

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ROWAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
MARCH 18, 2002 – 7:00 PM
J. NEWTON COHEN SR. ROOM, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

Present: Steve Blount, Chairman
Gus Andrews, Vice-Chairman
Arnold Chamberlain, Member
Frank Tadlock, Member
Leda Belk, Member

The County Manager, the Clerk to the Board, the Finance Director and the County Attorney were also present.

Chairman Blount called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Tadlock provided the Invocation and Commissioner Belk led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA:

Chairman Blount asked that Item #2 be deleted after receiving notification from Chris Bostian that he no longer wished to address the Board.

There were no additions to the agenda.

COMMISSIONER LIAISON REPORTS:

Commissioner Andrews stated that he had attended the grand opening of the Love Center, which is for homeless veterans. Commissioner Andrews was impressed with the facility and particularly impressed with the assistance the program offers to veterans. Commissioner Andrews described the grand opening as one of the “neatest” events he had attended since becoming a Commissioner. Commissioner Andrews stated that Commissioner Chamberlain also attended and did an excellent job as a speaker on behalf of the center.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA:

Commissioner Andrews made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Chamberlain seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following:

- A. Approval of the 03/04/2002 minutes.
- B. Approval of JCPC Board members for JCPC certification.
- C. Approval to set a public hearing for the proposed road name of Starnes Farm Lane.
- D. Approve a unanimous petition for the road name of Dan Ridge Lane.
- E. Approve a unanimous petition for the road name of Reid Farm Road.
- F. Approval Budget Amendments.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no citizens present who wished to address the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE STRUCTURE READDRESSING:

Fredda Greer of the Planning Department explained that staff had been working with ASI Landmark Company to survey the incorrect addressing situations within the county. Ms. Greer stated that the road names and addresses submitted before the Board came from one map in the pilot area. Ms. Greer reported that (20) addresses were incorrectly numbered or out of sequence. Ms. Greer continued by explaining that both the property owners and residents were notified of the need for address correction and were also informed of the public hearing scheduled for March 18, 2002. Ms. Greer stated that Planning received one call concerning the notification and staff worked with the property owner without readdressing that citizen.

Ms. Greer stated that staff recommends approval of the address corrections.

Chairman Blount requested clarification from Ms. Greer, for the sake of the audience, as to the purpose of the readdressing. Ms. Greer explained that the purpose is to correct addresses within Rowan County in order to efficiently dispatch emergency services and help maintain government data.

Chairman Blount read the list of current and proposed new addresses as follows:

Current:

8736 Cloverfield Drive
8725 Dogwood Drive
8702 Dogwood Drive
7929 Unity Church Road
7923 Grand Canyon Road

Proposed:

8687 Cloverfield Drive
8720 Dogwood Drive
8640 Dogwood Drive
7871 Unity Church Road
7987 Grand Canyon Road

2720 Montana Drive
8944 Dogwood Drive
9275A Dogwood Drive
8607 Sunset End Lane
6965 Unity Church Road
6837 Unity Church Road
6791 Unity Church Road
6797 Unity Church Road
8118 Park Edwards Road
352 Cedar Brook Drive
9028 Cloverfield Drive
8753B Cloverfield Drive
8753A Cloverfield Drive
8580 Sunset End Lane

7936 Nevada Place
8970 Dogwood Drive
9325 Dogwood Drive
8611 Sunset End Lane
6935 Unity Church Road
168 Blake Road
265 Blake Road
281 Blake Road
8018 Park Edwards Road
332 Cedar Brook Drive
7815 Longbriar Drive
8753 Cloverfield Drive
8745 Cloverfield Drive
8570 Sunset End Lane

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments concerning the address changes.

Three being no one who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Tadlock made a motion to accept the staff recommendations to correct the addresses as presented. Commissioner Belk seconded the motion. The motion passed carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED ROAD NAMES OF AFTON ROAD, BAMBOO LANE AND CADE LANE:

Fredda Greer described Afton Road, Bamboo Lane and Cade Lane, as coming from Map 1 in the pilot area. Ms. Greer stated that there were seven roads that needed to be named, however, four property owners along those roads, through petition, chose to name the road themselves.

Ms. Greer stated that Planning had not received any response back from the three or four residents on each of the roads, who received notification concerning the public hearing.

Ms. Greer stated that staff recommends approval of the three roads as advertised and presented.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments concerning the proposed road names of Afton Road, Bamboo Lane and Cade Lane.

There being no one who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to name the roads Afton Road, Bamboo Lane and Cade Lane as presented by Ms. Greer. Commissioner Tadlock seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR Z-28-01 AND CUP-04-02 (CUD) RA TO CBI, JACK PHILLIPS, OWNER:

Chairman Blount read the Chairman’s speech (Exhibit A) and declared the public hearing for consideration of Z-28-01 and CUP-04-02 to be in session. Chairman Blount stated that the hearing would focus on applications submitted by Mr. Jack Phillips, Jr. for rezoning of Tax Parcel 514-015 and 514-025 from Rural Agricultural (RA) to Commercial Business, Industrial (CBI) and the establishment of a parallel conditional use district upon these same parcels located at 12955 Bringle Ferry Road.

The Clerk swore in all those that came forward to provide testimony in this case.

Ed Muire, Planning Staff, stated that he was the Re-Zoning Coordinator for this case and presented the staff report (Exhibit B). Mr. Muire explained the request to be for rezoning Tax Parcel 514-025 located at 12955 Bringle Ferry Road, as well as Tax Parcel 514-015. Mr. Muire stated that there has been a store located at the site since 1945, but it was not evident if the store had been in continuous operation since that time. The applicant has operated a store at the location since October 2000. Mr. Muire continued by explaining the request is for a change in zoning from RA to CBI for both tracts “to be in compliance with conforming use.” Mr. Muire stated that a previous zoning text change in 1998 had caused the site to be a non-conforming use. The applicant also submitted a parallel conditional use district (CUD) application to limit future uses in the proposed CBI district.

Mr. Muire summarized the zoning review, highlighting the following items:

- #2 Consistency with the requested zoning district’s purpose and intent.
- #3 Compatibility of all uses within the proposed district classification with other properties and conditions within the vicinity.

