



Agenda Abstract

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Meeting Date:	June 12, 2023
Department:	Planning and Econ. Dev.
Agenda Section:	Regular
Public hearing:	Yes
Date of public hearing:	April 20, 2023

PRESENTER/INFORMATION CONTACT

Shannan Campbell, Planning and Economic Development Manager

ITEM TO BE CONSIDERED

Subject: Collins Ridge Master Plan Amendments – 2023

Attachments:

1. Draft Collins Ridge Master Plan Conditions – amended Oct. 12, 2021 and June 12, 2023 (if approved)
2. Master Plan Amendment Application
3. Draft Collins Ridge Master Plan Conditions Amendment Narrative Exhibit A (updated May 22, 2023)
4. Draft Collins Ridge Master Plan Amendment Exhibit Map (updated May 23, 2023)
5. Resolution amending the Master Plan Conditions

Summary:

The developer is requesting a handful of changes to the original Collins Ridge Master Plan conditions as a result of a change in developers, site conditions, and development conditions since the project was originally approved in 2017. Staff also had a handful of conditions to add and modifications to the original conditions that reflect best development practices in place now.

The developer and Planning Board discussed an additional condition that was not considered during the public hearing at their meeting on May 18, 2023. This is a new Condition under #8 c. to allow for payment in lieu of bringing Open Air Lane to the property line due to topography challenges and lack of construction easements on the Daniel Boone Square property. Additionally, utilities staff asked for a \$15,000 meter reading contribution to be converted to a \$15,000 sewer outfall.

Amendment Summary:

Staff added Conditions:

- #4.v. Landscaping- to indicate that landscaping cannot be planted in water/sewer easements and where there is a conflict a Type B intent buffer shall be planted;
- Conditions # 17 and 18 tying town dedication/acceptance of infrastructure to Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Staff Modified Conditions:

- #8 Street and Pedestrian Connectivity, c. d. e. & f. Tying zoning compliance permits and certificates of occupancy to phases instead of units for the construction of road improvements and the developer evaluating the stormwater system at Churton Street and James J Freeland Memorial Drive;

Staff Deleted Condition:

- Condition #8. i. due to redundancy and the 12 ac parcel now being dedicated to the town in Condition #6.a Town Park

Staff requests to further amend:

- Condition #9 Voluntary Contributions- to amend a \$15,000 contribution toward Utility Meter Reading Antennae over to a \$15,000 contribution to sewer flow monitoring equipment in this sewer outfall. The developer has agreed to this condition.

Developer added Conditions:

- Condition #16 Lot Width Variation to match current development pattern of SUP 1/Phase 1.
- 'Single Family Detached' to anticipated land uses for POD A and POD B.

Developer amended Conditions:

- Condition #3 Affordable Housing to modify the date the property will be transferred to CASA;
- Amended Condition #6 Community Amenities a. Town Park- by dedicating the 12.45 ac tract south of I-85 and the remaining .7 ac portion of the original public park site along Gold Hill Way to the town. f. Walking/Biking Trails- to allow grading and clearing within the 100' perimeter buffer.
- Condition #8 a. to allow for the alternative street cross section used in SUP1/Phase 1 to continue on Open Air Lane and Lightfoot Lane in SUP 2/Phase 2.
- Condition #8 j. to acknowledge that NCDOT and NC Railroad redesigned projects that caused additional ROW dedication and modified the boundaries of PODS E and F.

Developer requests to further amend:

- Condition #8 c. to allow for payment in lieu of bringing Open Air Lane to the property line due to topography challenges. Town staff and the Planning Board have reviewed and amended the condition.
-

April 20, 2023 Public Hearing Draft Minutes:

- C. Collins Ridge Master Plan Amendments: Developer-requested amendments to certain Master Plan conditions of approval

Campbell said the Collins Ridge developers have submitted the plans for Special Use Permit 2. She said changes to the conditions of approval for the master plan are required before staff review continues. Campbell said she met with the developers the day before to clear up some questions and concerns ahead of the public hearing. She said the meeting helped generate staff suggestions for new and revised conditions, as well.

