

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF STOKES)
)

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS
STOKES COUNTY GOVERNMENT
DANBURY, NORTH CAROLINA
JUNE 5, 2007

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, June 5, 2007 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:
County Manager K. Bryan Steen
Clerk to the Board Darlene Bullins
Planning Director David Sudderth
Code Enforcement Officer Jimmy Kallam
Zoning Enforcement Officer Gary Williams

Chairman Leon Inman called the meeting to order.

Chairman Inman 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.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT – GOVERNING BODY – APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Inman entertained a motion to approve or amend the agenda for the June 5, 2007 meeting.

Vice Chairman Walker moved to approve the June 5, 2007 agenda.

Commissioner Lankford seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING – Germanton Autos LLC #193 (RA to H-B)

Chairman Inman called the Public Hearing for Germanton Autos LLC to order.

There were no public comments.

Chairman Inman closed the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING – Bullins & Smith Inc. #194 -(RA to RE)

Chairman Inman called the Public Hearing for Bullins & Smith Inc. to order.

There were no public comments.

Chairman Inman closed the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING – Jane Carroll Tuttle #195 (RA to RE-CU)

Chairman Inman called the Public Hearing for Jane Carroll Tuttle to order.

There were no public comments.

Chairman Inman closed the Public Hearing.

REZONING REQUEST #193 – Germanton Autos LLC (RA to H-B)

Planning Director David Sudderth presented Rezoning Request #193- Germanton Autos LLC to rezone approximately .49 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to H-B (Highway Business). Director Sudderth presented the following information to the Board for their consideration:

REQUEST: Rezone approximately .49 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to H-B (Highway Business).

SITE OWNER: Germanton Autos L.L.C.

APPLICANT: Bart Burroughs

SITE LOCATION: The property is located at 3525 NC Hwy 8 & 65 in Germanton, NC.

Map: 693111 **Parcel:** 0673 **PIN #:** 6931-11-76-0673

Deed Book: 565 **Page:** 110 **Township:** Meadows

SITE INFORMATION:

PARCEL SIZE: Total tract .49 acres, (21,344.4) sq. ft.

CURRENT USE: There is currently a single-family residence on the property, which has been removed from the property.

ZONING DISTRICT: RA (Residential Agricultural)

PROPOSED DISTRICT: H-B (Highway Business)

Minimum lot size is 20,000 sq. ft. (.459 acre)

FLOOD HAZARD AREA: Not located in flood hazard area.

FIRM MAP #: 3710693100 J

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

WATERSHED DISTRICT: No

SEPTIC/WATER APPROVAL: Stokes County Environmental Health section has identified and inspected an existing septic system on the property.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: N/A

EMERGENCY SERVICES: Rural Hall VFD, EMS - Station # 101 Walnut Cove.

EROSION CONTROL: N/A until construction begins.

ACCESS: The site will have to have an approved commercial driveway permit from NCDOT. The current residential access is located off of NC Hwy 8 & 65 across from the Friendship Rd. intersection with NC 8 & 65.

SURROUNDING LAND USE: The adjacent surrounding properties are zoned RA (Residential Agricultural) to the east, south and west and H-B (Highway Business) and C-S (Community Shopping), Germanton Gallery & Winery and Germanton Grocery to the north. Other commercial zones located nearby are Germanton Mercantile and Tuttle's Creekside Restaurant on NC Hwy 8 & 65 about .1 mile away, and the Germanton Shell station is located .6 mile east of the site located where NC 8 and NC 65 split.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER: As with all general use rezoning petitions the Board should consider all the impacts both positive and negative that a commercial development brings with it.

