

**TOWN OF UNIONVILLE
MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

The Planning Board of the Town of Unionville met on Monday, January 4, 2021, at Town Hall, 1102 Unionville Church Road, Monroe, NC. Chairman Ken Trull, Board members Jerry Adams, Craig Rushing, Andy Fowler, Steve Outen, and Alternates Devin Clontz and Scott Barbee were present. Absent were Barry Baucom and Matt Price.

Everyone stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States flag, after which Andy Fowler led the prayer of invocation.

Chairman Trull called the meeting to order and welcomed all to the meeting at 7:31 p.m. Chairman Trull then asked Scott Barbee and Devin Clontz to sit on the Board. Chairman Trull then introduced the first item of business, with Land Use Administrator Gaddy issuing the Oath of Office for Steve Outen. Chairman Trull explained that the Town Hall is limited to 28 occupants by the Governor of North Carolina, due to COVID-19. He advised the Board that there were some guests who were waiting outside. He advised they may have to ask some to step outside once they have finished with their business. He advised everyone that he was trying to make the best of the situation.

Chairman Trull then opened the floor for the election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the 2021 Planning Board. Steve Outen asked if Ken would object to doing it again. Chairman Trull stated that he was not opposed to it but would love for someone else to do it if interested. Scott Barbee then nominated Jerry Adams to serve as Chairman, which was seconded by Steve Outen. The nomination passed unanimously. Chairman Trull advised Jerry Adams that the meeting would be turned over for Jerry to call for nominations for a Vice Chairman. Andy Fowler nominated Craig Rushing, which was seconded by Scott Barbee. The nomination passed unanimously.

Chairman Adams then brought forward the consideration of the minutes of the September 14, 2020, Regular Meeting. After a motion made by Ken Trull and seconded by Craig Rushing, the Board unanimously approved the minutes from the September 14, 2020 Regular Meeting.

At this point, Chairman Adams introduced the next item of business, the Consideration of Subdivision #SUB-20-17 to form two new lots on Hillcrest Church Road. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that the parcel is owned by Hillcrest Baptist Church and they were cutting off the front portion of the 9.3-acre tract. They have put in a 25-foot dedicated easement for access to the back lot. The lots on the front portion are 2.605 acres and 1.339 acres, and the back portion is 7.33 acres. The subdivision has been approved by Union County and Land Use Administrator Gaddy also recommended approval. Land Use Administrator Gaddy advised the Board that the applicants were in attendance in case there were any questions. Craig Rushing clarified that the subdivision would create two new lots, one a little over 7 acres and the two one acre and two acres. Land Use Administrator Gaddy confirmed this and also advised the Board that there was an existing 60-foot right-of-way on the front portion identified on the survey that had been existing for at least 20 years, and she is not sure why it is there. The surveyor identified it on the survey, but it is not a part of this subdivision. The access for the backlot is down on Hillcrest Church Road at the bottom of the drawing. Steve Outen asked for the purpose of the subdivision and if it would be used for residential purposes. The applicants advised that they did have a

buyer who wanted to build on the property and the church was not using the property. Upon a motion made by Ken Trull, seconded by Steve Outen, the Subdivision #SUB-20-17 passed unanimously.

The second item of business presented by Chairman Adams was the recommendation of Rezoning #ZC-20-03, rezoning a portion of parcel #08129024, located at Sikes Mill Road/Love Mill Road intersection, from RA-40 to B-2 for a Dollar General store. There were several people in attendance who signed up to speak on this matter, so Chairman Adams advised that he call them in order of the sign-up sheet. First, he called Derek Goddard.