Campbell said one suggested condition relates to an original condition connected to the number of dwelling units. She said that approach is confusing and the number of units has changed as housing types have changed. She said another permanent access road needs to be constructed and staff would like to ensure the road is completed before home construction starts on the second special use permit. Campbell said staff would like project completion tied to the second permit so such items as road completion and town acceptance of public roads and infrastructure are completed before the last building permits are issued. She said this would prevent the developer from completing all the housing units and not completing other items that need to be done.

Laura Holloman with McAdams came forward to address the boards. She said McAdams is a planning and civil engineering firm working on the Collins Ridge development. She said the changes being presented would bring items up to the town's standards since this is an older project. Holloman said her firm has agreed to all the changes recommended by staff.

Commissioner Matt Hughes asked about an offer from the developer to donate about 12 acres to the town as park land. He said this arose from a road reconfiguration and railroad realignment that mostly consumed 2

previously designated acres. Hughes said acceptance of the 12 acres would help other town greenway plans. He also mentioned .7 acres of diminished park land that would remain from the original 2 acres for the planned park and asked what the developer would do with this parcel if the town did not accept it. Holloman asked the developer to provide the response.

Jonathan Cooper, entitlements manager for the developer D.R. Horton, clarified that two areas are being discussed as proposed park land – one for .7 acres and one for 12 acres that is on the other side of Interstate 85. He said the .7 acres is what would remain from the 2 acres previously set aside for a park for that section of development. He said changes that arose from some development land being taken for the railroad realignment caused the area to be reduced. The speaker said an outcome of the previous day's meeting was staff seemed to welcome receiving 12 acres and maybe the .7 acres as well. He said the original master plan also required the developer to provide right of way to Interstate 85 and he understood the town is planning to develop access across the interstate through an overpass for the greenway. Cooper said the donation of property could serve as a landing and would allow the trail that will run through the development to continue onto that side. He said if the developer kept the land, it could be sold to the homeowners, but there would be a question as to how to provide vehicle access since it is landlocked.

Chandler asked if the developer's intent is to donate the 12 and .7 acres. Campbell demonstrated the two areas on a map, for clarity. The representative said an avenue to donate both parcels to the town exists if there is interest.

Commissioner Mark Bell requested to structure the question-and-answer session to discuss the parks first and then return to the other items. Others agreed. Bell said the intersection at Churton Street and Interstate 85 is due for replacement in the near future, which could affect the proposed park area on the 12 acres. He said the area could have highway on both sides and the value to community members may be diminished.

Bell also asked for clarity on language about conveyance of the land in about 30 months or 2.5 years and asked when the land would be conveyed. The representative said that language refers to how long the town has to accept the property, but the land will be conveyed within 6 months once the town accepts the property. The developer said the language and timeline could be revisited and updated.

Bell said the Parks and Recreation Board should have input on whether the town should accept the land as a park.

Commissioner Robb English indicated the Parks and Recreation Board had discussed the park land dedication at its last meeting. He asked if Pod B will be the only pod without a park if the town accepts the land. The developer said pods E and F are affected by the railroad. He said the .7 acres could be a trailhead or combined with the town's adjacent train station area land. He said the pods will still have direct access to a park area.

Brad Rhinehalt with McAdams addressed the boards. He clarified that each pod needs a .25-acre park and said the developer wants to have the 12-acre parcel counted as the .25-acre park area for Pod F. He clarified that the required park area for each pod is not 2 acres but .25 acres.

Commissioner Evelyn Lloyd asked who will be required to maintain the parks once built. Cooper with DR Horton said the parks within the pods that are required by the master plan will be maintained by the homeowners association. He said areas donated to the town will be maintained by the town.

Lloyd asked if there would be a new map to reflect the changes caused by the railroad right-of-way acquisition. The developer said there will be a new map, but more changes that are being made through the process will need to be incorporated into it. Campbell indicated that she could get Lloyd a bigger, updated map.

Planning Board member Robert Iglesias asked at what point it will be determined whether the land is feasible as a park and what other use the land could possibly have. Campbell said due to the size and topography, the land will more likely be open space rather than a park. Planning Board member Alyse Polly, who also serves on the Parks and Recreation Board, said having enough space to do switchbacks to make the area wheelchair accessible is also a potential benefit and is a concern regarding the proposed Ridgewalk greenway and the landing area on the 12-acre parcel.

Cooper referred back to the .7-acre parcel and said while it may not be large enough to do a park, it abuts town owned property and could be recombined for broader use.