Mr. Muire outlined sixteen (16) proposed uses chosen by the applicant, out of the ninety-eight (98) permitted uses in the CBI district: 1) Greenhouses 2) Wholesale trade-durable goods 3) Brick, stone & related construction materials 4) Wholesale trade-nondurable goods 5) Farm supplies 6) Building materials, hardware, garden supplies 7) General merchandise stores 8) Food stores 9) Automotive dealers and gasoline service stations 10) Apparel and accessory stores 11) Home furniture, furnishings and equipment stores 12) Eating and drinking places (excludes drinking establishments) 13) Miscellaneous retail 14) Campground and RV parks 15) Miscellaneous repair services, and 16) Amusement and recreational services (limited to riding stables only). Mr. Muire noted the campground and RV parks, and stables are conditional uses in the RA district.

Mr. Muire reviewed the vicinity map (Exhibit “C”), the rezoning application (Exhibit “D”) and the application for Parallel Conditional Use Permit (Exhibit “E”).

Mr. Muire stated that Mr. Phillips had prepared written responses to the Parallel Conditional District Review evaluation criteria and the responses were listed in the staff report.

Mr. Muire continued by stating a courtesy hearing had been held at the Planning Board meeting on February 25, 2002, with Mrs. Cindy Stiller speaking against the requested use for a campground/RV park and concerns related to amusement services. The Planning Board voted favorably, 9-1, to forward a favorable recommendation for Z-28-01 and CUP-04-02 to the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Muire said Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request and the requested list of parallel conditional uses with the exception of a campground/RV park. Mr. Muire stated that Mr. Phillips may seek a modification to his parallel conditional use district application in the future for a campground/RV park, once a specific site plan has been developed and soil evaluations have found suitable areas for on-site sewage disposal.

In response to a query from Commissioner Andrews, Mr. Muire stated that Planning had taken out the Campground/RV Park due to no specific plan for this type of facility. Mr. Muire stated there are development standards in the Zoning Ordinance for Campground/RV Parks and the Planning Board meeting had the standards listed, with additional screening and buffering standards. Mr. Muire stated there were issues with the Environmental Health concerning how the area would perk and this had been explained to Mr. Phillips.

Commissioner Chamberlain asked Mr. Muire if he was of the opinion that Mr. Phillips was requesting the change to CBI for purposes that Mr. Phillips had in store for later, or to assist Mr. Phillips in selling some property. Mr. Muire responded that if Mr. Phillips wished to expand, the change would definitely benefit him. Mr. Muire stated that there is a provision in the Zoning Ordinance for a Special Use Permit (SUP), which would allow Mr. Phillips to expand under a site plan procedure through the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Muire stated that he couldn't answer the question as to what he “thinks” Mr. Phillips is going to do. Mr. Muire said the area seems to be a commercial area with the potential to do other things. Mr. Muire stated the current uses that Mr. Phillips has, and the proposed uses, do not seem in direct conflict with what is already in the area.

Chairman Blount stated that Mr. Muire indicated the list of uses would be acceptable in the RA district and asked if an individual must live on the property to have a business in the RA district. Mr. Muire responded yes and continued by saying that the point he was trying to make, was that if Mr. Phillips lived on the property, the uses were permitted. Chairman Blount stated that the limitation had been changed to assure that someone would not do something objectionable if they, too, had to live next door to the business.

Chairman Blount verified with Mr. Muire that the proposed businesses would not be allowed, unless Mr. Phillips lived on the property.

Chairman Blount called the applicant, Mr. Phillips, to address the Board.

1. Jack Phillips stated that he had performed a lot of work on the property and spent approximately \$5,000 on the roof of the barn and updated the gas pumps. Mr. Phillips said the building appears to have been added onto seven (7) times since 1945. Mr. Phillips explained that he had put block underpinning around the building, and had purchased vinyl to put on the building. Mr. Phillips stated that everything he was trying to do was a “plus” for the community and that he would not put in anything that would make the community look bad. Mr. Phillips expressed that he would like the opportunity to expand and “do some other things.” Mr. Phillips stated the property is not for sale, however he would “sell the business tomorrow.” Mr. Phillips informed the Board that he wanted to keep his property and remain in control of the property. Mr. Phillips described the area as a “good area to try a few things that Rowan County doesn’t have.”

Chairman Blount asked Mr. Phillips if he lived in the area. Mr. Phillips responded that he lives in Rockwell.

With no further questions for Mr. Phillips, Chairman Blount requested anyone wishing to provide testimony to please come forward.

2. Ms. Stiller presented pictures (Exhibit “F”) depicting her residence as related to the location of Mr. Phillips property. Ms. Stiller explained that Mr. Phillips had purchased the property from Ronnie Trexler. Ms. Stiller furnished copies of a letter dated May 12, 1999 (Exhibit “G”), issued by the Rowan County Health Department to Ronnie Trexler, which declared the property as having unsuitable soil conditions. Ms. Stiller also presented the Board with a statement from Steed Properties (Exhibit “H”) which states the business is for sale, at a price of \$185,000.00. Ms. Stiller presented a letter of affidavit from Pauline and Norman Beam (Exhibit “I”), whose house borders the backside of the property. Ms. Stiller provided copies of Salisbury Post classified ads (Exhibit “J”) listing the business for sale at \$185,000 during the month of February. Ms. Stiller also supplied copies of photographs (Exhibit “K”) taken from her backyard that depicted the close proximity of Mr. & Mrs. Beam’s home to Mr. Phillips property. Ms. Stiller continued by describing the area to consist of longtime residents and to be a stable neighborhood and she would not like to see the area changed. Ms. Stiller asked the Board to “save the neighborhood.” Ms. Stiller stated she did not have a problem with building supplies but did have a problem with the campground. Ms. Stiller reiterated the fact that the land previously wouldn’t perk for a mobile home and to “please don’t let this happen.”

Chairman Blount referred to the copy of the letter presented by Ms. Stiller, from Environmental Health, which addresses Tax Map 514 Parcel 015. Chairman Blount pointed out that the letter did not refer to Tax Map 514 Parcel 025, which is the parcel the store is located on.