Mr. Goddard stated he was with Blue Ridge Environmental and represented the property owners and development company. He was joined by Daniel Almazan and asked Mr. Almazan to speak first. Mr. Almazan, of 306 Oak Brook Dr., Salisbury, NC, represented Terramore Development, which is the preferred developer of Dollar General stores. They have built several stores across Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina. Based on their research, the area presents good demographics, ample space between other stores, and will not negatively affect traffic. He advised the Board that they review the impact on the community and begin the process by conferring with the DOT. He spoke of the site plan conditions that they addressed from the staff report. For example, the lighting at the facility will only illuminate the walkways, preventing unnecessary light pollution. The store is projected to have a tax value of \$1.3 million and is projected to have annual sales of \$1.2 million. It will employ 7-9 full-time and part-time people. He understands that there may be some who are present in opposition to the store, and requested the Board give him an opportunity to respond to those opponents after they have spoken. At this time, he asked if there were any questions before handing the meeting back over to Mr. Goddard to discuss the logistics of the chosen site. Ken Trull stated that he may have questions later.

Then, Derek Goddard, of 467 Callaway Rd., West Jefferson, NC, addressed the Board once more. He stated that this was an important intersection for the community, serving as a commercial node, which was why they wanted to develop this site. After consulting with the Land Use Plan for the Town, they felt that this would be a great place to set a course for development to take place in the community. The Dollar General provides a service to the community, and access to goods. According to the Town's Land Use Plan, this property is identified as an area that is a future node for commercial growth. They have come to the Town to ask for rezoning to B-2 in order to meet the criteria. Dollar General wants to be in a commercial node, and the Land Use Plan has specifically identified this location as a future commercial node. Once they determine a location that fits within the Town's Land Use Plan, they then have to consider the physical attributes of the land and the government requirements. Their first call is to NC DOT to review the location, including the traffic safety, volume, and density. The DOT has a process called the driveway connection permit process. A commercial-use property must be approved, and a driveway will be provided by DOT. In order for approval, the DOT has included a caveat with significant roadway improvement by requiring a dedicated left turn lane. This will be a significant expense at the developer's cost. Some additional areas for consideration included erosion and stormwater. The Dollar General treats stormwater on site. From a volume and quality standpoint, the discharged water is better quality and the volume mimics natural conditions. The Dollar General maintains onsite wastewater. This location is a workable site and will benefit the community from a tax base and goods/services standpoint. He also asked to address any comments at the end of the meeting. Chairman Adams asked if DOT required a line taper of the median coming out of the roundabout. Mr. Goddard advised that it would be a line taper. Ken Trull asked if there would not be an entrance off of Love Mill Road. Mr.

Goddard stated that there would be no entrance off of Love Mill Road due to DOT discretion. Craig Rushing asked if he knew how many Dollar General stores are already existing in the Town's radius. Mr. Goddard stated that he was not sure about that. He went on to say that Dollar General was good with their demographics and knew where to put a store in the community. Jerry Adams stated that he knew there were stores in Fairview, New Salem, and Monroe. Mr. Almazan stated that the stores are typically spaced 3-5 miles apart in rural areas. They work off of the existing traffic flow and may only impact existing traffic counts by 1-2%. The store is not a traffic generator like a Walmart would be.

Next, Dion Barrett of 3101 Sikes Mill Road spoke out in opposition of the store. While he stated that he was not opposed to development in general, he firmly believes that this particular development is not in the best interest of the community. He stated that there are six stores within 10 miles, and eight within 14 miles. He stated that the need doesn't exist. He also voiced concern about the traffic, since the traffic circle already backs up due to the two schools in the area. In addition, he argued that the store would not be in the best interest based on what it attracts.

Then, Adam Haigler of 5509 Lander Benton Rd. spoke in opposition of the store. He stated that he grew up here, went to school here, and loves the town. He said that he thinks the small-town feel is slipping away all around us, with towns like Indian Trail and Wingate getting more commercialized. By further commercializing the town, it will open doors for crime and traffic issues. There are multiple Dollar General locations within 10-15 minutes, and he argued that small town commercialization can't be worth the 10-minute drive. In addition, the DOT may do best to say it will not negatively impact traffic, however, the DOT has made mistakes in the past, such as the 4-way stop installed on Lawyers Road. The DOT stated in a press release that they had done multiple studies on the area but had to remove the 4-way stop within 24-hours of its installation because it was a disaster. It took commuters over 30-minutes to go through the intersection. He stated that an avalanche starts with a single snowflake, and this store would be the opening of Pandora's box. Once one corner of that area is changed, the entire area will be developed. He stated that he drives 65 miles roundtrip for work each day and makes that sacrifice to live in Unionville.