- Impact on surrounding development.
- Consistency with surrounding development
- Impact on community infrastructure, roads, public services etc.
- Increase in commercial tax base.
- Community acceptance
- Traffic

STAFF COMMENTS: The Planning staff does not see a problem with the request. The properties across the road are zoned C-S and H-B. There are multiple commercial zones within a mile of the site. There are mixed residential and commercial uses along NC Hwy 8 & 65 in the Germanton community. The addition of a commercially zoned property in this area should not have an adverse effect on the community.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Board recommended by a 8 to 0 vote to recommend approval of rezoning request # 193 by Germanton Autos L.L.C. from RA to H-B. The Board felt that the request was consistent with the current development trends in the Germanton area.

Director Sudderth noted that there were no calls regarding the rezoning request.

The Board discussed the rezoning request #193.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the Rezoning Request #193 – Germanton Autos, LLC.

Commissioner Lankford moved to approve the Rezoning Request #193 – Germanton Autos, LLC (RA to H-B). Commissioner Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

REZONING REQUEST #194 – Bullins and Smith, Inc (RA to RE-CU)

Planning Director David Sudderth presented Rezoning Request #194- Bullins and Smith, Inc. to rezone approximately 1.1081 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to RE-CU (Residential Exclusive Conditional Use) for a 1-lot residential subdivision. Director Sudderth presented the following information to the Board for their consideration:

REQUEST: Rezone approximately 1.1081 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to RE-CU (Residential Exclusive Conditional Use) for a 1-lot residential subdivision.

SITE OWNER: Bullins & Smith Inc.

APPLICANT: Bullins & Smith Inc.

SITE LOCATION: The property is located on Wall Loop Rd. (SR#1985) approximately .1 miles from the intersection of NC Hwy 8 and Wall Loop Rd.

Map: 695503

Parcel(s): 2008

PIN #: 6955-03-03-2008

Deed Book(s): 553

Page(s): 001

Township: Meadows

SITE INFORMATION:

PARCEL SIZE: Total tract 13.905 acres

ZONING DISTRICT: RA (Residential Agricultural)

PROPOSED DISTRICT: RE (Residential Exclusive)

TOTAL LOTS: Proposed 1-lot subdivision.

LOT SIZE: 1.081 acre

FLOOD HAZARD AREA: Not located in flood hazard area.

FIRM MAP #: 3710694400J

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

WATERSHED DISTRICT: N/A

SEPTIC/WATER APPROVAL: Mr. Joseph A. Hinton a licensed soil scientist has evaluated the site for septic disposal and found it provisionally suitable for a septic system. This report was prepared in June 2006 for Doyle Bullins who is the representative for Bullins & Smith Inc. Individual septic permits will have to be issued for each proposed lot by the Stokes County Health Department, (Environmental Health Section).

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: Germanton Elementary, Southeastern Middle, South Stokes High

EMERGENCY SERVICES: South Stokes VFD, EMS - Station # 101 – Walnut Cove.

EROSION CONTROL: Plan would be submitted at permitting phase and for construction with North Carolina Division of Environment Health and Natural Resources, (DEHNR) if necessary.

ACCESS: Lot access for would be off of Wall Loop Rd. (SR# 1985).

SURROUNDING LAND USE: The subject property is currently vacant. The surrounding property on all sides is zoned RA (Residential Agricultural) and is either vacant or used for residential purposes.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER:

- Consistency with surrounding housing types.
- Housing compatibility with surrounding neighborhood.
- Impact on existing community infrastructure, schools, roads, public services etc.
- Increase in residential tax base.
- Density of development

STAFF COMMENTS: This rezoning request comes to the Board as a request for a conditional use rezoning for a 1-lot residential subdivision to be rezoned to RE (Residential Exclusive) that would allow stick built and modular housing. The Board may discuss the development plan in detail. The developer has already utilized a minor subdivision on the property creating four (4) lots adjacent to the proposed site. The request for an additional lot created the major subdivision request. The request is necessary because the proposed lot would exceed the number of subdivision cuts that can be allowed on a parent parcel by the Stokes County Subdivision Regulations. The addition of stick-built homes in this area is consistent with the immediate surrounding property development. The addition of a subdivision consisting of (1)- lot on a state maintained road should not have a major impact on the surrounding property or infrastructure in the general area, however the Board should be take into consideration the County's and immediate community's ability to serve new residences. The subdivision review committee will have to review the subdivision proposal on its technical merits if approved by the Board.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: The Board voted 8 to 0 to recommend rezoning request # 194 by Bullins & Smith Inc. from RA to RE for a 1-lot residential subdivision.