Casadonte asked for questions or comments related to the affordable housing portion of the development. Campbell said the developer is concerned about meeting a June performance date and is working with the nonprofit organization CASA to aim for an October date. She said it is still up in the air, but she wants to make the boards aware.

Casadonte asked if the affordable housing portion is still expected to be pad-ready in March of 2025. Cooper affirmed and said the date change is because the affordable housing location within the larger development needed to change per the negotiations with CASA. Weaver said she understood the reasons for the delay but encouraged remembering any expiration of low income housing tax credits for the project.

The discussion moved to street cross sections. Hughes said he and Efird had exchanged emails about Hughes' concerns about utilities and roads. He asked Efird if he had an update. Efird said part of the previous day's meeting was to discuss a punch list for Phase 1A. He said that discussion led staff to recommend the items be completed before moving into Special Use Permit 2. Hughes asked if there are any concerns about the inspections of the projects. Efird said part of the negotiations of the second permit is to have a requirement for third-party inspections.

Ryan Randall requested to ask a question during this item. He said he is a resident of one of the townhomes in Collins Ridge. Casadonte allowed the question. Randall said more parking is occurring on the street and the community is concerned there will not be enough parking when more homes are built. The representative for the developer pointed to a purple area on a map and showed that more on-street parking is planned in the vicinity of the townhomes.

The discussion moved to item 5 on lot width variation modification. Bell asked for clarification that this is simply a codification since the lot widths have already been approved. Rhineholt said this lot width variation modification was a waiver in the original special use permit, but waivers are no longer available per the UDO. He said the developer is not able to ask for waivers in the new special use permit, so they are requesting the variation modification as a condition in the Master Plan. He said since it was a waiver in the original special use permit, this is the way the project has been developed already along the way. Bell asked if staff is okay with this. Campbell indicated yes.

The discussion moved to Item 6 on grading and clearing for trails. Chandler said the request is to allow the developer to grade and clear within the buffer to facilitate the trail's construction. She said her concern is what that means and how many trees will be removed. She asked the representative to explain what was included in the italics of that section. She said she fears a lot of mature trees will be removed and replaced with young trees that will take 30 years to reach the same stage of growth. The representative said this is a clarification item. He said trails are allowed within the buffer, but the language in the Unified Development Ordinance doesn't allow them to run parallel in the buffer.

Campbell said that buffers may be crossed with trails. She pointed to an area on the plan where the developer is having a hard time with a 100-foot buffer and will need to enter the buffer to construct the trail because it is

on the property's periphery. She said the developer is still planning to do all the required planting within the buffer. Chandler asked if that means replacing older trees with younger ones. Hughes said he has a similar concern. The representative said the developer only intends to remove the trees necessary to install the trail. He said the exact location will depend on the terrain and the existing trees. Campbell showed the area where the trail is proposed on an aerial map and said not much tree coverage exists on the site since it has been mass graded. Efrid clarified that this is not a change to the developer's plans but rather an attempt to reconcile that the developer was previously approved to build a trail but was not allowed to work in the buffer to build it. Rhineholt said some of the area is very steep and some retaining walls may need to be built as a result. He said he had talked to the public space and sustainability manager about walking the area with her after surveying and modifying as needed. He said the developer will be fine with including language to that effect in the approval. Polly said she likes including this as well as minimizing tree removal.

The discussion moved to Item 7. The representative said the expected land use originally only had apartments and the area in question is the former CASA site. He said this request is to allow single-family homes to be included in the area. Weaver asked if this approval adds a higher number of single-family homes or if it only moves the different types of development around. She reflected on an earlier meeting with the developer regarding capping the amount of single-family homes. Rhineholt said Pod D was discussed in an earlier meeting attended by Weaver and it is not changing. He said this request is related to Pod A, which was not part of the discussion. Cooper said the request for the additional home type is still under the single-family cap. Johnston asked what is going into Pod D. Rhineholt said it will be market-rate apartments.

Casadonte asked for comments for the public hearing.