3. John C. Underwood, who resides at 145 Big Buck Drive in Richfield, addressed the Board, stating he is a landowner whose property that adjoins Mr. Phillips property. Mr. Underwood stated he wanted the Board to know “that all the neighbors are not against this.” Mr. Underwood stated that he has lived in the area for nine (9) years and that Mr. Phillips is the third owner of the property during the nine (9) years. Mr. Underwood stated that Mr. Phillips has improved the property and described that on numerous occasions painting has been done, as well as numerous times work has been performed with a Bobcat. Mr. Phillips stated that he had never smelled vapors from the property, and confirmed the area to be a stable neighborhood. Mr. Underwood stated that even though Mr. Phillips may not live in the area, Mr. Phillips had as much at stake as the neighbors who do live there, by having thousands of dollars in merchandise and equipment. Mr. Underwood declared that he has no problem with the honest legitimate business that Mr. Phillips is trying to run. Mr. Underwood responded to a query from Commissioner Belk that he had no problem with an RV Park being put on the site.
4. Carol Morton addressed the Board and stated that her property adjoins the store property. Ms. Morton explained that she “had not come before” because she was under the impression “this was for tax purposes only.” Ms. Morton stated that she did have a problem with an RV Park in the neighborhood. Ms. Morton continued by stating there were a lot of older people in the area, a volunteer fire department, but not a nearby police force to take care of any problems. Ms. Morton stated that since the owner does not live in the area, she would not be comfortable with people not being supervised.

Chairman Blount recalled Mr. Phillips for additional questions. Chairman Blount referred to the photographs of the store and asked if it were in operation at this time. Chairman Blount inquired if there was a restroom facility at the store, to which Mr. Phillips responded the facility was inside the store. Chairman Blount stated there must obviously be a septic field, to which Mr. Phillips replied, yes, but he was uncertain “what is there” but the system is operating without any problems that he is aware of.

Mr. Phillips stated that he had spoken with Mr. Muire and was under the impression that the Campground/RV Park was removed from the list. Chairman Blount replied that staff had recommended removing the campground from the list. Mr. Phillips expressed that he had no problem with the campground being removed from the list and continued by saying he had no plans for a campground, now, or in the future.

Chairman Blount asked how long the store had been in operation, to which Mr. Phillips responded 1945. Mr. Phillips stated he had bought the store 1 ½ years ago and he has had the store in operation since the purchase.

Commissioner Chamberlain pointed out to Mr. Phillips that he could come back at a later date to petition the Board for a conditional use permit in the RA district for the campground.

Commissioner Tadlock pointed out that suitable soil would be the question.

Commissioner Andrews directed a question to Ms. Morton as to whether she had experienced any problems with “what is there now” and would she have any problems with expansion of the store or sales. Ms. Morton replied no.

With no further questions, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing and declared the Board would now go into deliberations with no further testimony to be heard.

Commissioner Chamberlain began the deliberations by stating that the Board does not normally rezone property without some type of site plan.

Commissioner Belk wished to clarify the issue was before the Board due to not being in compliance with conforming use. Chairman Blount responded yes and explained the reason behind his question concerning a business in an RA district without living on the property, was to the purpose that not only does the property become a nonconforming use, but if the business operations stopped, the business could not be reopened.

Commissioner Chamberlain questioned how the setbacks change if the property is rezoned from RA to CBI.

(Mr. Muire responded, but the answer was unclear on the tape).

Chairman Blount explained that the case consists of an existing business that has been in operation specifically for the last 1½ years, and that Mr. Phillips is requesting to correct the zoning classification for what the property has been used for since the 1950’s. Chairman Blount stated the only reason to leave as a non-conditional use is “if we want the use to go away.” Chairman Blount pointed out that the concerns mentioned are the Campground/RV Park and the applicant has agreed to have the item removed as a conditional use. Chairman Blount stated that he would be unsure of the purpose in denying the request before the Board, other than the fact that in the past, as pointed out by Commissioner Chamberlain, rezoning was not allowed without a site plan. Chairman Blount stated the site plan presented depicted three existing buildings with a list of uses for each site, with driveways or actual building locations.

Commissioner Tadlock made a motion to accept staff’s recommendations for the rezoning to CBI and the Parallel CUD, with the exception that the Campground/RV Parks

not be allowed. Commissioner Belk seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Andrews emphasized the area to be in dire need of the general store and future enhancements to the property would be a great resource to the lake area.

Commissioner Chamberlain stated he did “not see the rush to do this.” Chairman Blount stated that if the store had not been on the property, he would agree with Commissioner Chamberlain. Commissioner Chamberlain continued by stating if the request were denied, none of the current operations at the business would cease.

Rita Foil, Clerk to the Board, questioned if the motion should be made as two motions. Marion Lytle responded that one motion was all that was required.

Chairman Blount reported the Findings of Fact to be as presented in the Staff Report:

1. Development of the property in accordance with the proposed site plan (excluding a campground and RV park) will neither materially endanger the public health or safety, nor substantially injure the value of adjoining properties.
2. The continued operation of the existing store and proposed diversity of sales and services at this crossroads location warrant the requested list of uses as contained in item #3 of the Staff Report (excluding a campground and RV park) in the Commercial, Business, Industrial (CBI) district. These limited uses will ensure the character of development at this site will be in general harmony with the area.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CUP-05-02 FOR THE EXPANSION OF LITTLE ACRES MOBILE HOME PARK:

Chairman Blount declared the public hearing for consideration of CUP-05-02 to be in session and read the Chairman’s speech (Exhibit “A”). Chairman Blount explained that the hearing would focus on applications submitted by Mr. Jarvis Arey for expansion of Little Acres Manufactured Home Park (MHP). The expansion would allow three additional manufactured home lots to be added to an existing manufactured home park.

The Clerk swore in all those who wished to provide testimony is the case.

Marion Lytle, County Planner, presented the Staff Report (Exhibit “B”) and explained that the Little Acres Manufactured Home Park has been in existence for a long time and contains over 200 lots. Mr. Lytle reported that due to the availability of water and sewer, the opportunity exists to expand into an area that could not previously be developed.

Mr. Lytle reviewed the required findings of fact.

Mr. Lytle stated that staff recommends approval of the request.

