

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF STOKES)
)
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS
STOKES COUNTY GOVERNMENT
DANBURY, NORTH CAROLINA
DECEMBER 5, 2006

The Board of Commissioners of the County of Stokes, State of North Carolina, met for regular session (Planning) in the Commissioners' Chambers of the Ronald Wilson Reagan Memorial Building (Administrative Building) located in Danbury, North Carolina on Tuesday, December 5, 2006 at 7:00 pm with the following members present:

Chairman Leon Inman
Vice-Chairman Jimmy Walker
Commissioner Ron Carroll
Commissioner Ernest Lankford
Commissioner Stanley Smith

County Personnel in Attendance:
Clerk to the Board/Interim County Manager Darlene Bullins
Planning Director David Sudderth

Chairman Leon Inman called the meeting to order.

Vice Chairman Walker delivered the invocation.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT-GOVERNING BODY-PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Inman opened the meeting by inviting the citizens in attendance to join the Board with the Pledge of Allegiance.

*PUBLIC HEARING - REZONING REQUEST #185 - R. MARK PENDLETON -
(RA to M-1-CU) (FEED MILL)*

*Chairman Inman opened the Public Hearing for the Rezoning Request #185 -
(RA to M-1-CU) Feed Mill.*

*James & Sharon Shouse
1143 Edd Mabe Road
Lawsonville, NC 27022*

*Michelle Swaim
1143 Edd Mabe Road
Lawsonville, NC 27022*

*Both Mr. & Mrs. Shouse along with their daughter, Michelle Swaim did not wish to speak.
They were here just to listen to the rezoning case, their land joins the Pendleton land being requested to be rezoned.*

Chairman Inman closed the Public Hearing.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - PLANNING - REZONING REQUEST #185

R. Mark Pendleton - (RA to M-1-CU) # 185

Planning Director David Sudderth presented Rezoning Request #185 to rezone approximately 26.723 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to M-1-CU (Light Manufacturing Conditional Use) for a "Feed Mill". Director Sudderth noted that the reasons for the feed mill are to create their own feed to supply their own needs, be able to maintain a consistent quality project, and cost savings.

SITE OWNER: R. Mark Pendleton

APPLICANT: R. Mark Pendleton

SITE LOCATION: The property is located on the corner of NC Hwy 8 and Edd Mabe Rd. (SR# 1442).

Map: 6030 Parcel: portion of 4680 PIN #: 6030-00-99-4680

Deed Book: 362 & 383 Pages: 2470 & 1315 Township: Peters Creek

SITE INFORMATION:

PARCEL SIZE: Total tract 26.723 acres out of 29.610 acres.

ZONING DISTRICT: RA (Residential Agricultural)

PROPOSED DISTRICT: M-1-CU (Light Manufacturing Conditional Use)

FLOOD HAZARD AREA: Not located in flood hazard area.

FIRM MAP #: 370362 0050B

FIRM MAP ZONE: Property is located in Zone X, area determined to be outside *the 500-year floodplain.*

WATERSHED DISTRICT: N/A

SEPTIC/WATER APPROVAL: The site has been evaluated and was found to be suitable for septic disposal by Brandon Joyce, RS.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: N/A

EMERGENCY SERVICES: Lawsonville VFD, EMS - Station # 102 Lawsonville.

EROSION CONTROL: When construction begins, if necessary.

ACCESS: The proposed facility will have a new commercial driveway access off of Edd Mabe Rd. (SR# 1442) (NCDOT must approve a commercial driveway permit).

SURROUNDING LAND USE: The subject property is located on the corner of NC Hwy 8 and Edd Mabe Rd. The surrounding land use consists of mixed residential, agricultural and commercial property. The owner of the property, R. Mark Pendleton owns and operates Performance Livestock Company. The business is located on approximately 2.534 acres and is zoned H-B (Highway Business), rezoned 7-6-99.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER:

Potential tax base increase due to commercial development.

Potential new jobs.