Shawn Flynn spoke first. He said he owns a townhome in Collins Ridge. He said that Collins Ridge Land Co., LLC, dissolved on Feb. 28 for failing to file an annual report and that the residents now have no name for the new developer. The representative said D.R. Horton is the developer and builder. Flynn directed a question to the boards about how they came to require the roads and utilities be tied to construction since the market and inflation can change the incentive to build. He said a lot of people already living in Collins Ridge would like to see stormwater improvements, completed roads, and the homeowners association eventually conveyed to them. He said that will not happen until all the development is completed and sold. Flynn asked what the thinking is among the boards for unit-based versus calendar-based requirements. He said there are not a lot of trees, and he encouraged the board members to see the site in person. He said a lot has changed in the last year, but there has not been a lot of construction recently. The latter fuels his concerns about the completion of the utilities and roads. He suggested Special Use Permit 2 may be a good place to take a break as the existing residents wonder what is next for them. Chandler asked Flynn to clarify whether his concern is about a certain type of development. Flynn said his concern is tying the completion of roads in areas of already completed homes to the completion of the remaining development since there may not be enough incentive for the remaining development to happen.

Campbell said that was the reason for the staff-initiated conditions that recommend connecting the completion of roads to the second permit versus to the completion of a certain number of homes. She said that the town really can do nothing to keep a developer from rotating between building projects in different locations and that the practice is relatively common. Campbell said staff is recommending withholding the last few building permits to make sure everything is done before the developer leaves. She also said the town holds bonds for situations where developers leave, and those funds could be used to ensure completion of the development.

Johnston asked if the development areas referred to as pods each have their own homeowners associations. Planning Board member Sherra Lawrence said Flynn is referring to the association now being managed by a third party and the residents not having a say until a certain number of homes are built. She also lives in Collins Ridge.

Campbell said the town does not become involved when the developer turns over the association to the homeowners. Cooper said until the town accepts the utilities and roads, they are the developer's responsibility. He said the developer cannot turn over anything until everything is up to the town's standards for approval. He said it is a common predicament when someone comes into a development early on, noting he is in the same situation in his own home in Wake County. Cooper said he understands the residents' positions. He said the most recent meeting with town staff was very positive and a move in the right direction for the developer to be able to convey as much as it can as soon as it can. He said the proposed updates prevent the developer from running into stopping points.

Casadonte asked Cooper if there is anything he could rely on regarding an update to the residents on when the roads may be completed. Flynn also asked that stormwater improvements be addressed due to existing issues. Cooper offered to exchange contact information with the resident.

Amanda Barbee spoke on behalf of CASA, the developer building the affordable housing portion of the project. She asked the boards to consider October over December for the targeted approvals due to the time and money CASA has invested in applying for the tax credits that could be lost if prolonged. She reiterated the need from CASA's perspective to not have the project approvals go into 2024.

Roseanne Maillie introduced herself as a resident of Collins Ridge. She asked if the updated map is available on the D.R. Horton website. The representative said it is not on the D.R. Horton site at this point, but it is on the town's website. Maillie asked what park she will have and where it will be. The representative said the map does not change any parks that have been built. He said the only park it changes is for an area that has not been constructed yet. Maillie asked when the trail will be done. The representative said a big part of the trail was changed by the railroad right of way. He said once all the approvals are finalized, the developer can begin to evaluate the construction of the trail. Campbell said the condition says Dec. 31, 2027, is when the trail has to be built and turned over to the town. Maillie asked for confirmation that the byway mentioned to cross the interstate would extend the trail. Several board members confirmed it will eventually but that it is a town project. Polly said the estimate for building the Ridgewalk Greenway is maybe another 10 years. Lawrence clarified that the greenway will extend through Collins Ridge and other neighborhoods, as well. The developer's representative said the Collins Ridge neighborhood likely will have the greenway before other areas.

Campbell asked Randall to speak again about the parking concerns for the townhomes so his comments could be captured with the other public comment. Randall said some of the townhomes have only one garage, so people are parking on the street. He said there is concern that as more of these homes are built, more cars will be parking on the street, potentially causing a problem in emergency situations. Randall said there does not seem to be an opportunity for more general use parking. He said the issue was brought up in homeowners association meetings and there did not seem to be a good mechanism for resolving the problem. Hughes asked for a response from staff since the homeowners association will not be able to regulate the street parking once the roads are turned over to the town. Campbell said once they are town roads, areas of no parking can be designated on one side of the street if there is a safety issue. She said staff can discuss with the developer about having small visitor parking pads in the townhome area or overflow parking in Pod D.