Director Sudderth noted that there were no calls regarding the rezoning request.

The Board discussed the rezoning request.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the Rezoning Request #194 – Bullins & Smith Inc.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Rezoning Request #194 – Bullins and Smith, Inc. (RA to RE-CU). Vice Chairman Walker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

REZONING REQUEST #195 – Jane Carroll Tuttle (RA to RE-CU)

Chairman Inman noted before Director Sudderth presented any information that Ms. Tuttle may choose Stokes Realty and Auction for marketing the property.

Chairman Inman requested to abstain from discussion and voting on the rezoning request due to being an auctioneer for Stokes Realty and Auction.

Commissioner Smith also requested to abstain from discussion and voting on the rezoning request due to being an auctioneer for Stokes Realty and Auction.

Chairman Inman turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Walker.

Vice Chairman Walker entertained a motion to allow Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith to abstain from discussion and voting on Rezoning Request #195.

Commissioner Carroll moved to allow Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith to abstain from discussion and voting on Rezoning Request #195 due to their association with Stokes Realty and Auction. Commissioner Lankford seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Planning Director David Sudderth presented Rezoning Request #195- Jane Carroll Tuttle to rezone approximately 9.206 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to RE-CU

(Residential Exclusive Conditional Use) for a 4-lot residential subdivision. Director Sudderth presented the following information to the Board for their consideration:

REQUEST: Rezone approximately 9.206 acres from RA (Residential Agricultural) to RE-CU (Residential Exclusive Conditional Use) for a 4-lot residential subdivision.

SITE OWNER: Jane Carroll Tuttle

APPLICANT: Jane Carroll Tuttle

SITE LOCATION: The property is located on the south side of Denny Rd. (SR#2000) approximately .1 miles north of the intersection of Denny Rd. and NC Hwy 66.

Map: 690302

Parcel: 8592

PIN #: 6903-02-99-8592

Deed Book: 268

Page: 241

Township: Yadkin

SITE INFORMATION:

PARCEL SIZE: Total tract 9.206 acres

ZONING DISTRICT: RA (Residential Agricultural)

PROPOSED DISTRICT: RE-CU (Residential Restricted Conditional Use) for a 3-lot subdivision.

FLOOD HAZARD AREA: Not located in flood hazard area.

FIRM MAP #: 3710690300J

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

WATERSHED DISTRICT: N/A

SEPTIC/WATER APPROVAL: Mr. Joseph A. Hinton a licensed soil scientist has evaluated the site for septic disposal and found it provisionally suitable for septic systems. This report was prepared in May 2007 for Stokes Realty & Auction on behalf of Jane Carroll Tuttle who is the applicant. Individual septic permits will have to be issued for each proposed lot by the Stokes County Health Department, (Environmental Health Section).

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

EMERGENCY SERVICES: Sauratown VFD, EMS - Station # 3 – 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 Denny Rd. (SR# 2000). The developer would be required to submit information to NCDOT to obtain the necessary subdivision driveway approval.

SURROUNDING LAND USE: The subject property is currently vacant. The surrounding property is zoned RA (Residential Agricultural) and is used for residential and agricultural purposes. The primary housing type along Denny Rd. is a mixture of stick-built homes, and manufactured housing. This proposal of single-family dwellings would consistent with the current housing in the area.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER:

- Consistency with surrounding housing types.
- Housing compatibility with surrounding neighborhood.
- Impact on existing community infrastructure, schools, roads, public services etc.