Impact on existing and future surrounding development.

Impact on community infrastructure, roads, public services etc.

Need of services provided.

STAFF COMMENTS: The rezoning request comes to the Board as a conditional use rezoning in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) zoning district; you may discuss the development plan of the proposed "Feed Mill" in detail. The nearest commercial district is located on the same parcel, Performance Livestock Company, (H-B). The nearest manufacturing-zoning district (M-2) is located approximately 1.4 miles south of the property near the corner of Harold Lackey Rd. (SR# 1443) and NC Hwy 8. The pattern of mixed development is common throughout the county where residential commercial, and agricultural activities are interspersed along a road. NC Hwy 8 is a major corridor through the county and is a prime example of this pattern of development. The applicant's request to expand the existing business to incorporate a feed mill producing the product they sell seems to be a logical expansion of the business. The applicant's request to rezone 26.723 acres of the remaining parcel to M-1 (Light Manufacturing) is for possible future expansion and to provide a buffer for the proposed new facility and existing business. The applicant has indicated that he intends to continue to allow livestock to graze around the pond. The proposed feed mill operation would be the major change to the property, as it currently exists. The conditional use aspect of the request would allow the Board the opportunity and ability to regulate the proposed use and any potential uses on the property, as well as the ability to address any environmental or neighborhood concerns that might arise if the proposal is approved. As always the Board should pay close attention to the potential effects the rezoning petition will have on the surrounding property and community. The Planning staff sees this request as a positive for economic growth in the northern part of the county with minimal impact on the community. There seem to be more pluses than minuses.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION - REZONING: The Planning Board voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of rezoning request # 185 RA to M-1-CU for a feed mill. The Board felt that this would be a positive economic benefit to the county.

Director Sudderth stated that there were only a few inquiries about the rezoning, no negative comments. Director Sudderth also stated that the office received positive comments about the potential of new jobs.

Jason Pendleton, Mark's Pendleton's son, spoke on behalf of the rezoning request.

Jason Pendleton stated the following regarding the rezoning:

Proposed mill process will produce a blended product

Blended product is more attractive to sell

Possible job creations in manufacturing of product, administration, and delivery

Saves freight charges

Ability to buy local grain from local farmers

Local Farmers have the ability to sell grain without traveling a great distance
Will also utilize products made in NC

The Board discussed the rezoning request, potential job creations, and the rezoning of the 26.723 acres of the remaining parcel to M-1 for possible future expansion.

Vice Chairman Walker questioned what protects the surrounding landowners that the requesting landowner will not use the land for other purposes than a feed mill. Director Sudderth noted that the rezoning request specifies that the rezoning is for a feed mill, but could be included in the recommended conditions for more clarification.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the Rezoning Request #185.

Commissioner Lankford moved to approve the Rezoning Request #185 to rezone approximately 26.723 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to M-1-CU (Light Manufacturing Conditional Use) for a "Feed Mill". Vice Chairman Walker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Director Sudderth presented and read the following proposed recommended conditions for R. Mark Pendleton who had agreed to all the recommended conditions:

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION - CONDITIONAL USE: The Planning Board voted 8 to 0 to recommend the Conditional Use permit associated with this request along with the following proposed conditions.

Recommended Conditions for R. Mark Pendleton M-1-CU #185

NCDOT must approve a commercial driveway access for the site coming off Edd Mabe Rd. (SR# 1442).

Applicant shall adhere to all applicable Federal, State, and local laws.

If any of these conditions are not met or complied with or the permit has not been exercised in or before one (1) year from the granting of the permit, the permit shall become void and of no effect.

All required permits must be obtained from the County Inspections Department prior to placing structures on the property, as well as any signage that may accompany the project.

Any structure shall post a visible lot number in a numbering scheme approved by the County to facilitate rapid emergency response (E- 911).

If conflict arises between any conditions or the developer's proposed site plan or written text, the most stringent conditions or requirements shall be considered the governing requirement.

