conditions for approval:
1. Should the Zoning Administrator, Building Inspector, Environmental Health, Public Utilities, Fire Marshal, or NCDOT identify minor changes staff shall be authorized to accept such minor modifications to the site plan as necessary.
2. To recombine the parcels prior to submitting for zoning and building permits.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends the Moore County Watershed Review Board make the following motion:

Motion #1: Make a motion to approve the Special Non-residential Intensity Allocation (SNIA) on the parcels known as ParID 00030147 and 00015903 with the provided additional conditions.

ATTACHMENTS:
Land Use Map and Adjacent Pictures
Vicinity Map
SNIA Application
Submitted Site Plan
PICTURES OF SITE AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES

1. Proposed Retail Business Site
2. 7501 NC HWY 211 (Auto Works Business)

3. 7561 NC Hwy 211 (Etheridge Landscaping & Design)
# Special Non-Residential Intensity Application

**Application Date:**

**Location/Address of Property:** Near intersection of NC Hwy 211 and Juniper Lake Road

**Applicant:** Par 5 Development Group, LLC  
**Phone:** 910-944-0881

**Applicant Address:** 2860-B NC Hwy 5  
**City:** Aberdeen  
**St:** NC  
**Zip:** 28315

**Owner:** R. Carter Grine & Susan Scull Grine  
**Phone:** 910-235-0565

**Owner Address:** 185 Page Road  
**City:** Pinehurst  
**St:** NC  
**Zip:** 28374

**Proposed Use on the Property:** Commercial Retail

**Existing Impervious Surface (sqft):** 0  
**Proposed Impervious Surface (sqft):** 38,344 38,477

**Total Project Size (acres):** 4.17 1.92

**Comments:**

---

The following information must be submitted with all applications requesting a Special Non-Residential Intensity Allocation:

- Site Plan prepared by licensed individual showing all existing and proposed structures and distances from property lines as well as all proposed stormwater drainage designs.

I (We), the undersigned, certify that all statements furnished in this application are true to the best of my (our) knowledge, and do hereby agree to follow all reasonable requests for information as designated by the County of Moore Planning and Zoning Administrator.

---

Owner Signature  
Authorized Agent  
Date: 8/24/15

Owner Signature  
Date:  

Office Use Only:  
LRK-00030147  
Zoning District: B-2  

Received By:  
Date: 8/31/15
August 31, 2015

Moore County Planning
Attn: Theresa Thompson
PO Box 905
Carthage, NC 28327

RE: Site Plan Submittal, West End Dollar General Site, Moore County, North Carolina

Theresa:

We are submitting the construction drawings for the West End Dollar General site. Please find enclosed a copy of the construction drawings as well as the SNIA application. The site is within the WS-III BW watershed. The impervious area of the project exceeds the maximum of 24%. We are submitting a SNIA application to exceed the 24% impervious requirement. A storm water BMP measures has been designed on site in accordance with the NCDENR Stormwater BMP manual. The BMP measures satisfies the requirements of the NCDENR manual. The total impervious area for the project is 38,477 sf or 46%.

I look forward to working with you on this project. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,
4D Site Solutions, Inc.

Scott Brown, PE
sbrown@4dsitesolutions.com

Enclosure
WEST END
DOLLAR GENERAL
SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

MINERAL SPRINGS TOWNSHIP
NEAR WEST END, NORTH CAROLINA
MOORE COUNTY

INDEX OF DRAWINGS
C1.0 - EXISTING CONDITIONS
C2.0 - SITE PLAN
C3.0 - GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN
C4.0 - UTILITY PLAN
C5.0 - PROFILE
C6.0 - SITE DETAILS
C6.1 - EROSION CONTROL DETAILS
C6.2 - STORM DETAILS
C6.3 - STORM DETAILS

EXISTING UTILITY OWNER
WATER AND SEWER
MOORE COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITIES
5227 US HWY 15/501
Carthage, North Carolina 28327
910-947-6315
Contact: Randy Gould

SURVEYOR
4D SITE SOLUTIONS, INC.
409 Chicago Drive - Suite 112
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28306
910-426-6777
Contact: Jimmy Holland, PLS
email: jholland@4dsitesolutions.com

CIVIL ENGINEER
4D SITE SOLUTIONS, INC.
409 Chicago Drive - Suite 112
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28306
910-426-6777
Contact: Scott Brown, PE
email: sbrown@4dsitesolutions.com

OWNER/DEVELOPER
PAR 5 DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC
2860-B NC Highway 5
Aberdeen, North Carolina 28315
910-844-0881
Contact: Rich Smith
email: rich@par5development.com

THE CONTRACTOR MUST CONTACT NORTH CAROLINA ONE CALL CENTER AT 1-800-632-4949 A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO DIGGING IN ORDER TO HAVE THE EXISTING UTILITIES LOCATED

THE CONTRACTOR MUST CONTACT NORTH CAROLINA ONE CALL CENTER AT 1-800-632-4949 A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO DIGGING IN ORDER TO HAVE THE EXISTING UTILITIES LOCATED
THE CONTRACTOR MUST CONTACT NORTH CAROLINA ONE CALL CENTER AT 1-800-632-4949 A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO DIGGING IN ORDER TO HAVE THE EXISTING UTILITIES LOCATED.
NOTES:

1. ALL REFERENCES TO CLASS I OR II MATERIAL ARE PER ASTM D2321 "STANDARD PRACTICE FOR UNDERGROUND INSTALLATION OF THERMOPLASTIC PIPE FOR SEWERS AND OTHER GRAVITY FLOW APPLICATIONS", LATEST EDITION.

2. ALL RETENTION AND DETENTION SYSTEMS SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D2321, LATEST EDITION AND THE MANUFACTURER'S PUBLISHED INSTALLATION GUIDELINES.

3. MEASURES SHOULD BE TAKEN TO PREVENT THE MIGRATION OF NATIVE FINES INTO THE BACKFILL MATERIAL, WHEN REQUIRED. SEE ASTM D2321.

4. FILTER FABRIC: A GEOTEXTILE FABRIC MAY BE USED AS SPECIFIED BY THE ENGINEER TO PREVENT THE MIGRATION OF FINES FROM THE NATIVE SOIL INTO THE SELECT BACKFILL MATERIAL.


6. BEDDING: SUITABLE MATERIAL SHALL BE CLASS I OR II. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION FOR MATERIAL SPECIFICATION TO ENGINEER. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED BY THE ENGINEER, MINIMUM BEDDING THICKNESS SHALL BE 4" (100mm) FOR 4"-24" (100mm-600mm); 6" (150mm) FOR 30"-60" (750mm-900mm).

7. INITIAL BACKFILL: SUITABLE MATERIAL SHALL BE CLASS I OR II IN THE PIPE ZONE EXTENDING NOT LESS THAN 6" ABOVE CROWN OF PIPE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION FOR MATERIAL SPECIFICATION TO ENGINEER. MATERIAL SHALL BE INSTALLED AS REQUIRED IN ASTM D2321, LATEST EDITION.