With no citizens who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing and declared the Board to be in the deliberation period with no further testimony to be heard.

Commissioner Chamberlain commented that if every park in Rowan County were like the Little Acres MHP, there would never be any problems.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to approve the recommended CUP as presented by Staff. Commissioner Tadlock seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Blount declared the Findings of Fact to be as reported by staff to be:

1. The addition of three lots will not endanger the public health or safety. Little Acres MHP is a clean and well-run manufactured home park.
2. The proposed development is identical to the existing manufactured home park and will not endanger the value of the adjoining property.
3. The location and character of the developments in accordance with the proposed conditions will be in general harmony of the area it is in. The proposed development is identical to existing development.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR Z-32-01 TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURES & RESIDENTIAL STORAGE FACILITIES:

Chairman Blount turned the hearing over to Mr. Lytle who presented the Staff Review.

Mr. Lytle informed the Board that the two (2) items were advertised under a single zoning case number, however, the Board may want to consider receiving public comment on each section individually. Mr. Lytle stated that each amendment had been sent to the Planning Board and that the information before the Board was the recommendations from the Planning Board.

Mr. Lytle explained that the text amendment for Residential Storage Facilities was done at the request of the Board at its December 17, 2001 meeting. Mr. Lytle reviewed the following text concerns by Staff:

1. These types of facilities should not become commercial ventures.
2. They should be limited in size.
3. They should not be approved just to keep activity away from a neighborhood (such as hobby car repair).

Mr. Lytle reported that the planning board committee met on February 21st, reviewed proposed text, and presented the text to the Planning Board at its February 25th meeting. Mr. Lytle reviewed the proposed changes as presented to the Board.

Chairman Blount asked a specific question of Mr. Lytle, using the following example: “If I owned fifty acres out in the country and I want to build a structure on that 50 acres, while living on a three-acre lot elsewhere, you’re saying I can’t build on that 50 acres?” Mr. Lytle responded, “Right” and explained that under current zoning, agricultural type facilities are allowed such as a horse barn, but a structure such as to store classic cars would not be allowed.

Mr. Lytle stated that if the proposed changes were adopted, the process would require individuals to come before the Board on a case-by-case basis to seek a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Lytle stated the individuals would have to meet the requirements at the minimum, but other constraints such as buffering, could be added.

Commissioner Chamberlain requested clarification on Item #8 in the attachment. Mr. Lytle responded by showing examples of structures through a power point presentation.

Commissioner Andrews asked what restrictions would be on a tract of land, ranging from 10-300 acres, with no residence on the property. Mr. Lytle verified if Commissioner Andrews meant a parcel without a residence. Commissioner Andrews clarified his example to mean no residence, just property that he might own and plow, plant trees etc. Commissioner Andrews’ next question was what if he wanted to build buildings on the property. Mr. Lytle responded that building a tractor shed, a barn for cattle or to store hay, were permitted uses. Mr. Lytle stated that a structure could not be built to store four-wheelers.

Commissioner Andrews queried Mr. Lytle as to whether there were any restrictions if he would want to build ten (10) buildings. Mr. Lytle responded yes, if the buildings were for agricultural uses.

Chairman Blount asked what zoning classification would the property have to be changed to, in order to be able to build a structure to store recreational vehicles on the property. Mr. Lytle stated that warehousing is allowed in commercial and industrial zoning. Chairman Blount continued by saying he could request a rezoning if he presented an acceptable plan to the Board.

Commissioner Chamberlain commented that once the property is rezoned to CBI and the individual sells the property, it is already zoned for an individual to open a business. Mr. Lytle mentioned spot zoning would be an issue.

In response to a query from Commissioner Chamberlain, Mr. Lytle stated that the burden of proof is on the applicant, to prove there is not sufficient room at the applicant’s residence to construct a storage building, in order to allow the individual to build a storage building on property owned elsewhere.

Commissioner Belk commented the procedure insures that property owners will not place unwanted structures on vacant lots.

Chairman Blount stated that currently the Board does not allow any accessory structures and that the Board is “relaxing the standard.”

Commissioner Andrews asked Mr. Lytle if Items #6 & #9 covered the same issue? Mr. Lytle responded the items might not be as clear as necessary.

Commissioner Tadlock used an example of 300 acres and asked Mr. Lytle if an individual had to reside on the 300 acres for the land to be a bona fide farm, or if the land had to produce a certain revenue amount to be considered as a bona fide farm. Mr. Lytle responded that the Tax Assessor’s classification of the property determines this information. Mr. Lytle explained the classifications as follows:

Forrest Land	20 acres
Crop or Animal Production	10 acres
Horticulture	5 acres

Chairman Blount verified that if the use were Agricultural a storage building could be constructed.

Commissioner Chamberlain asked if the property were rezoned to CBI and a 5,000 square foot building was erected, could a horse barn could be put in place? Mr. Lytle stated this would be a permitted use.

Chairman Blount stated the Board would review the explanation for Accessory Structures and then hold a joint public hearing.

Mr. Lytle explained the text amendment for Accessory Structures and reviewed the following items considered by Staff as most important to address:

1. Size limitation
2. Location on lot
3. Setbacks

Mr. Lytle reviewed the proposed changes as presented to the Board.

Mr. Lytle highlighted the fact that the building square footage is limited to the size of 10 percent of the acreage.

Chairman Blount questioned if the 10 percent size limitation is the “cap” suggested by Staff. Mr. Lytle responded that 5 percent up to 5,000 square feet was suggested, and rejected, at the committee meeting. Chairman Blount stated that “anything over a certain size was getting to be a commercial property” and rezoning should be required. Mr. Lytle expressed an attempt to “draw a line in the sand somewhere.”

Commissioner Chamberlain felt that “less is more,” and said he had a problem telling a resident who owns 300 acres what can be put on the property. Commissioner Chamberlain continued by asking Mr. Lytle if anyone owning 50, 100 or 300 acres of

land in the county had asked to build a 10,000 square foot building, since February of 1998 when zoning was implemented. Mr. Lytle said no.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments from citizens concerning these text amendments.