All costs and expenses associated with complying with these conditions shall be borne by the landowner/developer, with no expense being borne by the County.

Upon written request by the County, evidence of compliance with any of these conditions shall be provided to the County within ten (10) days after each request.

If any of the conditions shall be found to be unreasonable, invalid or otherwise impermissible by a court of competent jurisdiction then the County may impose such alternative reasonable conditions as it finds to be necessary and appropriate.

If any of these conditions once met are not continuously maintained, the permit may be revoked by the County upon the failure of the owner/developer to cure the deficiency in any specific condition within thirty (30) days after written notice to the owner/developer of the specific failed condition.

Applicant shall provide a paved driveway apron at approved access point with Edd Mabe Rd. (SR# 1442).

Applicant shall be allowed to continue grazing livestock on parcel.

Or any other condition that the Boards may deem necessary at the time the project is approved.

Director Sudderth noted that the following condition would be added as the first condition: (1) The conditional use permit for Rezoning Request #185 is for the purpose of a feed mill.

Director Sudderth noted that in future, conditional use permit requests, the purpose of the request would be listed as (1) in the recommended conditions.

Mr. Mark Pendleton had no issues with the recommended conditions.

Director Sudderth concluded that the County does not have a Comprehensive Use Land Plan, but does follow the County's Land Use Development Guide for Development. All conditional use permits must be exercised within one (1) year or they expire.

Director Sudderth reviewed the following regarding a conditional use permit and requested the Board's response to each of the following

In granting a conditional use, the responsible body shall insure:

(a) The requested use is listed among the conditional uses in the district for which application is made. Yes (5-0)

(b) The requested use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare. Yes (5-0)

(c) The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the surrounding or adjoining districts, nor be detrimental to the health, morals, or welfare. Yes (5-0)

(d) Due consideration has been given to the suitability of the property for the use applied for with respect to trends of growth or change; the effect of the proposed use upon the community; requirements for transportation, schools, parks, playgrounds, recreational area, conservation of natural resources, preservation of floodplains, and encouraging the most appropriate use of the land. Yes (5-0)

(e) Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. Yes (5-0)

That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets. Yes (5-0)

Director Sudderth included Conditions/Guarantees and General Provisions in Granting Conditional Use for the Board's information.

Section 133. Conditions and Guarantees

Prior to the granting of any conditional use, the Planning Board may recommend, and the responsible body (either the Governing Body or the Board of Adjustment) may stipulate, such conditions and restrictions upon the establishment, location, reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of the conditional use as it deemed necessary for the protection of the public interest and to secure compliance with the standards and requirements specified in Subsection 132.5 above. In all cases in which conditional uses are granted, the responsible body shall require such evidence and guarantees as it may deem necessary as proof that the conditions stipulated are being met. Conditions may include, but not limited to, the following:

- (a) Conditions may be imposed to abate or restrict noise, smoke, dust, or other elements that may affect surrounding properties.
- (b) Establish setback, side, front, and rear yard requirements necessary for orderly expansion and to prevent traffic congestion.
- (c) Provide adjoining property with a buffer or shield from view of the proposed use if necessary.
- (d) Establish a time limit at expiration of which the permit or approval shall no longer be valid, or shall require renewal.

Section 134. General Provisions in Granting Conditional Use

Compliance with Other Codes

Granting a conditional use does not exempt applicant from complying with all of the requirements of other ordinances.

Revocation

In any case where the conditions of a conditional use have not been or are not being met, the Enforcement Officer shall give the grantee notice of intention to revoke approval. Said notice shall be at least ten (10) days prior to action by the responsible body considering conditional uses.

Expiration

In any case where a conditional use has not been exercised within the time limit set by the responsible body, or within one (1) year if no specific time limit has been set, then without further action, the approval shall be null and void. "Exercised" as set forth in this Section shall mean that binding contracts for the construction of the main building have been let; or in the absence of contracts that the main building is under construction to a substantial degree; or that prerequisite

conditions involving substantial investment are constructed in a substantial stage of development, or completed (sewage, drainage, etc.). When construction is not a part of the use, "exercised" shall mean that the use in operation is in compliance with the conditions which are set forth in the approval.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the Conditional Use Permit for Rezoning Request #185.