Next, Cindy Tyson of 3013 Love Mill Road spoke in opposition to the store. Her concern was that traffic would be an issue. She cannot leave her home in the afternoons when school is dismissed because Love Mill Road is so congested. She also stated there was a drug problem at the Marathon station. She stated concern that opening a Dollar General would give people another location for drug deals. She said if it were a produce stand or something like that, she would support it. However, if anything, she feels that land should be used for the schools. With the schools being so crowded, they need to look at expanding, with this land being an ideal location.

Next, Bob and Debbie Maynard of 2805 Loxdale Farms Drive spoke in opposition of the store. They stated that they are frequent walkers and enjoy being able to walk around the community. They are concerned that there are eight Dollar General stores within 10 miles. The closest store is 3.9 miles away and could be accessed by a short four-minute drive. Another of their concerns was that Unionville does not have a full-time police presence since the Town does not have a full-time police force. They stated that they frequent the Marathon and will drive by when it appears there are shady circumstances. They have only lived here 2.5 years and moved to get away from the congestion that they experienced in Sun Valley. They came to Unionville for the country feel and to get away from the traffic nightmare with

commercial developments around their home. They stated that Sun Valley started this way with one commercial structure, and then it grew to ten. It started with CVS that was less than 5 miles from another CVS. Bob stated that we do not need a Dollar General here. Then, Debbie stated that they searched for the small-town feel, which was why they moved here. If there had been a Dollar General in the area, they would not have moved to their home. They like knowing the faces of people when they walk. They do not want it to be like what they left. She also voiced a concern about the store's proximity to the school and the potential for problems with drugs.

Next, Brendan Sheprow of 2402 East Lawyers Rd. spoke in opposition of the store. He stated that it was clear that the community did not want the store. The Dollar General provides a service, and we can appreciate them wanting to come into the community. In 2006, a grocery store was looking at coming into the lot behind the gas station. This is a farming and rural community, and the land is zoned RA-40. The Planning Board will have to decide that this will benefit the community, and if it will provide a long-term benefit for the community. He feels that there is no true way that this will benefit our community. While he feels growth is good, he stated that growth must be directed where our community finds it acceptable.

Next, Becky Seaman of 727 Baucom Deese Rd. spoke in opposition of the store. She stated that she and her family moved to Unionville because of the community and what it is. She stated that they just knew it was a good small town. She has a daughter in middle school and a Dollar General backing up to Piedmont Middle School is terrifying. Her biggest concern is that this location is too close to the kids. She is afraid that it will snowball, inviting more development. She wants to keep Unionville as our small town.

Next, Doug Helms of 2804 Love Mill Road spoke in opposition of the store. He stated that he lives directly across the road from the proposed location and has been there for 30 years. His grandfather was born and raised in the area. He voiced concern that the tract is 5.7 acres, but they are only rezoning 2.5 acres. He stated that no one will build a house on the remaining land in that tract and the other side of the tract might as well be rezoned. He stated that this is our Mayberry, and the town will have to fight to hold on to our Mayberry. He is concerned that all of the land in that area will open the door for major development, turning the town into a place like Stallings. He also voiced concern that the traffic will be an issue, even though it was studied by DOT. His other concern was in regard to the water runoff, which will flow directly to his pastures across the road. He noted that with stores in Fairview and New Salem, that while we do not have a store in the community like Jim Baucom's, we can easily go down the road for supplies. He said that people love the rural atmosphere, and it will go away once this area begins to develop.

Next, Cory Klasset of Newton, NC, spoke to represent the Haigler Family, the property owners, in favor of the store. He stated that the marketing of the property was based on the approved Land Use Plan and vision for that property. In 2007, the Board made a recommendation that this property would be a strategic node for commercial use needs in the Town, as outlined in the future land use vision. He expressed appreciation to have an opportunity to bring this to the Board.

