



RANDOLPH COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

January 10, 2023

There was a meeting of the Randolph County Planning Board on Tuesday, January 10, 2023, at 6:30 p.m. in the 1909 Historic Courthouse Meeting Room, 145-C Worth St, Asheboro, NC.

Chairman **Pell** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance and asked for a roll call of the members.

Hal Johnson, County Manager, called the roll of the Board members.

- Reid Pell, Chair, *present*;
- Kemp Davis, Vice-Chair, *present*;
- John Cable, *present*;
- Melinda Vaughan, *present*;
- Reggie Beeson, *present*;
- Ken Austin, *present*;
- Barry Bunting, *present*; and
- Brandon Hedrick, Alternate, *present*.

County Attorney, **Ben Morgan**, was also present.

Johnson informed the Chairman there was a quorum of the members present for the meeting. He announced that the Crumley case, originally postponed until tonight's meeting has been postponed until the next Planning Board meeting, being held on February 7, 2023.

Pell called for a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Consent Agenda:

- Approval of agenda for the January 10, 2023, Planning Board meeting.
- Approval of the minutes from the December 6, 2022, Planning Board meeting.

Davis made the motion to approve the consent agenda as presented, with **Austin** making the second to the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Pell asked the Board members if there were any conflicts in the following cases. Hearing none, **Johnson** presented the first case along with site plans, and pictures of the site and surrounding properties.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUEST #2022-00003162

The Randolph County Planning Board will hold a duly published and notified Quasi-judicial Hearing on the request by **JAMES MATTHEW AND HALEIGH PAIGE POOLE**, Denton, NC, and their request to obtain a Special Use Permit at 6345 Bombay School Rd, New Hope Township, Tax ID #6697331685, 2.71 acres, RA - Residential Agricultural District. It is the desire of the applicant to obtain a Special Use Permit to specifically allow a hair salon in an existing 24 ft. by 15 ft. building as per the site plan.

Pell opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak for or against the request to come forward and take the oath before giving testimony on the request. **Morgan** administered the oath to **Matthew** and **Haleigh Poole**.

Matthew Poole and **Haleigh Poole**, 6345 Bombay School Rd, Denton, addressed the Board. **M. Poole** said the building shown in the agenda packet for the Board members will be used for a hair salon and placed according to the surveyed site plan as shown as well.

Johnson asked **M. Poole** to confirm that the building would not be in the floodplain. **M. Poole** said it would not be in flood. **Johnson** asked how many employees Haleigh planned to have. **H. Poole** said she would be the only one working at this location.

Cable asked for the hours of operation. **H. Poole** said her normal hours would fall within the hours of 9:00 a.m. through 6:00 p.m., Tuesday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. on Saturday.

Johnson asked if there would be any loud music played on site. **H. Poole** answered no.

Davis asked if the building would be moved to this site. **M. Poole** said the building is a pre-manufactured office building already on site. He said it would be slid back and placed on a permanent foundation if the request is approved.

Bunting asked if they lived on the property. **M. Poole** answered yes. He said the initial application was for their 2.71-acre tract which has changed to 9.63 acres because they combined the deed with their adjoining tract.

Pell asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, **Pell** asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, **Pell** closed the public hearing for discussion among the Board members and a motion.

Having no opposition, **Cable** asked if the notice was duly posted. It was confirmed that notices were duly posted.

Bunting made the motion to **APPROVE** this Special Use Permit request on the specified parcel(s) on the Special Use Permit application, based upon the sworn witness testimony

that is included in the minutes, as well as the site plan(s) with any and all agreed-upon revisions, and that the use will not materially endanger the public health or safety, the use meets all required conditions and specifications, the use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property, that the use is a public necessity and the location and character of the use if developed according to the plan(s) as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area and in general conformity with the *Randolph County Unified Development Ordinance*. **Austin** seconded the motion to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit.

Pell, having a proper motion and second, called the question on the motion to approve the rezoning request, and the motion was adopted unanimously.