Vice Chairman Walker moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit of stated Recommended Conditions for R. Mark Pendleton with the addition of the following becoming condition #1: The conditional use permit for Rezoning Request #185 is for the purpose of a feed mill.

Commissioner Lankford seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The Board discussed having a zoning provision of agri-business in the zoning Ordinance. Director Sudderth noted at the present time, there have been no requests that could not be handled by the regular existing ordinance.

PUBLIC HEARING - REZONING REQUEST #186 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUEST -ALLTEL

Chairman Inman called the Public Hearing for Special Use Permit Request #186- Alltel to order.

*Erik Nygard
Superintendent
Hanging Rock State Park
Danbury, NC 27016*

Mr. Nygard expressed his appreciation to the Board for allowing the Park Advisory Committee to have a chance to review the cell tower request. Mr. Nygard noted that after the call, the committee went to review the request, the balloon test had already been completed and taken down which resulted in not having a visual of the height. Mr. Nygard noted that the tower would be visible from Moore's Knob, but with the distance, would not be detrimental to the area. Mr. Nygard concluded that after reviewing the photos taken, the tower would not be detrimental to the park area, but does recognize the importance of the need of a cell tower in the area and requested earlier notification if possible.

*Carl Hicks
2188 Sheppard Mill Road
Danbury, NC 27016*

Mr. Hicks came to observe the rezoning process.

Chairman Inman closed the Public Hearing.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - PLANNING - SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUEST #186

Special Use Permit Request- Alltel # 186 - (199ft. Telecommunication Tower)

Planning Director David Sudderth presented the Special Use Request #186- Alltel's request for a Special Use permit for the construction of a 199 ft. telecommunication tower.

SITE OWNER: Carl J. Hicks

APPLICANT: Alltel Communications Inc.

INITIAL SERVICE PROVIDER: Alltel Communications Inc.

SITE LOCATION: The property is located on the south side of Mission Rd. approximately .4 mile from the intersection of Pitzer Rd. (SR# 1697) and Mission Rd. (SR# 1702).

Map: 6957 Parcel: 6646 PIN #: 6957-00-41-6646

Deed Book: 427 Page: 171 Township: Danbury

SITE INFORMATION:

PARCEL SIZE: Total tract 47.453 acres

PROPOSED LEASE LOT: .23 acres, 10,000 sq. ft. (100 ft. x 100 ft.)

PROPOSED TOWER HEIGHT: 195 FT. (199' to top appurtenance)

PROPOSED TOWER TYPE: Monopole tower located within a 60 ft. x 60 ft. fenced equipment compound.

CAPACITY: (6) Antennae arrays

ZONING DISTRICT: RA (Residential Agricultural)

FLOOD HAZARD AREA: Not located in flood hazard area.

FIRM MAP #: 370362 0100B

FIRM MAP ZONE: Zone X - Area outside 500-year floodplain.

WATERSHED DISTRICT: N/A

EMERGENCY SERVICES: Danbury VFD, EMS - Station # 102 Lawsonville.

ACCESS: Access for the site will be from a proposed 20 ft. access easement beginning at Mission Rd. (SR# 1702) and terminating at the leased area. The easement is incorporated entirely within the Hicks property.

STAFF COMMENTS: The proposed site meets the requirements as set forth in appendix B of the zoning ordinance. The Center for Municipal Solutions has given us a letter of approval stating that the applicants have fulfilled the technical requirements of the ordinance. A staff review of the application and site concur with this recommendation. The zoning requirements for issuing a special use permit are:

Mr. Bill Howard, Alltel Communications, briefed the Board on the proposed project to place a 199 ft monopole tower with ancillary structures at the base located on Mission Road in Danbury.