Next, LeNae Haigler of 1521 Tom Helms Rd. spoke in favor of the store. She stated that she was proud of her address. She stated that many people know the two-story white house in the traffic circle. She and her husband have lived there for the past 23 years. She stated that the house was built with love

in 1887. They moved to Unionville in 1997. The house was about ready to fall in. Her husband and his family bought it in 1979. One farmer told them to dig a whole and bury the house because it was in such bad shape. They remodeled the house in 1997 and found out some history of that house. Bits and pieces of history within this community started coming together. They revitalized the house and that piece of property to be beautiful again. They have painted every inch of that house. All of the work they did themselves and didn't hire the labor done. They learned that the house was the stopping point for people coming from Anson County to Charlotte. The people who built the house had troughs for the horses to drink and a place for people to rest under the trees. She and her family have tried to show the same love, not only for that property, but for neighbors and community. In 2003, when they heard that the convenience store would be built, they knew it would provide a service for the community. She said that they sit on the front porch, watching the comings and goings of everyone. It has been a good community. Every morning, the Marathon's parking lot is full of people who stop and get biscuits and coffee. When the traffic circle was proposed, they supported it because they had experienced two crashes in one afternoon at the intersection. The traffic circle works. They watch it from their front porch. Everything they have done for the past 23 years has only been for the good of the community to provide beauty, strength, and atmosphere. They are providing what people need. Ken Trull asked to clarify her position of the store. Mrs. Haigler said she was in favor.

Next, Tanya Hinson of 1502 & 1412 Henry Smith Rd. spoke in opposition of the store. She stated that she has been here for 17 years. Her husband has been here his whole life. She addressed Mrs. Haigler, telling her that her house is beautiful. She stated that she, too, moved to Unionville thinking that it is a small town. She stated that she only got a letter at one of her properties, not the other, but it may not have been an adjoining property. She stated she was opposing this specific store; however, she was not opposed to the Dollar General and the goods it brings to the community. She expressed concern about a lack of law enforcement in the town to monitor the store. She is also concerned about the children and what they would be exposed to. She is trying to think of things that would benefit the town. While we do need resources and could use more food services, there are already two Dollar General locations on Highway 218. She expressed concern that it could be a place for kids to loiter after school. She said that the proximity to the middle school, lack of law enforcement, and potential for loitering are her reasons for thinking this is not the best location. In addition, she expressed concerns that it may create problems with traffic. She said they would not have purchased their home in 2003 if there had been a Dollar General in that location and she is concerned that it will damage their property values.

Next, Michelle Sullivan of 6317 Love Mill Rd. spoke in opposition of the store. She stated that she had two children in middle school and high school and echoed everyone in opposition. She also wanted to add a couple of concerns. She moved to Unionville in 2011. She stated that she is concerned about the teen drivers around the high school. When she drives through the area, there are kids driving everywhere, with no idea that they can kill somebody or themselves. She feels that by adding a left turn lane right there on Love Mill Rd., it would create more issues with traffic. The DOT does not live here and just has statistics. There are several kids who have died this year on Highway 218 in our area already. She has two Dollar Generals within seven minutes of her house, and a third is not necessary. There are better things that could be done with that property like a town park.

At this time, Mr. Almazan stated that he appreciated the opportunity to hear from the community. He stated that it was important for a developer to hear from the community. He said that

the current application and information he had was not sufficient to answer all of the questions and concerns that arose. He stated that they would like to withdraw their current application. Under the circumstances, he felt that a conditional rezoning might be more appropriate. He heard a lot of concerns raised about crime, traffic, lighting, and runoff. Those are things they can address with a conditional rezoning application, rather than a straight rezoning. In addition, the current requirement was only to notify adjacent owners; however, they will make a larger radius with notifications to ensure more members of the community would be included. He requested that the application be tabled to allow him time to come back more prepared. Ken Trull stated that he felt it was a negative that there was only one entrance into the property. Mr. Goddard stated that after hearing the feedback, especially concerns regarding the traffic, it does appear as a hindrance. They must abide by DOT's recommendations; however, he will ask to understand why that decision was made. He expressed appreciation to everyone who showed up to share their complaints and concerns.