Rhinehalt said the developer has been or intends to place no parking signs on one side of the street. Randall said there is already an issue with the existing number of residents when construction vehicles are in the area. Rhinehalt said the developer has added additional parking for Special Use Permit 2, but street parking is also a part of the long-term plan.

C. Collins Ridge Master Plan Amendments: Developer-requested amendments to certain master plan conditions of approval

Campbell displayed a summary of staff recommendations for changes to the Collins Ridge Master Plan with explanations for each. She said staff also added an amendment to have the developer contribute \$15,000 towards sewer flow monitoring equipment rather than towards a utility meter reading antenna, as originally requested.

Campbell explained the developer had added one condition and amended several others. The developer also had asked for a condition after the public hearing, which was permission to post a payment in lieu so that if the developer can't extend Open Air Lane to the property line because of topography, then a payment can be made instead. She explained the developer needs to stop construction of Open Air Lane before the property line to avoid grading on neighboring property and the developer needs a construction easement to grade on the adjacent parcel.

Iglesias asked if there was previously an exit or entrance at the location. Campbell said there was not, but when the adjacent Boone Square property is redeveloped, this would be an ability to tie in so there's more connectivity between Churton Street businesses and the Collins Ridge neighborhood. The amendment would be to create an easement for the town to build the connection or for the redevelopment company that does Boone Square to make this connection with town reimbursement from the payment in lieu funds. When asked by the town attorney if staff had a formula for payment, Campbell said 125% of the engineer's estimate is used for sidewalk payment in lieu, with 25% intended to account for inflation.

Town Attorney Bob Hornik noted the Boone Square developer would have the right to make the connection. Johnston asked if the redeveloper of Boone Square could decline to make the connection. Hornik said the town could require the connection as a condition for approving any plan submitted. Campbell added that the town would probably require it for the connectivity.

Salvi said the developer wants to pay the town in lieu of doing the work themselves, but the board doesn't know if the cost will be more than the estimate. Campbell explained the 125% formula is meant to ensure the amount fully covers the cost, adding the board could recommend raising it to 150%.

Casadonte noted that there's currently nothing for Open Air Lane to connect with. Johnston pointed out that the original plan had this connection, and there was nothing to connect when the plan was written.

Polly said it could be many years before Boone Square is redeveloped and that 125% or 150% may not be enough to keep up with inflation. Giglia said the developer wouldn't be asking to make a payment in lieu unless they thought it would save them money, so the board should stick with the original plan. Others agreed.

Casadonte asked the applicants if they'd like to speak.

Brad Rhinehalt, engineer for McAdams, said the topography was very challenging and that Open Air Lane was a road to nowhere until the adjacent property is developed. He added that the applicant could be held hostage by the adjacent property owner because the adjacent property owner can ask whatever they want for a construction easement to grade.

Polly said she felt sure the town was going to have the connection built because connectivity is a high priority for the town, but that 15 to 20 years from now, it may cost more than 150% of today's estimate.

Hornik asked if the developer had approached the adjacent property owner about an easement. Otherwise, he said, this could be a premature conversation.

Johnston asked if the developer was not aware of the topographical issue earlier, and Rhinehalt explained they were not the original developer.

Casadonte asked the developer to answer Hornik's question regarding discussions with the adjacent property owner about an easement. D.R. Horton representative Jonathan Cooper indicated that he did not know. He added that uncertainty about the adjacent development left the question very open.

Salvi agreed the conversation was premature.

David Bergmark, senior planner for McAdams, explained the applicant was in the middle of modifying their request and trying to look ahead to potential problems. He noted many jurisdictions have a payment in lieu built into their code for situations like this, which allows relief when the adjacent property owner will not accommodate. Because Hillsborough's code doesn't have that built into it, the developer is trying to build that in now so that if the developer finds the adjacent property owner isn't reasonable, the developer doesn't have to come back to the board to modify the master plan again to address this one issue.

Johnston asked if there was a way to modify this amendment so that if an easement dispute comes up that can't be resolved, it then reverts to a payment in lieu of a certain percent, which would save the applicant the trouble of coming back to the Planning Board.

Giglia asked if this arrangement would require the town to make the connection. Campbell said no, the town would either make the connection or use payment in lieu to pay the Boone Square owner/developer to make the connection.

Casadonte noted the board didn't know what a reasonable cost for the easement was. Polly said she didn't want the town to spend more than it needed to.