1. Daniel Tuttle, of 485 Murray Drive in Wildwood Acres, addressed the Board stating he owned 4 acres of property across from his home. Mr. Tuttle stated he had taken one (1) of his metal buildings down, and ordered the materials to construct a new building, not realizing he would have a problem obtaining a permit to replace the building. Mr. Tuttle pointed out the details of his property through Mr. Lytle's power point presentation. Mr. Tuttle said the acreage where he would like to construct the building has a tax value of \$45,000.00 and that "it's kind of bad" not to be able to put anything on it.

Chairman Blount verified that Mr. Tuttle lived across the road and the lot in question is adjacent to Mr. Tuttle's residence. Chairman Blount continued by stating if the property is adjacent, Mr. Tuttle should be allowed to construct the building.

An unidentified citizen stated that because Murray Drive runs between the tracts of land, it is not considered to be adjacent.

Mr. Tuttle described his situation as "a very expensive problem" and that he is paying to store his boat in Davie County.

Chairman Blount requested for the record, the name of the unidentified citizen, which was Pamela Tuttle, wife of Daniel Tuttle.

2. David Morrow, of 250 Upright Avenue in China Grove, addressed the Board, stating he was opposed the Article VII, Section 15B concerning changes in setbacks for accessory structures. Mr. Morrow informed the Board that he owns and pays taxes for 7.2 acres of property. Mr. Morrow explained the property to be "odd-shaped" and with the proposed setback changes, he would "lose 3.2 acres out of the 7.2 acres." Mr. Morrow said nearby family members will face the same situation, with some members losing nearly half of their acreage. Mr. Morrow said he would lose about 42 percent of his own land. Mr. Morrow felt the proposed changes were "ridiculous." Mr. Morrow referred to several pages detailing setback requirements, including page-32 for junkyards. Mr. Morrow pointed out that a screened junkyard allowed junked cars to be within 15-feet of the property line, while a property owner could not construct a 10 x 10 building 50-feet from the property line to store a lawnmower. Mr. Morrow stated that if everyone were going to have to receive a variance, the ordinance needed to be changed. Mr. Morrow declared that all he wanted was to be able to do something with his land.

Mr. Lytle responded to a question from Chairman Blount that the current front and side setback requirements, is 5-feet for accessory buildings, in the RA district. Chairman Blount mentioned to Mr. Morrow that staff is recommending removing this section.

Chairman Blount thanked those who had addressed the Board and closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chamberlain stated that under Section 15, he would like to make the following recommendations:

- Leave “A” as is
- Mark out “B”
- Take off Table XII
- Delete B, C & D
- Under new “C”, “go with a 30’ front setback and leave the side and rear setbacks alone”
- “D” is fine

Commissioner Belk asked if the Board were going to include a sliding scale for larger buildings.

Chairman Blount stated that staff suggested that the Board include a sliding scale or put a maximum cap on the building size.

Commissioner Andrews commented that the Board Room would “fill up” if a property owner found out that a 20,000 square foot building were going to be built next door to his residence. Commissioner Andrews stated that citizens might not want zoning and controls, but when situations arise, the citizens come to the Board and say, “protect me”. Commissioner Andrews said he did not know the answer but felt the size of the building was a pertinent issue in the process.

Chairman Blount agreed that if there were a cap on the maximum size, the setbacks could be left as they are. Chairman Blount asked staff about setting a cap that would allow flexibility through the variance process. Staff responded variances are allowed on setbacks and not on the size of the buildings.

Commissioner Chamberlain expressed concern about trying to control everything out in the country.

Chairman Blount referred to the situation in Crane Cove and stated it was not recognized as being a problem until it was almost too late. Chairman Blount stated that because a cap was not put in place when zoning was enacted several years back, was not a reason to keep the Board from putting a cap in place now.

Commissioner Chamberlain stated that he was not interested in controlling this process.

Commissioner Andrews said that he was not as concerned on the size of the building as he is the setbacks being placed so close to the adjacent property owner. Commissioner Belk said she feels that the size and setback go together. Commissioner Andrews agreed.

Chairman Blount added that the “sliding scale” impacts property owners with irregular lots by taking away usable land and he emphasized that this issue concerns accessory structures and not the original residence.

Commissioner Chamberlain acknowledged that it made more sense to go back to setbacks based on building square footage.

Chairman Blount reviewed Commissioner Chamberlain’s suggestion to delete the two sections and Commissioner Andrews’ suggestion to add table XII (1) back in with changes the numbers. Commissioner Andrews agreed to have staff work on this emphasizing the difficulty in informing a property owner that big buildings are not allowed and being sensitive to the fact that neighbors would not want these buildings being placed next to them.

Commissioner Chamberlain asked Mr. Lytle if he would agree that when there is an irregular lot size with minimum acreage and a 4,000 to 8,000 square foot building is place on the lot, that this could cause a problem. Mr. Lytle responded that there is also the option to reduce that by 50 percent in setbacks. Commissioner Belk asked if this meant that there could be a 8,000 to 12, 000 square foot building with a 30-foot setback to which Mr. Lytle said this would be referred to the ZBA (Zoning Board of Adjustments). Chairman Blount reminded the Board that the property owner must show, to the ZBA, that a reduction in setbacks would be needed to build the desired structure.

Commissioner Andrews discussed other options to the “sliding scale” and gave examples that a 4,000 square foot building would require a 50-foot setback and a 8,000 square foot building would be a 50-foot setback and go from there. Commissioner Andrews added that more footage in setbacks is needed for larger buildings.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to adopt, in Section 15. Accessory Structures, (a)-Accessory structure footprints shall not exceed 10 percent of the size of the lot on which it is located.

And (b)-Table XII (1) to be:

Building sq. ft.	Setback
• 0 – 4,000	10-ft
• 4,000-8,000	40-ft
• 8,000 and up	60-ft

Also (c)-Accessory structures shall not be allowed in the required front setback.

And deleting table (b)-Setbacks shall be based on the lot size as provided in Table XII (1).

With clarification that the setbacks were for the side and rear yard and not for the front, Commissioner Belk seconded the motion.

Chairman Blount mentioned that the Board should give serious consideration for establishing a cap on the size of the buildings in the future.