8. MINIMUM COVER: MINIMUM COVER OVER ALL RETENTION/DETENTION SYSTEMS IN NON-TRAFFIC APPLICATIONS (GRASS OR LANDSCAPE AREAS) IS 12" FROM TOP OF PIPE TO GROUND SURFACE. ADDITIONAL COVER MAY BE REQUIRED TO PREVENT FLOATATION. FOR TRAFFIC APPLICATIONS, MINIMUM COVER IS 12" UP TO 36" DIAMETER PIPE AND 24" OF COVER FOR 42" - 60" DIAMETER PIPE, MEASURED FROM TOP OF PIPE TO BOTTOM OF FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT OR TO TOP OF RIGID PAVEMENT.
MEMORANDUM TO THE PLANNING BOARD

FROM: Debra Ensminger
Planning & Transportation Services Director

DATE: September 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit Request: Veterinary Clinic

PRESENTER: Theresa Thompson

REQUEST
The applicant, David Garza, is seeking a two year vested Conditional Use Permit approval to operate a veterinary clinic in an existing building located at 125 West Plaza Drive, West End in Seven Lakes West on a parcel (ParID 97000323) owned by Phillip and Pamela Harrell as identified in the Moore County tax records. The parcel is approximately 1.2 acres. This case was properly advertised and all adjacent property owners were notified.

EXISTING ZONING AND SURROUNDING LAND USE
The property is zoned Village Business (VB). All adjacent properties are zoned Village Business (VB). The property is currently being used as a real estate business. The adjacent land uses are all include a shopping center comprising of a church, retail, medical, and a restaurant.

BACKGROUND
The existing building on site was built in 1999. Per the applicant, the building will not be expanding and the veterinary clinic will not include outdoor kennels. The applicant intends to lease a portion of the building as indicated on the attachment “Phase I” for one year. After one year the applicant intends to purchase the property and occupy the entire building as indicated in the attachment “Phase II.” Therefore, the applicant is requesting a two year vested rights approval to occupy the entire building.

WATER AND SEWER
- The property will be tapped onto County Water.
- The existing septic system will be enlarged to adequately service the site.
- Per the Fire Marshal, installation of a fire hydrant is not required.

OVERLAY DISTRICTS
- Watershed – The property is located in WS-II-BW Drowning Creek Watershed. The building is existing. No additional impervious surface is being requested.

TRANSPORTATION
- Per NCDOT, a driveway permit is not required.
UDO REQUIREMENTS MET
- The submitted application and site plan meets all required standards and conditions set forth in the Moore County Unified Development Ordinance.

REQUIRED FINDINGS
In recommending the Conditional Use Permit the following findings must be met:

1. The use will not materially endanger the public health or safety if located where proposed and developed according to plan;
2. The use meets all required conditions and specifications;
3. The use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property unless the use is a public necessity;
4. The location and character of the use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and will be in general conformity with the approved Moore County Land Use Plan. In this instance, the proposed use is reflected in the goals of the Moore County Land Use Plan adopted in November 2013. Specifically, Goal 3: Optimize the Uses of Land Within the County of Moore; under Goal 3, Action 3.4.4 states, “Plan for the development of alternative energy systems that minimize the adverse impacts to prime agricultural lands and public water supply watersheds.”

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS
Staff recommends the following conditions for approval:
1. Should the Zoning Administrator, Building Inspector, Environmental Health, Public Utilities, or the Fire Marshal identify minor changes staff shall be authorized to accept such minor modifications to site plan as necessary.
2. The veterinary clinic shall not include outdoor kennels.
3. The applicant shall have two (2) years to occupy the entire building through vested rights approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends the Moore County Planning Board make the following motion:

Motion: Make a motion to endorse the Moore County Board of Commissioners to approve/deny a two (2) year vesting of a Conditional Use Permit for the use of a veterinary clinic on the parcel known as ParID# 97000323.

ATTACHMENTS
Land Use Map and Adjacent Pictures
Vicinity Map
Conditional Use Permit Application
Submitted Site Plan
Phase I Floor Plan
Phase II Floor Plan
PICTURES OF SITE AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES

1. Proposed Veterinary Clinic (Building in the Middle)
2. 102 Lakeway Drive (Vacant Business)
3. 145 West Plaza Drive (Shopping Center)
Vicinity Map
Owner: Phillip & Pamela Harrell
Applicant: David Garza
Conditional Use Permit Request
ParID 97000323
**Conditional Use Permit Application**

**Application Date:** 8/17/15  
**Location/Address of Property:** 125 West Plaza Drive, West End, NC 27376  
**Applicant:** A. David Garza, DVM  
**Applicant Address:** 800 Pleasantville Ln  
**City:** West End  
**St:** NC  
**Zip:** 27376  
**Phone:** 910-975-9485  
**Owner:** Phillip Harrell  
**Owner Address:** 3207 Seven Lakes West  
**City:** West End  
**St:** NC  
**Zip:** 27376  
**Phone:** 910-673-1724  
**Current Zoning District:** 2.0 Commercial Lot 2, V.8  
**Proposed Use:** Veterinary Hospital  
**Comments:** No Boarding

**Application Submittal**

The applicant must submit a complete application packet on or before the submittal deadline. This includes:

- Completed Moore County Conditional Use Permit Application.
- Application Fee ($175).
- Postage sufficient to notify all adjacent landowners FOR TWO MAILINGS. (One for Planning Board meeting, and one for Board of Commissioners meeting.) The rate for postage FOR EACH CERTIFIED MAIL LETTER is $6.49. This includes $3.30 (certified mail) plus $2.70 (return receipt) plus $0.49 (first class stamp).
- A detailed site plan. (See page two of this packet for list of items to include.)

I (We), the undersigned, certify that all statements furnished in this application are true to the best of my (our) knowledge, and do hereby agree to follow all reasonable requests for information as designated by the County of Moore Zoning Administrator.

Applicant/Owner Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 8/25/15  
Applicant/Owner Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 8/25/15

**Office Use Only:**

**PAR ID:** 97000323  
**Received By:** R. W. Thompson  
**Date:** 8/31/15
Planning and Community Development
1048 Carriage Oaks Dr.
Carthage, NC 28327

Planning and Zoning Board,

In regards to the Conditional Use Permit Application, we would like to include some background information and our future plans for this location. We will be using this location 125 West Plaza Drive in West End as a veterinary hospital. I have been a veterinarian for almost 30 years (graduated from vet school in 1986). I owned a very busy, progressive practice in Austin, TX for many years. My wife (who is the practice manager) and I sold our practice in 2009. We traveled for a few years with our two children and settled in the Seven Lakes/West End area in April of 2013. We began a mobile veterinary practice in the area and I have also done some relief work in the area. With that being said, I have built a good practice with exceptional clientele. While we have been providing mobile services to our clients, we have found that there is a need and desire for a full service veterinary hospital in the area. Our goal and mission will be to provide the highest level of care with the latest technology available in a friendly, caring and compassionate environment. We believe that this location will allow us to achieve our goals and we look forward to being a staple in the Seven Lakes, West End and surrounding communities.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Dave Garza, DVM
PineHills Veterinary Services
910-975-2405
MEMORANDUM TO THE PLANNING BOARD

FROM: Debra Ensminger
Planning & Transportation Services Director

DATE: September 16, 2015

SUBJECT: UDO Text Amendment Review

PRESENTER: Theresa Thompson

Staff is pursuing amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance at the discretion of the Moore County Planning Board and Board of Commissioners. The following chapters are included for review:

Article 2. Review Bodies and Officials
Article 8. Parking, Driveways, and Loading
Article 9. Zoning & Sign Permits

Amending Sign Regulations
As part of the recent decision in the Reed vs. Town of Gilbert case, the U.S. Supreme Court case found that sign ordinances cannot apply differing standards based on content of noncommercial signs. For example, a community cannot create special allowances for political or religious signs without also allowing the same privileges to other types of noncommercial speech.