Next, Mr. Klassett stated that the entrance was an issue that he had been back and forth with the developer and DOT about. The chief component behind that decision for one entrance was based on the safety of the kids at school. If they had two entrances, it could create an unintended shortcut, causing traffic issues. The DOT felt that this approach was the most suitable for the safety of all drivers, especially new drivers.

Next, Dalton Helms of 2804 Love Mill Road spoke out in opposition of the store. He stated that he grew up in the town. He stated he had done a lot of good in this community but was also a part of the rambunctious crowd and hung out wherever he could. He expressed concerns that it could be an opportunity for teens to congregate and then get into trouble. He did not want there to be another opportunity for someone to get into drugs, especially so closely to the schools.

At that time, Land Use Administrator Gaddy advised the Board that the applicant had requested to table the application. Ken Trull asked if it would be tabled until it was brought back up. Steve Outen stated that there were several folks who came to speak for or against the store. He didn't know the plans but did not feel that it would change the minds of those speaking out. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that currently, the application is for a straight rezoning to B-2 district. That does not bear with what is being requested tonight. Ken Trull stated that any applicant can pull an application. Land Use Administrator stated that all adjoining property owners were notified. She stated that Mr. Almazan had offered to notify more people with their next application. Doug Helms stated that the sign on the property was in a hole and was difficult to see. He also asked for plenty of time to be notified. Ken Trull stated that the time was governed by law. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that the ordinance states that notification has to be mailed no less than 10 and no more than 25 day of a meeting. The sign is also erected seven days prior to a meeting. Mr. Helms asked that the sign be moved to somewhere more visible.

Bob Maynard stated that he felt there would have been better attendance if there were an option to hold a virtual meeting. Ken Trull stated that we had options for a larger facility, and we may be able to use one of those locations in the future, if needed. Jerry Adams made a motion to table the application, which was seconded by Craig Rushing, and passed unanimously.

Chairman Adams then introduced the Recommendation of Rezoning #ZC-20-04, rezoning a portion of parcel #08168006J, located at 1210 Sikes Mill Road, from RA-40 to CUD-LI for a tire recap or

repair facility. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she wanted to mention to the Planning Board that Mr. Pressley submitted an application for rezoning, and she had checked with Union County's Zoning office to review this zoning request. At that time, Lee Jenson confirmed in an email that the front portion was RA-40, and the back portion was LI. However, Mr. Pressley presented a letter from 1983 to this meeting that states that the entire six acres was rezoned from RA-40 to LI. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she was not sure how we should go forward, and she advised the Board to table the issue so she could seek more information. According to the Land Use maps, which were provided by Union County, the front portion was showing as RA-40 and the back portion showing as LI. One of the Board members asked which portion Mr. Pressley's home was on. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that the house is on the back portion that is zoned LI. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that he wants to put a tire facility on the front portion. Craig Rushing asked where the confusion was coming from and where the two different records had come from. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she believed that both the letter and the email came from the County Planner's office. Ken Trull stated that in 2003, the Planning Board voted to accept all of the zoning in place from the county planner's office. If the letter is true, we would need someone from the planner's office to clarify it. Craig Rushing stated that he felt the Board had no choice but to table this topic and figure out the disconnect between what we have and what we think we had. Mr. Fred Pressley was in attendance and stated that he believed the reason that it was not done at one time was because the front portion of the property was his grandmother's dowry. The tire store was opened in 1983. He told the Board that if it would make things go faster, he would be fine for them to go forward with the rezoning. He stated that it had been put off because of all of the running back and forth to the courthouse. He would like to go ahead and get this thing situated. Scott Barbee asked if Mr. Pressley wanted the entire six-acre tract zoned as LI. Mr. Pressley stated that he wanted the entire property to be LI, and according to the letter, that was done in 1983. Craig Rushing stated that there are two conflicting pieces of information and we need to clarify which piece of information was accurate. Steve Outen asked if there was a problem with hearing the matter and voting on it. Chairman Adams stated that if the land is already zoned as LI, there is nothing to vote on. Steve Outen then asked why it was being discussed. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she reached out to Union County's Planning Office to verify that our records are correct. They confirmed that the front of the property was RA-40, and the back portion of the property was zoned LI. Mr. Pressley stated that the letter came from the Planning Office and was provided to his surveyor. Ken Trull asked if there were people in attendance to speak about this request for rezoning. There were some people in attendance. He stated that the Board should hear from those who came out to the meeting, and then make some sort of contingent recommendation. He stated that it might still be a moot point. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she felt that would be a reasonable course of action. Chairman Adams then called on Alexandra and Joseph Caldwell.