STAFF COMMENTS: This rezoning request comes to the Board as a request for a conditional use rezoning for a 4-lot residential subdivision to be rezoned to RE –CU (Residential Exclusive) that would allow stick built, and modular homes. The Board may discuss the development plan in detail. The Board did hear a request for a three-lot subdivision on 12.67 acres of land by Sarah Riddle on October 4, 2005 further down Denny Rd. The request was turned down by a vote of 2 to 1. The Board cited impact on the schools. There were some other issues concerning this particular tract of land that may have caused the request to be turned down. The addition of stick-built homes in this area is consistent with the mixed uses on the surrounding property and should not pose a substantial burden on the community infrastructure. The subdivision review committee will have to review the subdivision proposal on its technical merits if approved by the Board.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Board recommended by a vote of 8 to 0 to approve rezoning request # 195 by Jane Carroll Tuttle from RA to RE-CU for a 4-lot residential subdivision. The Board felt that the request was consistent with the development pattern in the area.

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

Mr. Dean Slate, Surveyor was in attendance for the meeting.

The Board discussed the rezoning request.

Vice Chairman Walker entertained a motion regarding the Rezoning Request -Jane Carroll Tuttle #195 – (RA to RE-CU).

Commissioner Lankford moved to approve the Rezoning Request #195 – Jane Carroll Tuttle (RA to RE-CU). Commissioner Carroll seconded and the motion carried (3-0) with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting).

Planning Director David Sudderth explained the following Recommended Conditions for Jane Carroll Tuttle (RE-CU) 4- lot Residential Subdivision #195:

1. The proposed use shall be for a “4-lot residential subdivision” consisting of stick built and modular homes in the RE-CU zoning district.
2. NCDOT shall approve and permit driveway entrances to the subdivision.
3. Adequate storm water facilities shall be provided for each lot, including the placement of NCDOT approved drain tile under each driveway if necessary.

4. All improvements shall be completed before final subdivision approval is granted by the (SRC) Subdivision Review Committee.
5. 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.
6. Each dwelling unit shall also have a visible lot number in a numbering scheme approved by the County to facilitate rapid emergency response (E- 911).
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. The Rules and Regulations of the Developer, as modified by the developer at the prior hearing (s) on this request, shall not be inconsistent with these conditions. Any conflict between said Rules and Regulations shall be resolved in favor of these conditions.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. The lots approved shall not be further subdivided.
14. The Conditional Use permit will expire one (1) year after approval is received from the Board of Commissioners. If no work on infrastructure improvement has begun within this time frame, the Conditional Use permit will expire. The Planning Department shall determine if substantial work or progress has been made to allow continuance of the project.

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

Director Sudderth noted that Ms. Tuttle had agreed to all the recommended conditions.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: The Board recommended by a vote of 8 to 0 approval of the conditions listed above for rezoning request # 195 by Jane Carroll Tuttle from RA to RE-CU for a 4-lot residential subdivision.

The Board may want to consider additional conditions concerning buffering, and access or any other condition the Board may deem applicable based on public comment or observation. All conditional use permits must be exercised within one (1) year or they expire.

Director Sudderth reviewed the following regarding a conditional use permit:

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

134.1 Compliance with Other Codes

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

134.2 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.

134.3 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.

Director Sudderth requested the Board's response to 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. (3-0 with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting)
- (b) The requested use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare. (3-0 with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting)
- (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. (3-0 with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting)
- (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. (3-0 with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting)
- (e) Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. (3-0 with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting)

- (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. (3-0 with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting)

The Board discussed the recommended conditions.

Vice Chairman Walker entertained a motion regarding the Conditional Use Permit for Rezoning Request #195 – Jane Carroll Tuttle.

Commissioner Carroll moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Rezoning Request #195- Jane Carroll Tuttle. Commissioner Lankford seconded and the motion carried (3-0) with Chairman Inman and Commissioner Smith excused from voting).

Vice Chairman Walker turned the meeting back over to Chairman Inman.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

DISCUSSION AGENDA - Departmental Procedures

Planning Director David Sudderth along with Code Enforcement Officer Jimmy Kallam and Zoning Enforcement Officer Gary Williams discussed departmental procedures with the Board.