Johnson presented the second case, site plans, and pictures of the site and surrounding properties.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUEST #2022-00003163

The Randolph County Planning Board will hold a duly published and notified Quasi-judicial Hearing on the request by **KAYDEN NICHOLSON**, Trinity, NC, and their request to obtain a Special Use Permit at 3710 Thayer Rd, Tabernacle Township, Lake Reese Balance Watershed, Tax ID #7705017102, Homewood Acres Subdivision Revised Section 2, lot 2A, 0.87 acres, RA - Residential Agricultural District. It is the desire of the applicant to obtain a Special Use Permit to specifically allow a small furniture maker in an existing 24 ft. by 48 ft. building with no employees as per the site plan.

Pell opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak for or against the request to come forward and take the oath before giving testimony on the request. **Morgan** administered the oath to **Kayden Nicholson**.

Kayden Nicholson, 3710 Thayer Rd, Trinity, rose to address the Board. He explained that he has been woodworking for several years and has been busy making furniture for his own home including; beds, side tables, end tables, dressers, and coffee tables, in addition to other pieces. He said people have seen his work and have shown interest in having him build pieces for them as well so he is asking for this Special Use Permit to allow him to do so.

Johnson said the application states there will be no employees. **Nicholson** said that is correct. He said his wife lends a helping hand occasionally. **Johnson** asked **Nicholson** if he understands that if the request and conditions are approved, he will be held to those conditions and will not be allowed to expand his business without coming back before the Board with a request. **Nicholson** said he understands.

Davis asked if he is currently building furniture in the workshop. **Nicholson** answered yes and that he is currently working on a couple of desks for himself but has not built them commercially. **Davis** asked if he has had any complaints. **Nicholson** answered no.

Johnson asked **Nicholson** how he became aware that he would need a Special Use Permit. **Nicholson** said he works with a gentleman that asked him if has been approved to work on furniture for others.

Austin asked **Nicholson** if he plans to have retail sales for the finished product out of this building. **Nicholson** answered no. **Nicholson** said he is not set up for retail sales, he would bring materials in on his truck and deliver to the needed locations as well. **Austin** asked if all his work would be custom-built. **Nicholson** answered yes.

Beeson asked for his hours of operation. **Nicholson** said he has a full-time job where he works until 12:30 or 1:00 p.m., so he may start as early as 1:00 p.m. until approximately 7:00 p.m. He said in the last year, he may have spent 150 hours total in the workshop so it would not be excessive.

Cable said with these types of operations, the main complaint is noise at dinner time. **Nicholson** said his wife normally gets home around 5:00 p.m. with their child and he typically stops working to spend time with the family. **Cable** asked if these hours are during the week and not on the weekend. **Nicholson** answered yes.

Morgan asked **Nicholson** what type of equipment he uses. **Nicholson** said he has a table saw, router table, drill press, band saw, hand tools, sanders, nail guns, staplers, glue, and maybe a couple of others.

Beeson asked if he has an air compressor and if so, is it located inside or outside the building. **Nicholson** said he has one located inside the building.

Austin asked how he planned to store and dispose of the waste material. **Nicholson** said he stacks the material in the corner of the shop and disposes of it at a waste facility located off Kersey Valley when he has enough to make a trip.

Pell asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, **Pell** asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the request.

Morgan administered the oath to **Amy Stout**.

Amy Stout, 3696 Thayer Rd, Trinity, told the Board that the noise from equipment being used in the building is high-pitched in a metal building with no insulation or sound barrier. **Stout** said she works from home and can hear the noise while trying to work. She said she had called in a noise complaint to the County previously because at one time he was out of work and would run his equipment all day long, seven days a week and the building is located as close to her property as it is allowed to be. She said even having Leyland cypress trees along her fence line, does not drown out the noise.

Johnson asked **Stout** if she is the closest neighbor to **Nicholson**. **Stout** answered yes. **Morgan** asked what structure is located next to **Nicholson's** building. **Stout** said it is their storage building. **Morgan** asked **Stout** if her building is metal as well. **Stout** answered no and that their building is constructed of wood.

Cable asked when she had called to make the noise complaint. **Stout** said she called on December 29, 2021. She said the County employee said he would investigate. She said when she is home, she would like some peace and quiet.

Davis asked if she had spoken to the applicant about the noise issues. **Stout** answered yes.

Austin asked **Stout** what the earliest and latest she has heard the equipment running. **Stout** said during COVID-19 when everyone was working abnormal hours, she heard the noise as early as 8:00 a.m. and as late as 8:00 p.m., during the summer, sometimes seven days a week.