The motion passed unanimously

Residential Storage Facilities:

Commissioner Chamberlain responded to the following in staff's recommendations for additions to Article IV, Special Requirements and Section 10, Conditional Use Requirements for Specific Uses:

1. OK
2. OK
3. Would like to see this taken out
4. OK
5. Would like to see this taken out
6. OK
7. OK
8. OK
9. OK
10. Would like to see no lighting or some security lighting
11. OK

Commissioner Belk questioned why bathrooms were not allowed. Mr. Lytle responded that this would make it more difficult to become a high activity place.

Chairman Blount asked how businesses would be prevented from opening up in the storage facilities. Mr. Lytle responded that, by the definition, these are not to be a commercial facility, but should this happen, citations could be issued, conditional use permits could be revoked, operations could be ceased through the courts and the structure could be removed.

Commissioner Tadlock stated that he felt the lighting should be left in the amendments.

Chairman Blount said he had a problem with deleting item #5; going from not allowing these structures to allowing structures of any size and he would like to leave item #10, concerning the lighting, as it is.

In reference to item #5, Commissioner Chamberlain asked if the maximum was set for 2400 square feet, could this be changed. Mr. Lytle responded that this cannot be increased, but it could be decreased. Commissioner Chamberlain said that he felt this was too much control. The Board by consensus recommended a maximum of 3,000 square feet.

Mr. Lytle clarified that the RS district classification was not added to these amendments in the table of uses.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to strike item #3, change item #5 to a maximum size allowed of 3,000 square feet and to add the RS classification in the table of uses. Commissioner Tadlock seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Blount recessed the meeting for a break at 9:00 pm

Chairman Blount reconvened the meeting at 9:15 pm.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENTS TO UPDATE THE TABLE OF USES FOR THE ADDITION OF AMBULANCE STATIONS AS PERMITTED USES IN ALL ZONING DISTRICTS:

Mr. Lytle informed the Board that in anticipation of the expansion of the ambulance stations in the county, staff is recommending approval of ambulance and rescue squad stations as permitted uses in all districts. Police and Fire stations are currently permitted used in all districts. Mr. Lytle added that the Planning Board unanimously approved this recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing requesting those in attendance to come forward with comments.

Those that chose to come forward are as follows:

1. David Morrow who lives at 250 Upright Avenue said the county wants to bypass required steps that others must go through for zoning changes. Mr. Morrow said that if there were no provisions for ambulance stations, he could understand this change and it appears that citizens are held up to higher standards that the county is held up to.

Chairman Blount responded that any citizen could request a text amendment, which would then follow a process of reviews and recommendations from the Planning Board and possibly other committees to the Board of Commissioners. Therefore, the Board of Commissioners is held up to the same standards as required by citizens, the only difference is that the Board of Commissioners does vote.

There being no further comments, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Belk made a motion to add ambulance stations and rescue squads as a permitted use in all zoning districts. Commissioner Andrews seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE REVISING THE HISTORIC PROPERTIES COMMISSION AS A HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION:

Mr. Muire reviewed with the Board the Proposed Historic Landmarks Commission acknowledging that this was first written in 1995 and pointed out the commentary to the right of the ordinance gives an explanation of what the ordinance states. Mr. Muire reviewed the terms of office and the powers and duties of the commission members.

Mr. Muire emphasized that under Section 23.13, the Board of Commissioners always has the final authority to designate and/or revoke a landmark. Mr. Muire also emphasized that not every site studied would be a national register or study list. This commission can investigate these sites and send findings to the Department of Cultural Resources for review and comments, which would then come before the Board for landmark designation as a recommendation from the commission

Mr. Muire referred to the Certificate of Appropriateness, which means anyone wanting to alter or modify their property, would present plans and ask for approval from the commission and the commission would act on this request. An appeal of this decision would come before the Board and it could be appealed to superior court.

Mr. Muire then commented on the Delay in Demolition of Landmarks, which authorizes a waiting period up to 365 days. This would give the commission an opportunity to negotiate with the property owner to acquire the property or other means for historic preservation. The number of days could be stated as any number up to 365 days.

Mr. Muire concluded by stating the members of the commission are to have an expertise in certain areas and the goal to attain a CLG (Certified Local Government) status, which is recognized by the state to receive a higher priority for grants, etc.

Chairman Blount inquired if landmark status could be enforced on someone that did not want this status. Mr. Muire responded that he thought this could be done. Commissioner Chamberlain asked how to “fix” this so it cannot be done. Mr. Muire stated that he thought it was a mute point and the “safety valve” is that the Board has the final “say.”

Commissioner Andrews asked if the property could be condemned and taken as a landmark status. Mr. Muire answered “yes.” Chairman Blount asked to have the following section added: “no property shall be designated as a landmark without the permission of the property owner.” Mr. Russell suggested to say the “majority of the property owners” referencing an estate situation that could occur involving more than one person. Mr. Holshouser stated that if one person were to not agree, this would “veto” the whole process. Mr. Holshouser continued by saying that there are other procedures through the law, but there is a special set of statutes to address those issues.

Commissioner Andrews added he had queried at a previous meeting, if a landmark is designated, could the adjoining properties be brought in as an historic district and

governed under the same jurisdiction. Commissioner Andrews said the answer was “no,” but the proposed ordinance reads that it does involve lands and districts. Commissioner Andrews asked for clarification to which Mr. Muire responded the ordinance refers to a landmark as being one piece of property and it is not intended to be a grouping of property. Commissioner Andrews said “this becomes a mute point if the property owner, who owns the landmark property, says no.”

Chairman Blount asked staff to add this language to Section 23.14 “that no property would be designated as a landmark without the expressed permission of the property owner.”

Commissioner Andrews asked for clarification on Section 23.12 (3) concerning Powers and Duties. Chairman Blount responded that, assuming funds are available, easements or property could be purchased and the Board is allowing this to happen, however, it is at the property owner’s discretion whether or not they choose to sell. Commissioner Andrews asked if there was any other action the Board could take that would force the property owner into doing something they did not want to do. Chairman Blount answered that this would not happen once the statement is added to the ordinance.

Commissioner Andrews asked why someone would demolish a landmark that has been acquired. Mr. Muire explained that if property were designated a landmark and then ten years later, if the property has not been maintained and there could be safety problems, it may be beneficial to demolish the structure.