Brochures

Planning Director Sudderth presented the Board with brochures that the Department has developed to assist the citizens with planning and permit questions. (Manufacturing Home Requirements, Guidelines for Building a Deck, Handbook for Frequent Questions about Residential Building, Application for Single Family Dwelling-Building/Zoning Permit, etc.) Director Sudderth noted that future plans are to have brochures on the County's website.

Permits – One year or older

Planning Director Sudderth discussed departmental policies for renewing building permits. Director Sudderth requested direction from the Board to classify permits that are not exercised within one year (with no renewal request) be considered a “dead” permit. Before the end of that year, the landowner has the opportunity to renew the permit. If the landowner came back after the permit has been classified as a “dead” permit, the landowner would have to obtain another permit.

Refunds

The Department currently prorates refunds according to the number of inspections that has been performed on the property. Director Sudderth requested direction from the Board to allow the department to exercise the policy that a refund must be requested within one year from the date of the issuance.

The Board discussed the departmental procedures involving refunds presented by Director Sudderth. Director Sudderth noted that these permits are usually permits that the landowner has not started. Older permits can be subject to inspection according to Building Codes, which may have been valid 5-10 years ago.

Staging Visits for Efficiency

Director Sudderth noted that Planning and Environmental Health has started coordinating trips if possible to job sites in order to save gas. The Department also tries to arrange as many inspection within the same area as possible, to save gas, travel and staff time.

Re-inspection Fees

Director Sudderth noted that the department's current re-inspection fee is \$30.00 with some of the surrounding counties at \$50. The Board discussed the cost of re-inspection fees. Re-inspection fees can occur if the landowner is not at home, job has to be redone, or items have not been completed prior to calling the department for the inspection. Director Sudderth noted the staff takes extra steps to make sure the landowner understands why there is a re-inspection fee and stresses what must be done to eliminate another re-inspection fee.

Retention and Disposal Policy

Director Sudderth requested direction regarding a retention and disposal policy for departmental records. Director Sudderth noted the limited space for storage and several old records currently being stored in buildings located off the Government Center Complex. State law requires retention of 6 years. The Board suggested the County Manager do a countywide assessment of record retention for all departments. Director Sudderth noted that certain records within his department must be retained indefinitely.

Condemnation of Property

Director Sudderth discussed condemnation of property. Director Sudderth noted that the department receives complaints regarding property such as homes that have been burned, abandoned, etc. Director Sudderth explained the County's responsibility in condemnation of property, cost to the County, and county liability. The Board discussed procedures that must be following in condemnation of property.

Zoning Violations

Director Sudderth discussed zoning violations. Director Sudderth discussed the

procedure outlined in the County's Ordinance: Warning Citation first, Civil Citation second, and if there is no response the violation is turned over to the County Attorney for processing to take to Superior Court. Director Sudderth noted before any citation, there are several discussions with the property owner trying to eliminate further action. The property owner can appeal to the Board of Adjustments if they disagree with the County's Zoning Enforcement Officer.

Director Sudderth noted that limited action regarding zoning violations has been taken due to the changing of county attorneys within the past year.

Director Sudderth requested direction from the Board in pursuing the zoning violations in the county.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed Director Sudderth to proceed with zoning violations according to the law, county ordinance, and common sense. Director Sudderth reiterated that a landowner always has the option to appeal any decision made by the Zoning Enforcement Officer to the Board of Adjustments and his office always tries to work with the landowner within reason.

Director Sudderth expressed his appreciation to the Board for input regarding the departmental procedures discussed at tonight's meeting.

Chairman Inman requested Director Sudderth to place any new departmental procedures on the next planning agenda for the Board's consideration.

Adjournment

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

Commissioner Smith moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chairman Walker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Darlene M. Bullins
Clerk to the Board

J. Leon Inman
Chairman