Rhinehalt said municipalities typically pay the payment in lieu amount to the other developer and not more. Bergmark said if anyone gets shortchanged, it's the other developer.

Polly asked about the typical standard practice for the town. Campbell said the town doesn't allow payment in lieu for construction of streets, unless there's a condition that allows it. The current payment in lieu option in Hillsborough is only for sidewalks.

Polly asked what would happen if the cost were higher than the payment in lieu. Hornik said the developer of the adjacent property would pick up the shortage. Polly asked what would happen if the estimate is too high. Hornik said in that case the town would have to reimburse the difference.

Johnson asked if there was a scenario in which the cost falls back on the town. Hornik said if the adjacent property is never redeveloped, the town would have to pay for the connection if it was desired. Campbell added that if the redeveloper of Boone Square found the cost is astronomical, they could ask the town to waive the requirement that they make that connection as a condition of their development plan.

Casadonte asked if the applicant is granted an easement by the adjacent property owner, would they be obligated to build at their cost when that property's redeveloped. Hornik answered the applicant would have to build the connection.

Bergmark noted if the board approves the request, the board would be allowing the applicant in the future the ability to ask for payment in lieu. They would approach the other property owner. If an agreement about the

easement is reached, they would make the connection; if not, they would be allowed to make a payment in lieu based on an estimate of the cost today.

Iglesias asked, by agreeing to this, if the board is committing the town to accepting payment in lieu.

Hornik said if the town agrees to the fee in lieu now, what is the applicant's incentive to try to get the easement? Rhinehalt said the board can add a clause requiring proof that the developer approaches the adjacent property owner about an easement for a reasonable amount. Casadonte asked what is a reasonable amount. Hornik suggested the appraisal be done by a third party to determine if it's reasonable.

Giglia asked if the easement or the topography is the issue. Hornik explained that the topography requires the construction easement.

Casadonte noted worries among board members about the town incurring extra costs. Rhinehalt said he'd never heard of a municipality incurring extra costs in this situation.

Concern was expressed about the town never getting the payment in lieu until the connection is made. Campbell noted that the town would collect payment in lieu before approving the special use permit tied to Open Air Lane.

Polly suggested the applicant talk with the adjacent property owner and determine whether a payment in lieu would be needed. If the cost of an easement is unreasonable, the applicant would pay for an appraisal to determine if it's reasonable; if not, they would then make a payment in lieu of 150%.

Salvi suggested the process should stop at the appraisal and she clarified for Campbell that the applicant should come back to the Planning Board after the appraisal. The applicant explained that they were making the request now so they don't have to come back, which would delay approval of the project.

Campbell summarized the points made thus far. She said the board would recommend the developer approach the Boone Square owner and ask for necessary easements to construct the road to the property line, and an appraiser would determine whether the cost of the easements was reasonable.

Johnston said that 125% was stipulated in the town ordinances for payment in lieu for sidewalks and that 150% seemed capricious. There was discussion about the right percentage. Campbell said 150% was not unheard of. Hornik noted the board would just be making a recommendation to the town board, which would know the Planning Board debated the percentage.

Casadonte asked if the board had articulated all the stipulations they thought would be appropriate for this condition.

Giglia asked what if the redeveloper of Boone Square refused to build the connection. Hornik said the town could require the Boone Square owner to build it as a condition for approving their development plan.

Casadonte summarized the conditions discussed: if the adjacent property owner's offer for granting an easement is deemed unreasonable, the board would require a third-party appraisal. If the appraisal confirms the applicant's assessment, the town would allow the applicant to make a payment in lieu. The town would then require the property owner of Boone Square to build the connection using the payment in lieu funds. Casadonte asked the applicant if they accepted these conditions. They agreed.

Motion: Johnston moved that the board recommend to the Hillsborough Board of Commissioners a four-step plan: (1) the developer will reach out to the Boone Square property owner about the

easement; the developer will either (2) accept the offer and build the connection or (3) refuse the offer and get an independent appraisal; (4) if the Boone Square owner's estimate for the easement is unreasonable, the developer will be allowed to make a payment in lieu of 150% to the town. Schultz seconded.

Vote: 7-0.

Financial impacts:

Low.

Staff recommendation and comments:

None.

Action requested:

Approve, approve with conditions or modifications, or deny the request.