The County’s current sign standards contain several elements that are inconsistent with the Supreme Court’s recent decision. Therefore, staff has drafted content-neutral standards for noncommercial signs including religious, political, ideological, special events, and yard sale signs as outlined in Article 9 Section 9.8 (J).

Signs Regulations - Additional Attachments
- UNC School of Government Blog
  – Sign Litigation: A Brief Analysis of Reed v. Town of Gilbert
- NCGS 136.32 Regulation of Signs (Political Signs)
ARTICLE 1
GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1  Title
This UDO shall be known and may be cited as the “Moore County Unified Development Ordinance”, and may be referred to as “this UDO,” “this Ordinance,” and the like.

1.2  Authority
The provisions of this Ordinance are adopted under authority of the General Statutes of North Carolina, with particular reference to Chapter 153A.

1.3  Purpose
This ordinance seeks to promote orderly development relative to a comprehensive plan of land use and population density. The same seeks to promote public health, safety, morals, and general welfare; protect development from natural hazards; protect the integrity of watersheds within the county; and in so doing, regulate the location and use of structures and land, not inconsistent with prevailing State General Statutes.

1.4  Jurisdiction
Except as otherwise expressly stated, this Ordinance applies to the unincorporated area of Moore County, to the extent of the law. This Ordinance shall in no way regulate bona-fide farms. (Add “exemption” category to Table of Uses and add language to Specific Use Standards)

1.5  Severability
If for any reason one or more sections or provisions of this Ordinance are held invalid, such judgement shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remaining provisions of the Ordinance.

1.7  Delegation of Authority
The Director, or his/her designees, is appointed to serve as the “Administrator” of this UDO.

1.8  Conflict
It is not intended by this Ordinance to interfere with, abrogate, or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties; provided, however, that where this Ordinance imposes a greater restriction, in any way, the provisions of this Ordinance shall govern. Moore County does not enforce private agreements. Wherever, the provisions of this Ordinance conflict with the provisions contained in any other local, State, or Federal regulation, the more restrictive provisions shall govern.
1.9 Compliance Required

The regulations set forth in this UDO shall affect all land, every structure, and every use of land or structure. No structure or land shall hereafter be used or occupied, and no structure or part thereof shall be erected, moved onto, or structurally altered, except in compliance with the regulations of this UDO, and other applicable regulations of local, State, or Federal governments.

The issuance of a zoning permit is not required for any proposed accessory structure twelve (12) feet or less in any direction, or if a building permit is not required, though any change of use requires zoning approval. Any development within floodplains, wetlands, or watersheds shall require approval. (Add “exemption” category to Table of Uses and add language to Specific Use Standards)

1.10 Street Access

No building shall be erected on a lot which does not have access to a street.
ARTICLE 2
REVIEW BODIES AND ADMINISTRATOR

2.1 Board of Commissioners

A. Powers and Duties. The Board of Commissioners shall have decision-making authority on the following requests:

1. Amendments to the UDO text and the Zoning Map;
2. Conditional Use Permits;
3. Conditional Zonings;
4. Conditional Use Districts;
5. Vested Rights;
6. ETJ Expansions; and
7. Amendments to the comprehensive land use plans for Moore County.

B. Quasi-Judicial Appeal to Courts. Quasi-judicial decisions made by the Board of County Commissioners shall be subject to review at the request of any person who has standing as detailed within NCGS 160A-393 by the Superior Court by proceedings in the nature of certiorari. The appeal to the Superior Court must be filed within thirty (30) days of the filing of the decision of the Board of Commissioners by the Administrator or the delivery of the notice of the decision to the applicant, whichever is later.

C. Legislative Appeals to Courts. Legislative decisions made by the Board of County Commissioners pursuant to the Ordinance shall be subject to review at the request of any aggrieved party by the Superior Court. The appeal to the Superior Court must be filed from the date of adoption of said Ordinance within the prescribed period below:

1. 60 days in cases involving the appeal of a Zoning Map amendment;
2. One (1) year (365 days) in cases involving the appeal of a UDO text amendment;
3. Three (3) years (1,035 days) in cases involving an appeal based on an alleged defect in the adoption process of an Ordinance amending the UDO.

2.2 Planning Board

A. Powers and Duties. The Planning Board shall have all the powers and authority pursuant to NCGS 153A-321 and shall perform any related duties as directed by the Board of Commissioners. The Planning Board shall make recommendations of the following requests:
1. Amendments to the UDO text and the Zoning Map;
2. Conditional Use Permits;
3. Conditional Zonings;
4. Conditional Use Districts;
5. Amendments to the comprehensive land use plans for Moore County.

The Planning Board shall act as the Watershed Review Board and have decision-making authority of the following requests:

1. Special Non-Residential Intensity Allocations (SNIA); and
2. Watershed Density Averaging Certificate;
3. Public Health and/or Water Quality Abatement; and
4. Watershed Variances;

B. Rules of Procedure. Rules, Membership, Composition, and Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the by-laws and/or rules of procedures adopted by the Board of Commissioners.

2.3 Subdivision Review Board

A. Powers and Duties. The Subdivision Review Board shall have all the powers and authority pursuant to NCGS 153A-321 and 153A-322 and shall perform any related duties as directed by the Board of Commissioners. The Subdivision Review Board shall have decision-making authority on the following requests:

1. Minor Level 1 Flag Lot Subdivision Plats;
2. Minor Level 2 Subdivision Plats;
3. Major Preliminary Subdivision Plats; and
4. Subdivision Regulation Waivers

B. Rules of Procedure. Rules, Membership, Composition, and Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the by-laws and/or rules of procedures adopted by the Board of Commissioners.

2.4 Board of Adjustments

A. Powers and Duties. The Board of Adjustments shall have all the powers and authority pursuant to NCGS 160A-388 and/or NCGS 153A-345.1 and shall perform related duties as directed by the Board of Commissioners. The Board of Adjustments shall have decision-making authority on the following requests:

1. Variances;
2. Floodplain Variances; and
3. Administrative appeals

B. Rules of Procedure. Rules, Membership, Composition, and Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the by-laws and/or rules of procedures adopted by the Board of Commissioners.