In response to concerns from Commissioner Andrews, Mr. Muire explained that the Certificate of Appropriateness is a self-imposed limitation by the property owner and a contractual agreement with the Landmarks Commission that the owner will not destroy the architectural significance of the property.

Commissioner Andrews asked for clarification on Section 23.12 (11) concerning what would determine the “appropriateness” of negotiations. Chairman Blount stated that this would mean the owner has the final decision, but the Landmarks Commission could negotiate for the Landmarks Commission to incur the expense for renovations. Mr. Holshouser concurred. Commissioner Andrews emphasized that he did not want Rowan County property owners to be placed in a predicament of becoming an historic site against their will. Commissioner Andrews asked Mr. Holshouser if the addition of the statement previously stated would protect the property owner. Mr. Holshouser referenced staff’s recommendations, citing # 2 as being “the key” and that the applications should come from the property owners. Ed Norvell agreed. Commissioner Andrews stated that this should be in the wording. Chairman Blount stated the applications would go before the Landmark Commission and then to the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Chamberlain added that, out of the following counties, Wake, Mecklenburg, Gaston, Alamance, Union, Cabarrus, Iredell and Catawba, only one

county, Gaston County, set aside tax dollars for this purpose. The remaining counties relied on grants, private money, etc.

Commissioner Chamberlain reminded the Board to pay attention to the amount of staff time when this process is enacted. Commissioner Chamberlain referenced there was approximately \$12,000 in the bank for the Rowan County Historic Properties Commission.

Mr. Muire stated that the Board would need to appoint this ten-member commission. Chairman Blount added that the Board would also approve the by-laws of the commission.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments.

Those that chose to come forward were as follows:

1. Ed Norvell stated that the Rowan County Sustainable Community Development Commission (SCDC) is recommending that the ordinance be passed and Dr. John Wear, chairman of the SCDC, was unable to attend due to an illness, but wanted to urge the Board to pass the ordinance. Also, D.C. Linn, who was on vacation, is a strong opponent. Mr. Norvell emphasized that the property owners must agree. The property would never be designated a historic landmark, unless the owner agreed, as well as being placed on the National Register. This is fundamental. Mr. Norvell explained to Commissioner Andrews that # 3 and #11 gives the commission the ability to purchase the property. Mr. Norvell added that the “carrot” is the property tax deferral and cautioned the Board to be sure that the property, coming before the Board, does qualify. Mr. Norvell concluded by saying that the SCDC recommends approval of the ordinance with the changes.

In reference to the issue concerning tax deferrals, Commissioner Andrews said that the value of the property designated as historic would usually grow to a point that the deferral will more than offset. Mr. Norvell concurred. Mr. Norvell added there are currently 21 properties in Rowan County on the National Register. Eleven of these are taxable and ten are exempt.

There being no other citizens who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Belk made a motion to approve the establishment of the Historic Landmarks Commission with the suggested changes that “no property will be designated as a landmark without the permission of the landowner.” Commissioner Tadlock seconded the motion.

Commissioner Andrews stated he agreed to this point, but wanted to look at the primary functions, namely, to approve or disapprove applications from property owners. Commissioner Andrews asked to have wording added that the property owner must

approve it and the property owner must submit, at will, the applications. Chairman Blount suggested that this concern would be addressed in the by-laws, which would be approved in the future, along with the appointments to the commission, by the Board. Commissioner Andrews agreed.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lytle stated that the recommendation for the by-laws to come from the SCDC, as well as the commission appointments. Chairman Blount agreed.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PROPOSED FINANCING OF THE SOUTH ROWAN WATER PROJECT:

Leslie Heidrick informed the Board that, on February 22nd, the Finance Department distributed request for proposals for the South Rowan Water Project to eight financial institutions. The amount to be financed is \$7.8 million with a proposed term of ten years. Two bids were received from CCB and BB&T. BB&T offered the lowest interest rate of 4.9 percent, but also required a 1 percent financing transaction fee. CCB offered an interest rate of 4.6 percent with no additional fees. The Finance Department is recommending the Board approve CCB as the low bidder with the total cost amount.

Commissioner Chamberlain asked how much the low bid amount was, to which Ms. Heidrick responded about \$30,000. Commissioner Chamberlain also asked if BB&T was contacted to waive the one-percent fee. Ms. Heidrick stated that BB&T was firm with their offer.

Mr. Russell said this was a good proposal and the Local Government Commission (LGC) has indicated that this was a good rate.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments.

There being no one to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Ms. Heidrick asked the Board for approval to adopt the resolution and to authorize Finance to open a new investment account.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to approve the resolution and the opening of the new investment account as requested. Commissioner Belk seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE MOU AGREEMENTS WITH SALISBURY, CHINA GROVE, LANDIS AND KANNAPOLIS:

Mr. Russell referred to the proposed revised Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) for Salisbury, China Grove, Landis and Kannapolis.

Mr. Russell referenced that, in the Salisbury proposed agreement, there is an addendum 1, that was previously approved, now becomes addendum 2, which outlines the plan for the financing concept. Rowan County will be doing the financing, as opposed to Salisbury doing the financing, and China Grove, Landis and Kannapolis will pay Rowan County and Rowan County will pay the debt. The proposed agreement addresses the ownership of the line and how Rowan County will pay Salisbury, as the construction incurs, based on actual expenditures. Mr. Russell stated that the initial proposal was for all the funds to be remitted to Salisbury and Salisbury would hold the funds in escrow. Rowan County declined this agreement and instead has set up the trust account. The funds will be remitted as incurred, based on actual expenditures and interest would be earned, thus reducing the debt amount.

Mr. Russell then referenced the MOU's with China Grove, Landis and Kannapolis as follows:

- The provision of adequate water is a vital resource.
- Rowan County would be the principal borrower for a 10-year period for 4.6 percent (as just previously approved).
- Rowan County will be the primary guarantor of the funds for the financing.
- Rowan County will act as the primary guarantor of the indebtedness and will collect the funds.
- The interest earned on the funds that are not needed, will be directed to the reduction of the entire indebtedness.
- This memorandum supercedes all other agreements entered.