Alexandra and Joseph Caldwell of 1215 Sikes Mill Road spoke in opposition of the rezoning request. They requested that the hearing be postponed since many neighbors who feel the same way were unable to attend this meeting. They did question the confusion on the rezoning issue but would like to postpone for their neighbors who could not attend due to medical reasons. Chairman Adams stated that they will be notified of any further hearings or meetings regarding this request.

Next, Renee Hendricks of 1204 Sikes Mill Road spoke on behalf of her mother, Beulah Ryan, in opposition of the rezoning request. She stated that she manages a childcare center and private school that adjoins the property. While she supports everyone working and making a living, she is still

concerned about having a tire place directly beside the playground. The proposed building would only be 50 yards away from the playground. She stated that they would not be as opposed if the business were located on the back side of the property but has concerns regarding the property values and safety of the children if the shop were moved to the front of the property.

Chairman Adams clarified that Mr. Pressley is wanting to build a shop on the front of the property and the old shop is in the back. He advised the Board that the Land Use Administrator would need to check on the disconnect between the communications we have received, and the applicant has provided from the county Planner's Office. Mr. Pressley stated that they would like to put it there in the front and could move it back 200 feet to be on LI zoned property; however, he did not want to have to re-do his garden spot. He stated there is a fence, trees, and a concrete driveway that would separate his shop from the childcare facility. He said there would be no trash, drugs, or traffic problems. Ken Trull asked Mr. Pressley if he had a drawing or diagram of the proposed facility. Mr. Pressley did not, however, he stated that it would be a 60x30 industrial-grade metal building with three bays on the front and an office. Craig Rushing asked if they would only be doing tires. Mr. Pressley stated that they would be doing tires and may add an inspection bay. Scott Barbee stated that he understood Land Use Administrator Gaddy would be calling the county Planner's Office to speak with them next week and verify the letter. If that is true, then the property stands as it is. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she would need direction from the Board regarding what action she should take. Their motion should include a statement of reasonableness and consistency. Since this is a Conditional Use District, she did include eight conditions and if the Board chooses to recommend rezoning, those conditions will need to be included as well. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that the applicant has agreed to all of the conditions except that he is considering Saturday morning hours from 8-12. Craig Rushing stated that he was still struggling with the two conflicting pieces of information and curious as to why the Board has two different responses from the same office. He made a motion to table the request to give Land Use Administrator Gaddy some time to find out more details. He stated it would be better for everyone in the room and it would also give the applicant some time to get a layout of the proposed facility to give the Board an idea of what it will look like and give them a more thorough understanding of the request. Ken Trull seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she would check the zoning. Ken Trull stated that if she gets clarification and the letter stands, then it would not need to be a future agenda item and the applicant would not have to come back before the Board. Steve Outen asked Land Use Administrator Gaddy if she would notify Mr. Pressley of her findings. She advised him that she would.