C. Quasi-Judicial Decisions. Each quasi-judicial decision shall be reduced to writing and reflect the board’s determination of contested facts and their application to the applicable standards. The written decision shall be signed by the chair or other duly authorized member of the board. Notifications of any Board of Adjustment’s decisions shall be carried out per NCGS 160A-388. The Administrator shall notify the applicant, the property owner, or any individual who has submitted a written request for a copy prior to the date the decision becomes effective. This notice shall be made by registered or certified mail within five (5) working days of the Board’s actions.

D. Appeal to Courts. Quasi-judicial decisions made by the Board of Adjustments shall be subject to review at the request of any person who has standing as detailed within NCGS 160A-393 by the Superior Court by proceedings in the nature of certiorari. The appeal to the Superior Court must be filed within thirty (30) days of the filing of the decision of the Board of Adjustment by the Administrator or the delivery of the notice of the decision to the applicant, whichever is later.

2.5 Administrator

A. Powers and Duties. Except as otherwise specifically provided, the Planning Director, and his/her designees, are appointed to serve as the “Administrator” of this UDO. The term “staff” or “Planning Staff” may be used interchangeably with the term “Administrator.” The Administrator shall have the following powers and duties:

1. Administration and enforcement of the provisions of this UDO;
2. Zoning Permit Approvals;
3. Sign Permit Approvals;
4. Floodplain Development Permit Approvals;
5. Level 1 Minor Subdivision Plat Approvals;
6. Level 1 Minor Family Subdivision Plat Approval;
7. Exemption Plat Approvals;
8. Water Supply Watershed Approvals;
9. Communication Tower Regulations Approvals; and
10. Administrative Variance Approvals;
ARTICLE 8
PARKING & DRIVEWAYS

8.1 Applicability
Before a zoning permit is issued for the construction, reconstructions, expansion in footprint or capacity, or change in use of any building or land, for purposes other than a single or two-family family residence, all parking, loading, and driveways shall be reviewed and approved by the Administrator.

8.2 Minimum Parking Spaces Required
The number of off-street spaces required by this Ordinance shall be provided on the same lot with the principal use except as provided in Section 8.3 and the required number of off-street parking spaces specified for each use shall be considered as the absolute minimum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Parking Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto service / repair shop</td>
<td>5 spaces per service bay, plus 1 space per wrecker or service vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Training Facility</td>
<td>3 spaces for every 4 employees on largest shift, plus 1 space for each individual bedroom on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly such as auditoriums, churches, community centers, lodges, stadiums, theatres</td>
<td>1 space for each 4 seats in the assembly room(s), plus 1 space per employee, or 1 space for each 4 persons at full occupancy, whichever is greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>1 space for each 200 square feet of gross floor space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty and Barber Shops</td>
<td>2 spaces per operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp or Care Center</td>
<td>1 space for each employee and one space for each beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics</td>
<td>5 spaces for each doctor plus 1 parking space for each employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Facilities and Preschools</td>
<td>1 space for each employee plus 1 parking space for every 5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Multi-Family</td>
<td>2 spaces per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Single Family</td>
<td>1 space per dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>4 spaces for each tee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, bed &amp; breakfast, and similar uses</td>
<td>1 space per unit, plus 1 spaces per employee on a normal shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Uses</td>
<td>1 space per 3 employees on the largest shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing, Retirement and Convalescent Homes</td>
<td>1 space per 5 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>1 parking space for each 200 square feet of net rentable area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; Amusement Facilities (no spectators)</td>
<td>1 space for every 2 participants at full capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Combination of Parking Spaces

The required parking space for any number of separate uses may be combined in one (1) lot, but the required space assigned to the one (1) use may not be assigned to another use except one-half of the required parking spaces for places of assembly halls whose peak attendance is at night or weekends may be assigned to a use which will be closed at night or weekends.

8.4 Parking Lot Requirements

Where parking lots, other than for single and two-family residential, for more than five (5) cars are permitted or required, the following provisions shall be provided:

1. A strip of land five (5) ten (10) feet wide adjoining any right-of-way line or any lot zoned for residential uses shall be reserved as open space, guarded with curbing or wheel guards and planted in grass and/or shrubs or trees.
2. Install screening as described in Section 7.2 (Screening Types), along side or rear property lines adjacent to property used or zoned for residential uses.
3. Only one (1) entrance and one (1) exit sign no larger than two (2) square feet prescribing parking regulations may be erected at each entrance or exit.
4. The use of streets, sidewalks, alleys or other public rights-of-way for parking or maneuvering to and from off-street parking spaces is prohibited.
5. Be so designed that ingress and egress is by forward motion.
6. Any lighting of parking areas shall be shielded so as to cast no light upon adjacent properties and streets.
7. All parking spaces shall have minimum dimensions of nine (9) feet in width and eighteen (18) feet in length.

8. All access or backup aisles shall conform to the following minimum dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Angle</th>
<th>One-Way Traffic</th>
<th>Two Way Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 degrees</td>
<td>12 feet</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 degrees</td>
<td>12 feet</td>
<td>22 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 degrees</td>
<td>14 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 degrees</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 degrees</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Each off-street loading space shall have minimum dimensions of fifteen (15) feet in width and thirty (30) forty (40) feet in length.

10. Off-street loading spaces and circulation area shall be of sufficient width to allow for proper backing and/or turning movements without blocking the normal movement of other vehicles.

11. Minimum off-street loading space shall conform based on type of use:
   a. Retail Business: 1 space for each 20,000 square feet of gross floor area or fraction thereof
   b. Wholesale and Industries: 1 space for each 20,000 square feet of gross floor area or fraction thereof
   c. Office and Institutions: 1 space for each 50,000 square feet of gross floor area or fraction thereof

8.3.12 Vehicle Storage in Residential Districts (REMOVE FROM UDO)

8.3.1201 No inoperative or unlicensed vehicles shall be permitted to be parked or stored longer than (14) fourteen days (except in the RA and RE zoning districts).

8.3.1202 In the RA and RE Districts, storage of inoperative or unlicensed vehicles shall be permitted in the rear yard only.

8.3.13 Mobile Home and Trailer Parking and Storing (Move to Screening Chapter)

It shall be unlawful to park or otherwise store for any purpose whatsoever any mobile home or trailer within any zone district except as follows:

8.3.1301 At a safe, lawful, and non-obstructive location on a street, alley highway, or other public place, providing that the trailer or mobile home shall not be parked for more than 24 hours;

8.3.1302 Within a mobile home park, provided, however, the mobile home shall either have a North Carolina or HUD Label of Compliance permanently attached thereto.
8.3.1303 On any other lot or plot provided that trailers, as defined in Article 18, shall be stored in a garage or carport or in the rear or side yard.

8.5 Driveway Standards

A. **NCDOT Driveway approval.** The North Carolina Department of Transportation is the approval authority where driveways affect access to State Highways. All access work done on state right-of-way shall be approved by the DOT before a zoning permit is issued.

B. **One or Two Lane Driveways.** The width of any driveway intersection with the public or private street shall not exceed thirty (30) feet at its intersection with curb and street line.

C. **Four Lane Driveways.** Driveways that have double lane ingress and egress (4-lanes) shall be a minimum sixty (60) feet width at intersection with curb and street line.