Chairman Blount pointed out that he, along with Mr. Russell, Ms. Heidrick and Commissioner Tadlock met with representatives from China Grove, Landis and Kannapolis and they were all in agreement of the revised MOUs. Chairman Blount added that the MOUs would also go to their councils for approval.

Commissioner Andrews made a motion to accept the amendments to the MOU agreements. Commissioner Tadlock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION FOR PE-01-02, A REQUEST FROM “RELAY FOR LIFE” FOR A PERMIT TO EXCEED THE ROWAN COUNTY NOISE ORDINANCE:

Mr. Muire stated that this was the first request of this type for a permit to exceed the noise standards. The Rowan County Noise Ordinance does not establish this type of an application for a public hearing, but this has been established for public comment.

Mr. Muire explained that on May 3rd and May 4th the “Relay for Life” is to be held at the Rowan County Fairgrounds, which is sponsored by the American Cancer Society. This area is governed by the County’s Noise Ordinance and the Rowan County Sheriff’s Department does enforce this under “unreasonable amplified sound.” This location is in Salisbury’s ETJ, however, Salisbury’s Code of Ordinances does not address noise or decibel related requirements outside of their corporate limits, therefore the County’s Ordinance governs areas up to Salisbury’s municipal boundaries.

Mr. Muire explained that, in order to see how many citizens may or may not be impacted, staff took an aerial photograph and used Salisbury's cadastral overlay information along with data from the Tax Assessor's office. And where a house was located on the property, the land use codes of SF (Single Family Dwelling) or MH (Manufactured Home) were placed on top of the homes in this area. The track area was then buffered on the fair ground site at 500, 1,000 and 1,500 feet. The applicant provided a detailed site plan and stated that 5,000 to 8,000 people are expected to be in attendance.

Mr. Muire stated that the event would begin at 6:00 pm on May 3rd and last until 9:00 am on May 4th and added that the benefits of this event outweigh any type of negative impact. Notices were sent to all adjacent property owners.

Commissioner Andrews asked about music and Commissioner Chamberlain asked Tommy Kimball to come forward to comment.

1. Tommy Kimball explained how the "Relay for Life" began and that this program is to provide an awareness for cancer. Mr. Kimball explained that the worst time for someone with cancer is around 3:00 am and that is the reason for the hours for "Relay for Life." Mr. Kimball also talked about the growth of this program and the increase in participation and funds. Mr. Kimball discussed the various activities that would take place and the goal for this year is \$300,000. Mr. Kimball stated that Rowan Regional Medical Center is sponsoring a survival dinner at the Civic Center.

Chairman Blount thanked Mr. Kimball for his comments and what he was doing for Rowan County.

2. Earl Holt, property owner adjacent to the fairgrounds, voiced his reservations about the event and questioned some of the activities and the noise. Mr. Holt said that he was concerned for the senior citizens in the area. Mr. Holt suggested that Dan Nicholas would be a better place to hold this event. Mr. Holt stated that the Board should get involved in the activities that are held at the fairgrounds.

With no other citizens wishing to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to grant the request from "Relay for Life" a permit to exceed the Rowan County Noise Ordinance, enabling the group to secure as much as \$300,000, for the cause of cancer research.

Commissioner Belk seconded the motion.

In response to a query from Chairman Blount, staff reported that Mr. Holt is the only property owner who had responded to notices concerning the public hearing. Chairman Blount verified that Mr. Holt owns the property adjacent to the fairgrounds, but does not reside there.

The motion passed unanimously.

REQUEST FROM THE LOVE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FOR A SURPLUS VAN:

Mr. Russell reported that Dr. Hash, Chairman for the Love Center for Community Enhancement, contacted Senior Services Director, Clyde Fahnestock, and learned that Rowan County had transportation vans that were going into county surplus stock. Mr. Russell stated that Dr. Hash had sent a letter requesting the county to transfer one of the vans to the Love Center for the purpose of transporting Veterans. Mr. Russell explained that there are two categories of vans. One category, due to federal and state funds, may be more difficult to get. Mr. Russell described a 1993 van that had been donated to the county several years ago and added that the van was in good condition, with handicapped accessibility, could be donated and is not in circulation. Mr. Russell stated the vans from the state would have to be obtained through a petition to the state and the easiest option would be to donate the van mentioned that was given to the county. The mileage on most of the RTS vans is between 125,000 and 150,000 miles. Mr. Russell stated that, according to county policy, the Board could either ask Dr. Hash to submit 50 percent of the value or the Board may elect to waive this request.

Commissioner Tadlock said that he would lean towards the 1993 van.

Commissioner Chamberlain commented on the Love Center and the need they have for transportation to get to work and attend treatment appointments. They currently have six residents, but they have room for 16 residents.

Commissioner Belk made a motion to donate the van to the Love Center and to waive the 50 percent. Commissioner Chamberlain seconded the motion.

Commissioner Belk stated that she would like to see the Love Center submit a letter that they do not have the money, in order to stay within policy.

In response to a question from Chairman Blount, Mr. Russell stated that 50 percent of the value of the 1993 van to be approximately \$1,000. Mr. Russell stated that Dr. Hash indicated verbally that the funds were not available to them to purchase the van. Chairman Blount added that as long as the process stays within county policy.

The motion passed unanimously.

MEETING WITH THE CITY OF KANNAPOLIS:

Rita Foil, Clerk to the Board, explained to the Board that the City of Kannapolis Council have invited the Board to attend an informal meeting at breakfast, lunch or dinner to provide an opportunity to introduce their new city manager.

The Board by consensus agreed to allow the clerk to proceed with finalizing the plans.

DISCUSSION OF THE FIRST MEETING IN APRIL FALLING ON EASTER MONDAY:

The Board by consensus agreed to not change the meeting schedule for the first meeting in April.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments of concern to the Board.

1. Don Conner humorously expressed that while he was out on medical leave, he heard about the short meetings that lasted less than one-half an hour and now it is 10:45 pm.

The Board expressed that they wanted Mr. Conner to be impressed with how hard they work.

There being no one else who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public comment period.

Chairman Blount reminded the Board and staff about the moratorium on building in the floodplains, which will expire on May 6, 2002.

There being no further business, Chairman Blount adjourned the meeting at 10:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rita K. Foil
Clerk to the Board