Mr. Howard noted the following regarding the special use permit:

Placement of the tower will extend and improve Alltel's wireless communication services into and around the town of Danbury

Alltel will own, construct, and manage the facility

Alltel will lease space on the tower and inside the compound to wireless communication services providers and other potential tower users

Alltel will be the first provider using the facility with its antenna installed at the 190' elevation on the tower

Tower will have capacity to lease to 5 other carriers

Tried to lease space on the tower at Booth Mountain - no space available

Review of the topography of the area does present issues

Provides good coverage to the Town of Danbury and also for county facilities in and around the Town

All regulations of the Stokes County Cell Tower Ordinance has been followed

Have read and agreed to the recommendations from the Center for Municipal Solutions

Hope to have the tower up within 120 days

Mr. Rusty Monroe, The Center for Municipal Solutions, noted the following regarding the special use permit for the placement of a 199ft monopole tower on Mission Road:

Need for service in the immediate area has been supported with submitted propagation studies and supporting modeling information

Reviewed the application and recommend the approval of the application with considerations and conditionals presented to Alltel, which Alltel has agreed too

Recommendation to the County as regards to the issuance of a Special Use Permit including conditions to Alltel Communications for the proposed site on Mission Road

Alltel is an excellent firm to work with

The Board discussed the Special Use Permit, placement of the tower on Mission Road, and need for service within the area.

Director Sudderth stated there had been one call questioning what was being placed on the property.

Director Sudderth reviewed the following regarding a special use permit and requested the Board's response to each of the following

In granting a conditional use, the responsible body shall insure:

136.8 Action by the Responsible Body

The responsible body shall approve, modify, or deny the application for special use following the public hearing.

In granting a special use, the responsible body shall insure:

(a) *The requested use is listed among the special uses in the district for which application is made. Yes (5-0)*

(b) *The requested use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare. Yes (5-0)*

(c) *The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the surrounding or adjoining districts, nor be detrimental to the health, morals, or welfare. Yes (5-0)*

(d) Due consideration has been given to the suitability of the property for the use applied for with respect to trends of growth or change; the effect of the proposed use upon the community; requirements for transportation, schools, parks, playgrounds, recreational area, conservation of natural resources, preservation of floodplains, and encouraging the most appropriate use of the land. Yes (5-0)

(e) Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. Yes (5-0)

(f) That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets. Yes (5-0)

Director Sudderth included the Intent of Special Use District and Conditions and Guarantees for the Board's information.
136.1 Intent of Special Use District

The development and execution of this Ordinance is based upon the division of the County's jurisdiction into districts where the use of the land and buildings and structures in relation to the land are substantially uniform. It is understood that certain uses which because of their unique characteristics, are not easily classified into any particular zoning district or districts. In this situation, individual consideration for each case must be taken to determine the impact of those uses upon surrounding land and the public need for that particular use in that specific location. In these situations, a special use permit must be obtained.

136.9 Conditions and Guarantees

Prior to the granting of any special use, the Planning Board may recommend, and the responsible body may stipulate, such conditions and restrictions upon the establishment, location, reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of the special use as it deemed necessary for the protection of the public interest and to secure compliance with the standards and requirements specified in Subsection 136.5 above. In all cases in which special uses are granted, the responsible body shall require such evidence and guarantees as it may deem necessary as proof that the conditions stipulated are being met. Conditions may include, but not limited to, the following:

(a) Conditions may be imposed to abate or restrict noise, smoke, dust, or other elements that may affect surrounding properties.

(b) Establish setback, side, front, and rear yard requirements necessary for orderly expansion and to prevent traffic congestion.

(c) Provide adjoining property with a buffer or shield from view of the proposed use if necessary.

(d) Establish a time limit at expiration of which the permit or approval shall no longer be valid, or shall require renewal.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Board voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of Alltel's Special Use Request # 186 for a 199 ft. monopole telecommunication tower to be located off Mission Rd. The Board stated that the service was needed and that the proposed location provided a good site.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the Special Use Permit #186 for a 199ft monopole telecommunications tower to be located off Mission Road.