D. **Distance from Intersections.** No driveway shall be located closer than twenty-five (25) feet to any street intersection. No driveway (nearest edge) shall be located within twenty-five (25) feet of an intersection on a secondary road and forty (40) feet on a primary road except in the case where no other lot access to a street is available.

E. **Multiple Driveways.** Two (2) or more driveways entering the same street from a single lot shall be permitted only if the minimum distance between the closest edges of the driveways equals or exceeds thirty (30) feet or as otherwise approved by the DOT.

F. **Connectivity.** Businesses adjacent to, or integrated in, a shopping center or cluster of commercial facilities shall use the common access with other business establishments in the center.
ARTICLE 9
ZONING & SIGN PERMITS

9.1  Zoning Permit Applicability
No land shall be used or occupied and no building shall be structurally altered, erected, moved, used, or its use changes, until a zoning permit is issued by the Administrator.

9.2  Application
A.  Pre-Application Meeting. To minimize development planning costs, avoid misunderstanding or interpretations, and ensure compliance with the requirements of this Ordinance, a pre-application meeting between the developer and planning staff is encouraged. The developer is also encouraged to submit a sketch plan.

B.  Agency Review. Prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, the Administrator shall consult with other applicable departments, as necessary, including but not limited to:
   1. North Carolina Department of Environmental & Natural Resources
   2. Corp of Engineers
   3. North Carolina Department of Transportation
   4. Moore County Environmental Health
   5. Moore County Public Utilities
   6. Moore County Building Inspections
   7. Moore County Fire Marshal
   8. Moore County 911 Addressing

C.  Site Plan Requirements. Each application for a Zoning Permit and any other permit as indicated in this ordinance shall be accompanied by a site plan drawn to scale including the following information, as applicable:
   1. Dimension of property (front, side, and rear property lines)
   2. Dimensions and locations of any existing or proposed buildings and structures
   3. Non-residential floor plans
   4. Setbacks
   5. Existing and proposed uses of building(s) and/or land
   6. Dimensions and locations of driveways
   7. Location and dimensions of parking lots spaces
8. Loading and unloading area  
9. Existing and proposed utilities  
10. Existing and proposed right of ways and easements  
11. Non-residential screening plan  
12. Floodplain and wetland areas  
13. Significant natural features including lakes, streams, marshes, etc.  
14. Existing and proposed impervious surface percentages  
15. Location of any stormwater control devices including the name of the certifying engineer  
16. Phasing plans  
17. Any other information which the Administrator deems necessary as required per local, state, or federal law.

9.3 **Action by the Administrator**

If the proposed application is in conformity with the provisions of this UDO, and if all applicable permits have been approved by the Moore County Environmental Health Department, the Administrator shall issue a zoning permit, provided that all of the following conditions shall apply:

1. Issuance of a zoning permit shall in no case be construed as waiving any provisions of this UDO;  
2. The zoning permit shall include a determination that plans, specifications and the intended use of such structure and land do, in all respects, conform to the provisions of this UDO.

9.4 **Denial**

If the proposed application is not in conformity with the provisions of this Ordinance, the Administrator shall not issue the zoning or sign permit and shall provide in writing the cause of such disapproval to the applicant.

9.5 **Expiration** *(Vested Right Provisions are provided in Article 14)*

Once a zoning or sign permit has been issued, all activities pursuant to such permit shall be commenced within six (6) months. If the proposed moving, constructing, altering, repairing, or use of land, as set forth in an application for a zoning or sign permit, is discontinued for a period of one (1) year or more, the permit shall lapse and be of no further force and effect.

9.6 **Appeal**

Final action on a zoning or sign permit may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 13.1 (Administrative Appeals) of this Ordinance.
9.7 **Sign Permit Applicability**

Except as provided otherwise in this chapter, no sign shall be erected, located, relocated, enlarge, replaced, or altered until a sign permit, and building permit if applicable, has been secured in accordance with this article. Cleaning, electrical repair, resurfacing of a sign face, and other maintenance of a sign shall not require a permit.

9.8 **Signs Exempt From Permit Requirements**

A. **Building Identification & Marker Signs.** Signs bearing only building identification numbers and names or other identification of premises not of a commercial nature.

B. **Governmental Signs.** Local notices and warnings, regulatory, informational, or directional signs erected by any public agency or utility.

C. **Flags, Etc.** Flags or insignia of any nation, organization of nations, state, county or municipality, any religious, civic or fraternal organization, or any educational or cultural facility per lot provided the height of any pole shall not exceed the maximum building height for the district. Refer also to the United States Flag Code for usage of the United States Flag.

D. **Holiday Decorations In Season.** Temporary decorations or displays commonly associated with any national, local or religious holiday/celebration.

E. **Vending Machine/Automatic Teller and Gasoline Pump Signs.** Signs attached to and made an integral part of a vending machine, automatic teller machine or gasoline pump if advertising or giving information about the products or services dispensed or vended by that machine.

F. **Gas Pump Island Signs.** Portable signs associated with gasoline stations, specifically those denoting gasoline prices, gas types and other petroleum related signage. Such signs must be located at the pump island.

G. **Gas Station Price Signs.** Price signs at gas stations or other establishments engaged in the retail sale of gasoline. One (1) such sign is permitted for each frontage on a public street, provided it does not exceed nine (9) square feet in area. Any such sign shall be affixed to a permitted freestanding identification sign, to a canopy support in the vicinity of the gasoline pumps, or flat-mounted against the wall of a building.

H. **Directional Signs On Private Property.** Signs directing and guiding traffic and parking on private property, bear no advertising matter, and do not exceed four (4) square feet in area per display surface.

I. **Employee Vehicles.** Signs painted on or permanently attached to a currently licensed motor vehicle that is not primarily used as a sign.

J. **Temporary Special Event / Yard Sales / Religious / Ideological / Political Signs.**

1. Such signs may not exceed sixteen (16) square feet in area and four (4) feet in height, if freestanding on nonresidential zoned properties.
2. Such signs may not exceed four (4) square feet in area and four (4) feet in height on residential zoned properties.

3. Shall not be erected on public property. Such signs are permitted on private property with the permission of the property owner or occupant.

4. Shall not be illuminated.

5. Maximum number of one (1) sign per street frontage.

6. Shall not be located in the right-of-way and shall not be attached to or painted on utility poles, trees, bridges, refuse containers, or other objects not intended to support a sign.

7. Such signs must be removed within thirty (30) days of erection.

8. Political signs shall not be located within a public street right-of-way, except within NCDOT right-of-way according to the standards of NCGS 136-32.

9.9 Prohibited Signs

A. **Signs on Roadside Appurtenances.** Signs attached to or painted on utility poles, trees, bridges, refuse containers, or other objects not intended to support a sign.

B. **Signs Resembling Traffic Signals.** Signs which by color, location, or nature may be confused with official highway signs, warning signs, traffic signals or other regulatory devices are prohibited. Any sign that uses the word "STOP", "SLOW", "CAUTION", "DANGER", or any other word which is likely to be confused with traffic directional and regulatory signs is prohibited.