The next point of conversation was the Recommendation of Text Amendment #TC-20-03, Section 220 regarding easement lots. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that this was discussed in our September meeting. Council agreed with the Board's interpretation of the ordinance, concluding that an easement lot can be put on any lot, not just two easement lots on a parent parcel. She told the Board that they could consider this item to push it through or table it for more information. Chairman Adams read both the current and proposed wording to the Board. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that the wording does sound similar, and it is. When checked, it means that the parent parcel is the same as what the Town adopted from Union County's maps in 2003. Nadine, our consultant from N-Focus was not supportive of this change because she was concerned that it would open the door to having several lots served by easements. Currently, we do not have a ton of easement lots. Land Use Administrator Gaddy went on to tell the Board that if they wanted some time to study the wording, they could table the issue.

Ken Trull asked if there was any request that would make this issue more pressing. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that this was not a pressing matter. Ken Trull made a motion to table the Text Amendment, which was seconded by Andy Fowler. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Adams then opened the next item for conversation, the recommendation of survey questions for the new Land Use Plan. Land Use Administrator Gaddy advised the Board to be thinking of questions to put on a survey to the town to update our Land Use Plan. That plan needs to be updated and we need to consider questions, topics, and things to address so we can get to work on the survey. Devin Clontz asked when the survey would be sent out. Deputy Clerk Braswell responded that as soon as we get the questions together, we will begin working on survey distribution. Ken Trull asked if this would be a mail-in survey. Deputy Clerk Braswell stated that they have discussed doing a virtual survey and having hard copies made available through key points in the community, like convenience stores or churches. Ken Trull commented that we seem to have a recurring issue that a vocal number of citizens do not want anything. He asked if the Town was required to have a Land Use Plan. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she has to refer to the Land Use Plan and we did need it for her office. Ken Trull stated that it seemed like every time an issue came forward, there was a loud outcry from the town. If an applicant brings a request forward and it meets the requirements, then it gets voted down. Scott Barbee mentioned that the survey distributed by the Parks and Recreation committee several years ago might be a good place to find some questions. Ken Trull stated that he would like to see the survey be as broad as possible and reach as many citizens as possible. He pondered if the eleven people speaking out against the Dollar General reflected the majority's opinion or not. Chairman Adams agreed that he could see both sides of everyone's statements in the meeting. While it would be nice to have the store, no one wants it in their backyard. The majority of those speaking out lived close to the proposed location. Steve Outen stated that any survey questions would need to be worded in such a way that both sides can respond clearly. Devin Clontz asked Land Use Administrator Gaddy if there was a database of emails that could be used to send out the survey. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that she did not have a database of email. Scott Barbee asked if we could show a map with the survey so people could get a visual of the areas in question. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that we might be able to link the current map to an electronic survey. Councilman Jeff Broadaway was in attendance and stated that the Land Use Plan is a living document that should change and be representative of the community. He advised the Board that the survey could be done in three questions: 1. Would you like to see growth in Unionville? 2. What type of growth would you like to see in Unionville? (Residential, commercial, give examples) 3. Where would you like to see that growth in Unionville? Ken Trull stated that it bothers him that we have a Land Use Plan, pages full of criteria in the Ordinance, and an applicant comes forward who meets those criteria with a request. At that moment, we are met with all kinds of reasons as to why it is a bad idea, and the Board ends up voting against it. If we were to take the politics out of the decision, if the ordinance says that it meets the requirements, then it should be considered. Scott Barbee clarified that the Board was just being asked to get questions together. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated yes, and she would work on pulling former surveys.

The next item on the agenda that Chairman Adams brought forward was the Annexation #26, Essex Pointe, Update. Land Use Administrator Gaddy stated that the Board recommended RA-40 zoning; however, the annexation has not happened yet due to an illegal part of the annexation. They have given the applicants more time, and they are working to address the issue. The annexation has not happened yet but will likely happen in the near future.

In other business, Councilman Jeff Broadaway thanked the Board for all of the work they do on behalf of the Town.

With there being no other business and upon a motion by Craig Rushing, seconded by Scott Barbee, the meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melody Braswell

Deputy Clerk