Commissioner Lankford moved to approve the Special Use Permit #186 for a 199ft monopole telecommunications tower to be located off Mission Road.

Commissioner Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING - REZONING REQUEST #187 - WILLIAM O EAST - (RA to RR) ONE LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION

Chairman Inman opened the Public Hearing for the Rezoning Request #187 (RA to RR) for a one lot residential subdivision

There were no public comments.

Chairman Inman closed the Public Hearing.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - PLANNING- REZONING REQUEST #187

William O. East RA to RR # 187

Planning Director David Sudderth presented Rezoning Request #187 to Rezone approximately 1.132 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to RR (Residential Restricted) for a 1-lot residential subdivision.

SITE OWNER: William O. East

APPLICANT: William O. and Betty East

SITE LOCATION: The property is located off a proposed 30 ft. access easement off Capella Rd. (SR# 2006)

Map: 6915

Parcel: 7682

PIN #: 6915-00-09-7682

Deed Book: 544 Page: 2487

Township: Yadkin

SITE INFORMATION:

PARCEL SIZE: Total tract 1.132 acres

ZONING DISTRICT: RA (Residential Agricultural)

PROPOSED DISTRICT: RR (**Residential Restricted**) for a 1-lot subdivision.

FLOOD HAZARD AREA: Not located in flood hazard area.

FIRM MAP #: 370362 0075 B

FIRM MAP ZONE: Zone X - Area outside 500-year floodplain.

WATERSHED DISTRICT: N/A

SEPTIC/WATER APPROVAL: The site has been evaluated and was found to be suitable for septic disposal by Brandon Joyce, RS. (3-bedroom system).

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: Mt. Olive Elementary, Chestnut Grove Middle, West Stokes High

EMERGENCY SERVICES: Sauratown VFD, EMS - Station # 103 - Pinnacle

EROSION CONTROL: Plan submittal will only be required if more than one acre of land is disturbed during the construction process.

ACCESS: Access for proposed lots would be off of Capella Rd. (SR# 2006). The developer if necessary would be required to submit information to NCDOT to obtain the necessary driveway approval.

SURROUNDING LAND USE: The subject property is currently vacant. The surrounding property is zoned RA (Residential Agricultural) and is used for residential purposes. The RR (Residential Restricted) allows for the placement of multi-sectional manufactured housing, modular housing, and stick-built homes. The request is consistent with the housing types within the immediate vicinity of the proposed site.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER:

Consistency with surrounding housing types.

STAFF COMMENTS: This rezoning request comes to the Board as a request for a general use rezoning for a 1-lot residential subdivision to be rezoned to RR (Residential Restricted). This district would allow stick built, modular homes, and multi-sectional manufactured housing. The property owner is requesting this one lot division to allow a family member a building site for a residence. The request is necessary because the proposed lot would exceed the number of subdivision cuts that can be allowed on a parcel by the Stokes County Subdivision Regulations. The applicant had already allowed three other lots to be subdivided from the parent parcel. The addition of one home in this area should not pose a substantial burden on the community infrastructure. The Planning staff has no problem with this request.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: *The Planning Board recommended by a vote of 8 to 0 the rezoning request by William O. and Betty East # 187 to rezone 1.132 acres from RA to RR for a 1 - lot subdivision. The Board had no problem with the request.*

Director Sudderth noted that there was no opposition to the rezoning request.

The Board had no concerns with the request.