C. **Signs Resembling Official Signs.** Any sign that imitates an official governmental sign, or violates the Law of the State relating to outdoor advertising, is prohibited.

D. **Flashing Signs.** Signs displaying blinking, flashing, or intermittent lights, animation, and moving parts or sign giving the illusion of movement are prohibited, except signs giving only the time, temperate, and date. Electronic changeable message signs are permitted if operated in accordance with Section 9.15.

E. **Traffic Hazards.** Signs shall not include reflective material, flames, or lighting directed to a roadway or that interferes with vision of drivers. Signs shall not be located within sight triangles or within a public or private right-of-way.

F. **Banners.** Banners, posters, pennants, ribbons, streamers, strings of light bulbs, spinners, or other similar devices, except as approved for grand openings and promotions.
9.10 Computation of Sign Area

A. The area of a sign with three (3) or more sides shall be computed as the sum of the area of each side designed either to attract attention or communicate information. The area of any other sign is measured by finding the area of the minimum imaginary rectangle or square which fully encloses all sign words, copy, or message.

B. Frames or structural members not bearing informational or representational matter shall not be included in computation of the area of a sign face. Computations of sign area shall include only one (1) side of a double-faced sign structure. If a sign has two (2) sides joined at an angle greater than (sixty) 60 degrees, the surface of both sides shall be included in the computation of area.

9.11 Computation of Height

A. Attached Signs. The sign height for attached signs shall be computed as the distance from the finished grade at the base of the building to which the sign is attached to the top of the highest component of the sign.

B. Ground (Freestanding) Signs. As illustrated below, the sign height for ground signs shall be computed as the lesser of:

1. The distance from the base of the sign at the finished grade to the top of the highest component of the sign; or

2. The distance from the nearest adjacent street grade to which the sign is oriented, and on which the lot has frontage, to the top of the highest component of the sign.
9.12 Obsolete or Deteriorated Signs

A. Obsolete Signs. Signs which identify businesses no longer in existence shall be removed by the owner of the premises within thirty (30) days of becoming an obsolete sign. Signs designed for changeable sign faces may be covered instead of removed.

B. Deteriorated Signs. Any sign which, together with its supports, braces, anchors, and other structural elements, is not maintained in accordance with the provisions of the International Building Code, or which is otherwise determined to be unsound or unsafe, shall be removed or brought into compliance with all codes and ordinances within thirty (30) days of notification by the Administrator. Failure to remedy the situation voluntarily within thirty (30) days, unless an extension is given, will result in a violation of this Ordinance and subject to enforcement and penalties.

9.13 Billboards

A. No billboard shall exceed two hundred fifty (250) square feet in gross area or thirty (30) feet in height above ground level or street level, whichever is lower.

B. A billboard may have two (2) display sides, including an acute “V” shaped sign of forty-five (45) degrees or less.

C. No billboard shall be erected closer than two hundred (200) feet from any property used or zoned for residential purposes and no billboard shall project closer than thirty (30) feet to any building on the same premise / lot, to any property line, or to any street right-of-way.

D. No billboards shall be located within one thousand (1,000) feet along the same street frontage of another billboard as measured from the poles.

9.14 Off Premise Advertising Signs (excluding billboards)

Off-premise advertising signs (excluding billboards) are permitted in the RA, B-1, B-2, RE, RA-5, RA-2, and RA-40 Zoning Districts subject to the following:

A. For premise / lots of five (5) acres or more in size and having a street frontage greater than four hundred (400) feet, a second sign may be erected if the total display area of both signs does not exceed thirty-two (32) square feet (second sign shall also not exceed six (6) feet in height).

B. An off-premise advertising sign displaying multiple businesses may be used as the allowed sign(s) per premise, as long as the sign does not exceed fifteen (15) feet in height, fifty (50) square feet in total display area.

C. Off-premise advertising signs, not including billboards, shall not advertise a business, institution, or industry (including home occupations) on a premise farther than four (4) miles measured in a straight line distance from the sign to the closest parcel boundary on which the business, institution or industry is located.
D. A business, institution, or industry shall not erect more than three (3) off-premise advertising signs anywhere within the County’s planning jurisdiction.

E. No residential development, business, institution, or industry with frontage on any of the following roadways: US Highway 1, US Highway 15-501, NC Highway 2, NC Highway 5, NC Highway 22, NC Highway 24/27, NC Highway 211, NC Highway 690, or NC Highway 705 is eligible to use this type of signage.

F. Signs must be placed on a legal lot of record and the applicant shall provide a notarized statement from all owners of property allowing the off-premise advertising sign to be erected on their property.

G. Verification from the North Carolina Department of Transportation that the sign will not be in violation of any State regulations at its proposed location must be submitted with the sign permit application.

9.15 Electronic Changeable Message Signs

A. Electronic changeable message signs shall only be permitted in the Village Business (VB), Neighborhood Business District (B-1), and Highway Commercial (B-2) zoning districts.

B. Electronic changeable message signs shall only be permitted to advertise a business or service offered on the premise where the sign is located.

C. Electronic changeable message signs shall not include animated or scrolling images, graphics, video active images (similar to television images), projected images or messages onto buildings or other objects.

D. Electronic changeable message signs shall not have any moving, rotating, fluttering, blinking, or flashing elements. Animation, video, audio, pyrotechnics, or proximity marketing components are prohibited.

E. Advertising messages or information shall remain in a fixed, static position for a minimum of thirty (30) seconds. The change sequence must be accomplished within an interval of two (2) seconds or less.

F. Electronic changeable message signs shall be setback a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from any property used or zoned for residential purposes.

G. Electronic changeable message signs shall have an automatic dimmer (factory set to the illumination intensities set below) and a photo cell sensor to adjust illumination intensity or brilliance of the sign so that is shall not cause glare or impair the vision of motorists, and shall not interfere with any driver’s operation of a motor vehicle. The sign shall not exceed a maximum illumination of 7,500 nits (candela per square meter) during daylight hours and a maximum of 500 nits between dusk and dawn as measured from the sign’s face at maximum brightness.
H. Electronic changeable message signs shall contain a default design that will freeze the sign in one position with no more than a maximum illumination of 500 nits if a malfunction occurs.

I. An electrical engineer’s seal is required on all sign shop drawings to ensure all applicable settings required herein are met.

### 9.16 Dimensional Requirements for Signs

All signs located within the Moore County planning jurisdiction must meet the dimensional requirements shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Type</th>
<th>Maximum Number</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Maximum Height (ft)</th>
<th>Minimum Setback from Property Lines and ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>1 per site</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable</td>
<td>1 per site</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>4 signs per building wall</td>
<td>Cannot exceed 20% of wall surface area facing street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>1 sign per business establishment</td>
<td>50% of the awning area</td>
<td>Minimum 7.5 feet between ground level and the bottom of the sign</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window / Door</td>
<td>25% of the gross glass area on any 1 side of the building</td>
<td>25% of the gross glass area on any 1 side of the building</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Any Type</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Tenant / Shopping Centers / Industrial Parks / Business Parks</td>
<td>1 sign per tenant space</td>
<td>20% of wall surface area facing street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Type</td>
<td>Maximum Number</td>
<td>Maximum Sign Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>Max. Height (ft)</td>
<td>Minimum Setback from Property Lines and Street Rights-of-Way (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Changeable Advertising Message</td>
<td>Freestanding or Wall</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>Up to 50% of total allowable sign area, or 25 square feet whichever is less.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Premises Advertising</td>
<td>Single Use Displayed</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Uses Displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1 per street frontage or 2 for lots with frontage greater than 400 feet</td>
<td>Residually Zoned Properties (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>Nonresidential Zoned /Approved Planned Development (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Commercial</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>Single Family (6)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Opening (maximum 30 days)</td>
<td>Unlimited wall / 1 freestanding per street frontage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotional (maximum 30 days per year)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Non-Commercial</td>
<td>Special Events, Yard Sales, Religious, Ideological, Political</td>
<td>1 per street frontage</td>
<td>Residential zoned (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonresidential zoned (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Temporary yard signs are springing up all around town. Town council wants to reduce the clutter, but also wants to respect the free speech rights of the community. Council is considering new rules that will allow campaign signs during election season, event signs within a day of the event, and ideological signs anytime. It seems like a reasonable balance—allowing the signs but limiting them to a relevant time-frame. Can the town’s regulations distinguish among signs this way?

A recent U.S. Supreme Court decision says no. Such distinctions are unconstitutional content-based regulation of speech.

To be clear, every sign ordinance distinguishes among signs. Ordinances commonly distinguish between locations (commercial property, residential property, public property, etc.), between types of signs (free-standing, wall signs, electronic signs, etc.), and between messages on the signs (commercial, safety, political, etc.). Reasonable distinctions concerning location and types of signs remain permissible.

The Reed decision, though, clearly invalidated some distinctions based on the message content of signs, and it will require adjustments to many local ordinances and some state statutes. The decision, with its four separate concurring opinions, also left open several legal questions.

This blog considers the decision of Reed v. Town of Gilbert, 576 U.S. ___ (2015), and its impact on local sign ordinances.

Context of Free Speech Caselaw

In thinking about the Reed decision it is helpful to recall a few key points about Constitutional protections of free speech and local government sign regulation. This area of the law is complex—far beyond the scope and space of this blog—but some context is helpful in understanding the impact of the new decision.

Content-Neutral Sign Regulations. Some sign regulations concern the form and nature of the sign, not the content of the message. These regulations—called reasonable time, place, or manner restrictions—include regulation of sign size, number, materials, lighting, moving parts, and portability, among other things. These regulations are allowed, provided they are “[1] justified without reference to the content of the regulated speech, [2] that they are narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest, and [3] that they leave open ample alternative channels for communication of the information” (Ward v. Rock Against Racism, 491 U.S. 781, 791, 109 S. Ct. 2746, 2753, 105 L. Ed. 2d 661 (1989)). Over the years the courts have allowed a variety of content-neutral sign regulations.

Content-Based Sign Regulations. Some sign regulations, however, restrict the content of the message. The Supreme Court requires that content-based regulation of noncommercial signs must meet strict scrutiny. As phrased in the Reed majority opinion, a regulation is content-based if the rule “applies to a particular [sign] because of the topics discussed or the idea or message expressed” (slip op., at 6). The strict scrutiny standard demands that the local government must show that the regulation is (i) designed to serve a compelling governmental interest and (ii) narrowly tailored to achieve that interest. That is a steep hill to climb, and in practice few, if any, regulations survive strict scrutiny review.

It is worth noting that commercial speech is subject to yet another test—a version of intermediate scrutiny outlined in Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission of New York, 447 U.S. 557 (1987). That test is described in David Owens’ blog on Offensive Signs, and as discussed below, the impact of the Reed decision on the Central Hudson
test is unclear.

**Case Summary**

The Town of Gilbert, Arizona, had a sign code requiring permits for signs, but outlining a variety of exemptions. The *Reed* decision focused on the exemptions for three types of signs: Political Signs, Temporary Directional Signs, and Ideological Signs. Under the local code, Political Signs were signs designed to influence the outcome of an election; they could be up to 32 square feet and displayed during political season. Temporary Directional Signs were defined to include signs that direct the public to a church or other qualifying event; they could be up to six square feet and could be displayed 12 hours before and 1 hour after the qualifying event. Ideological signs were defined to be signs that communicate a noncommercial message that didn’t fit into some other category; they could be up to 20 square feet.

A local church—after being cited for violation of the rules for Temporary Directional Signs—challenged the sign code as abridging their freedom of speech. The Town argued (and the lower courts found) that its regulations were content-neutral. The distinctions among types of signs, they said, were based on objective factors not the expressive content of the sign. The distinctions did not favor nor censor a particular viewpoint or philosophy. And, the justification for the regulation was unrelated to the content of the sign.

Justice Thomas, writing for the Court, disagreed. He found that the distinctions were plainly content-based and thus subject to strict scrutiny. The distinctions—between Political Signs, Temporary Directional Signs, and Ideological Signs—“depend[ed] entirely on the communicative content of the sign” (slip op., at 7). “Regulation targeted at specific subject matter is content based even if it does not discriminate among viewpoints with that subject matter” (12). And, “an innocuous justification cannot transform a facially content-based law into one that is content neutral” (9).

In its failed attempt to meet the strict scrutiny standard, the Town offered two governmental interests to support its distinctions: aesthetic appeal and traffic safety. Even if these were considered compelling governmental interests (which the Court assumed without ruling), the Town’s distinctions were not narrowly tailored. Justice Kagan noted in her own opinion (concurring in the judgment only) that the Town’s distinctions did “not pass strict scrutiny, or intermediate scrutiny, or even the laugh test” (slip op., at 6, Kagan, J., concurring in judgment).

**Impact of Local Ordinances**

So what does this decision mean for local ordinances? In the end, some distinctions among signs clearly are allowed and will withstand judicial review. Some code provisions, though, must be revised. And then, there are the open questions.

The Court was unanimous in judgment: The particular provisions of the Town of Gilbert’s sign code violate Constitutional protections for free speech. The Court was fractured, though, in the opinions, making it harder to discern the full scope of the decision. Justice Thomas offered the majority opinion of the court with five justices joining. Justice Alito offered a concurring opinion to further clarify the impact of Justice Thomas’ opinion. He was joined by Justices Kennedy and Sotomayor. Three justices concurred in judgment only, and they offered two separate opinions to outline their legal reasoning and their concerns with the majority’s reasoning.

So we have a split court. Three joined the majority only; three joined the majority, but also joined an explanatory concurrence; and three disagreed with the majority’s legal reasoning. This three-three-three split, unfortunately, causes even more head-scratching for an already complex topic.

**Content-Based Distinctions** In thinking about your sign ordinance, ask this: Does this regulation apply to a particular sign because of the non-commercial content on the sign? If yes, the regulation must meet strict scrutiny under *Reed*. The government must show that the regulation is designed to serve a compelling governmental interest and narrowly tailored to achieve that interest.

If your ordinance distinguishes among noncommercial sign types—political v. ideological v. religious—those distinctions are unconstitutional and must be changed.