Vice Chairman Walker moved to approve the Rezoning Request #187 to rezone approximately 1.132 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to RR (Residential Restricted) for a 1-lot residential subdivision. Commissioner Carroll seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - GOVERNING BODY - PART (PIEDMONT AUTHORITY FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION) - PRESENTATION ON POLICIES AND ACTION FOR REGIONAL GROWTH

Director Sudderth presented the following information regarding the PART -2025 Policies and Actions for Regional Growth:

- The Piedmont Authority for Regional Transportation (PART) is requesting member counties to adopt by resolution the 2025 Policies and Actions for Regional Growth. The Stokes County Board of Commissioners heard a presentation by Mr. James E. Yarbrough, Jr. concerning the proposed 2025 Policies and Actions for Regional Growth on October 3, 2006. The Board of Commissioners requested that the Stokes County

Planning Board review this policy statement and forward a recommendation to them concerning the matter. There are currently 29 Planning and Governing Boards within the region who have approved the Policies and Actions document. These include the surrounding counties of Surry, Rockingham, Forsyth and Guilford.

- **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Planning Board recommended by a vote of 6 to 2 to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the resolution concerning the "2025 Policies for Regional Growth". Some of the members had concerns that the county could not provide financial incentives to encourage redevelopment of infill and "under invested" areas. There was also concern that adoption of the resolution might bind the county to items that they could not accomplish. The majority of the Board stated that they saw this resolution as a first step toward improvement of regional planning concerning transportation issues.

Director Sudderth noted that Mr. James Yarborough was unable to attend the meeting and would be willing to come to another meeting to discuss issues regarding the Resolution submitted by PART. This would allow the three new members to hear the presentation before considering the Resolution.

Interim County Manager Darlene Bullins presented comments on the Resolution concerning PART Land Use Policies from County Attorney Edward Powell and Economic Development Director Ron Morgan.

The Board discussed postponing the issue until Mr. Yarborough can present the information to the Board. Chairman Inman, with consensus of the Board, directed Planning Director Sudderth and Clerk to Board Darlene Bullins to schedule Mr. Yarborough for another Commissioner's meeting for the presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - GOVERNING BODY - CHRISTMAS LUNCH

Vice Chairman Walker requested to consider changing the amount allocated for the Christmas lunch.

Commissioner Lankford expressed concerns in changing the amount that has already been allocated which was a \$200 increase over last year.

Chairman Inman directed Interim County Manager Bullins to return the estimates to the Board at the December 11th meeting for further discussion.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - GOVERNING BODY - RULES OF PROCEDURES AND CODE OF ETHICS

Commissioner Carroll requested that the Board consider a special meeting to discuss the following issues:

- Rules of Procedures
- Code of Ethics
- Guidelines for compensation for Board members
- Board appointments

Clerk to the Board Darlene Bullins presented Board members with the Rules of Procedures and Code of Ethics.

Vice Chairman Walker questioned the Code of Ethics claim that was filed against him in 2005.

Commissioner Carroll also noted that the Ethics complaint against Vice Chairman Walker was never dealt with by the previous Board.

Commissioner Lankford requested the Board consider the following:

- Possibly changing the meeting times for the Board - 2nd Monday - 2:00pm and 4th Monday 6:00 pm.
- All night meetings would start at 6:00 pm
- Format of the agenda (consent agenda)

Commissioner Lankford noted that the afternoon meeting would allow 2nd and 3rd shift workers along with the Elderly a chance to attend a meeting.

Commissioner Carroll also noted that department heads if possible could be scheduled during the day meeting.

Clerk to the Board Darlene Bullins requested that the new meeting schedule be effective in January 2007.

Commissioner Carroll noted that the invitation to hold a meeting in a different location should include to meet at a different location by invitation at either the 2nd or 4th Monday.

Director Sudderth noted that the 7:00 pm time for Planning Meeting works well for those attending planning meetings.

Vice Chairman Walker requested additional time to discuss changing the meeting times with citizens for their input.

Vice Chairman Walker requested to use procedures such as approved motion by consensus.

The Board discussed calling a special meeting for next week or recessing the Monday night meeting to Tuesday to discuss the issues brought forth.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Inman entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Lankford moved to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Darlene M. Bullins
Clerk to the Board

J. Leon Inman
Chairman