Justice Thomas did offer some content-based regulations that may survive strict scrutiny if they are narrowly tailored to address public safety. These include warning signs for hazards on private property, signs directing traffic, or street
numbers associated with private houses.

**Content-Neutral Distinctions.** The several opinions of the court outline some valid distinctions for regulation. In his majority opinion, Justice Thomas noted that local governments still have “ample content-neutral options available to resolve problems with safety and aesthetics” (slip op., at 16). These include regulation of, among other things,

- size
- building materials
- lighting
- moving parts
- portability

Moreover, “on public property the Town may go a long way toward entirely forbidding the posting of signs, so long as it does so in an evenhanded, content-neutral manner” (slip op., at 16). A local ordinance or state statute can prohibit all signs in the public right-of-way. But, if signs are allowed, the regulations must not distinguish based on the content of the message. Regulations that allow some, but not all, noncommercial signs run afoul of the *Reed* decision.

For example, NCGS § 136-32 allows for “political signs” (as narrowly defined) in the public right-of-way of state highways during election season. That statute and similar ordinances will need to be revised to either, prohibit all signs in the right-of-way, or allow compliant signs with any noncommercial message in the right-of-way during election season.

Justice Alito, in his concurring opinion, provided further explanation (although not an exhaustive list) of what distinctions may be valid, content-neutral distinctions. He included:

- Size (including different sizes for different types of signs)
- Location, including distinguishing between freestanding signs and attached signs
- Distinguishing between lighted and unlighted
- Distinguishing between fixed message and electronic signs
- Distinguishing between signs on public property and signs on private property
- Distinguishing between signs on commercial property and signs on residential property
- Restricting the total number of signs allowed per mile of roadway
- Distinguishing between on-premises and off-premises signs*
- And time restrictions on signs advertising a one-time event*

* These last examples—distinguishing between on-premises/off-premises and restricting signs for one-time events—seem to conflict with the majority opinion in *Reed*. Here, we get back to the issue of the fractured court and multiple opinions (discussed below).

**Open Questions**

**Content-ish Regulations**

Justice Alito’s concurrence (discussed above) listed many regulatory distinctions that are clearly authorized. He listed two distinctions that do not clearly square with the reasoning of the majority opinion. But, if you consider the three justices concurring with Alito plus the three justices concurring in judgment only, there are six justices that took the question of content neutrality with more practical consideration than Justice Thomas’ hard line. Thus, Alito’s opinion may in fact hold the greatest weight of this case. Only time will tell—time and more litigation.

First, Justice Alito listed signs for one-time events. This seems to be precisely what the majority stuck down in this case. It is unclear how a local regulation could structure such regulation without relying on the content of the message itself. But the inclusion on Justice Alito’s list points to some room for defining signs based on function.
And second, Justice Alito listed the distinction between on-premises and off-premises signs. The enforcement officer must read the sign in order to determine if a sign is off-premises or on-premises. As such, these would seem to be facially content-based and subject to strict scrutiny. But, prior Supreme Court caselaw has upheld the on-premise/off-premise distinction and that precedent is not overruled by the majority opinion.

**Commercial and Noncommercial Speech.** In past decisions the Supreme Court has treated commercial speech to slightly less protection than noncommercial speech. Commercial speech regulation needs to meet a version of intermediate scrutiny, not the strict scrutiny applied to regulation of non-commercial speech (See, generally, *Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission of New York*, 447 U.S. 557 (1987)).

Arguably, the *Reed* decision opened the door to challenge a sign ordinance that distinguishes between commercial and noncommercial speech. Justice Alito’s concurring opinion noted that distinguishing based on the type of property—commercial or residential—would be valid. Regulating based on the content of the sign—commercial or noncommercial—arguably is undermined by the *Reed* decision.

Notably, though, the majority in *Reed* did not overrule its prior decisions. The *Reed* decision was focused on the Town code’s distinctions among types of noncommercial speech. Presumably the long-held standards for regulation of commercial speech still apply.

**Conclusion**

In the wake of *Reed*, some things are clear. Governments still have an array content-neutral regulations to apply to signs. But, content-based distinctions such as the ones in the Town of Gilbert’s code must survive strict scrutiny to stand. Because of mix of opinions from the Court, there are several open questions. We will not know the full scope and meaning of *Reed v. Town of Gilbert* until the federal courts begin to apply this decision to other sign litigation.

**Links**

§ 136-32. Regulation of signs.

(a) Commercial Signs. – No unauthorized person shall erect or maintain upon any highway any warning or direction sign, marker, signal or light or imitation of any official sign, marker, signal or light erected under the provisions of G.S. 136-30, except in cases of emergency. No person shall erect or maintain upon any highway any traffic or highway sign or signal bearing thereon any commercial or political advertising, except as provided in subsections (b) through (e) of this section: Provided, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the erection or maintenance of signs, markers, or signals bearing thereon the name of an organization authorized to erect the same by the Department of Transportation or by any local authority referred to in G.S. 136-31. Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor. The Department of Transportation may remove any signs erected without authority or allowed to remain beyond the deadline established in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Compliant Political Signs Permitted. – During the period beginning on the 30th day before the beginning date of "one-stop" early voting under G.S. 163-227.2 and ending on the 10th day after the primary or election day, persons may place political signs in the right-of-way of the State highway system as provided in this section. Signs must be placed in compliance with subsection (d) of this section and must be removed by the end of the period prescribed in this subsection.

(c) Definition. – For purposes of this section, "political sign" means any sign that advocates for political action. The term does not include a commercial sign.

(d) Sign Placement. – The permittee must obtain the permission of any property owner of a residence, business, or religious institution fronting the right-of-way where a sign would be erected. Signs must be placed in accordance with the following:

(1) No sign shall be permitted in the right-of-way of a fully controlled access highway.
(2) No sign shall be closer than three feet from the edge of the pavement of the road.
(3) No sign shall obscure motorist visibility at an intersection.
(4) No sign shall be higher than 42 inches above the edge of the pavement of the road.
(5) No sign shall be larger than 864 square inches.
(6) No sign shall obscure or replace another sign.

(e) Penalties for Unlawful Removal of Signs. – It is a Class 3 misdemeanor for a person to steal, deface, vandalize, or unlawfully remove a political sign that is lawfully placed under this section.

(f) Application Within Municipalities. – Pursuant to Article 8 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes, a city may by ordinance prohibit or regulate the placement of political signs on rights-of-way of streets located within the corporate limits of a municipality and maintained by the municipality. In the absence of an ordinance prohibiting or regulating the placement of political signs on the rights-of-way of streets located within a municipality and maintained by the municipality, the provisions of subsections (b) through (e) of this section shall apply. (1921, c. 2, s. 9(b); C.S., s. 3846(r); 1927, c. 148, ss. 56, 58; 1933, c. 172, s. 17; 1957, c. 65, s. 11; 1973, c. 507, s. 5; 1977, c. 464, s. 7.1; 1991 (Reg. Sess., 1992), c. 1030, s. 39; 1993, c. 539, s. 981; 1994, Ex. Sess., c. 24, s. 14(c); 2011-408, s. 1.)