Austin asked if the hours were reduced from 8:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m., would be acceptable. **Stout** said not seven days a week. She said several other neighbors are in opposition to the request that could not be present at the meeting. **Cable** asked if the other neighbors have filed a complaint with the County. **Stout** said she was unsure.

Having no additional opposition, **Pell** asked **Nicholson** if he would like to address the concerns brought before the Board.

Nicholson said if he planned to work in the shop seven days a week, this would be a very different venture. He said he has a full-time job and cannot remember the last time he was in the shop on a weekend. He said he may work in the shop a few times a week, for a couple of hours at most.

Austin asked if he would have an issue with set hours of operation and what those hours would look like for him. **Nicholson** said right now he is usually not in the shop any earlier than 12:00 p.m. and no later than 7:00 p.m. and rarely on weekends because he is trying to spend time with his family.

Morgan explained to **Nicholson** and the Board that if he agrees to specific hours for this request, **Nicholson** is limiting himself from using the workshop outside of the agreed-upon hours, even for personal use.

Beeson asked if he has given any thought to adding insulation to the building to help with the noise. **Nicholson** said he is not opposed to adding insulation but has not investigated it at this time because he was unaware of the noise issue. **Beeson** said he feels there should be a sound barrier to help with the noise. **Nicholson** said he does not feel the noise that is created in his shop exceeds the excessive late-night barking and trucks revving engines.

Davis asked **Nicholson** if he could describe the natural buffer that exists near his shop. **Nicholson** said there are some Leyland Cypress as mentioned by **Stout** as well as some pines and evergreens. **Davis** asked if the barrier was fully enclosed and if there was anything else he felt he could do to make the buffer even better. **Nicholson** said the buffer is full for the most part. He said he could look into the insulation option and the possibility of planting additional trees and is open to all suggestions. **Pell** said the proximity of the

building to the property line may not allow additional buffers. **Nicholson** said the building is close to the existing buffer.

Davis said he would like to make sure that **Nicholson** fully understands the restrictions for proposed hours of operation and the limits it will place on him for personal use as well. **Nicholson** asked for more details. **Morgan** explained to **Nicholson** that if hours of operation are imposed such as 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, he would not be able to go to his shop and run machinery to work on anything personally or professionally at 8:00 a.m. **Cable** said even if he wanted to teach his daughter some woodworking, he would not be able to do so outside of those hours. After explaining and giving examples of use within and outside hours of operation, **Nicholson** said he understands that he is not to work outside of approved hours of operation.

Having no additional questions for **Nicholson**, **Pell** closed the public hearing for discussion among the Board members and a motion.

Davis said he sees no way to govern the addition of insulation to the building. **Austin** said he has more concerns about the day and hours of operation. **Johnson** said the biggest issue for the Board would be hours of operation for them to consider because the property is located within a residential area. **Cable** said adding the insulation would be a “good neighbor” thing to look into but the hours of operation would protect all the neighbors.

Johnson commends **Nicholson** for coming to the Board to ask for this Special Use Permit. He said it would be hard, if not impossible, to enforce insulation requirements but Code Enforcement can enforce hours of operation.

Hedrick said the property is in a *Secondary Growth Area* and the property across the street is in a *Rural Growth Area*. **Hedrick** said the intent was to “protect the character of residential areas” while allowing mixed land uses and feels that is the Board’s responsibility.

Cable said this is a classic example of neighbors co-existing with an outside function. He said there will be no employees and only running one machine at a time but if he were to lean in favor of the request, he would have to limit the hours of operation to be respectful of the neighbors.

Davis said looking at hours of operation, he would propose the limitation be Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. and on Saturdays from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. **Austin** said he would agree to those hours as well. **Nicholson** asked if there would be flexibility for Sunday. **Bunting** suggested there be no activity on Sundays so the neighbors have a break.

Nicholson amended and signed his application to include limited hours of operation. **Davis** made the motion to **APPROVE** this Special Use Permit request on the specified parcel(s) on the Special Use Permit application, based upon the sworn witness testimony that is included in the minutes, as well as the site plan(s) with any and all agreed-upon

revisions, and that the use will not materially endanger the public health or safety, the use meets all required conditions and specifications, the use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property, that the use is a public necessity and the location and character of the use if developed according to the plan(s) as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area and in general conformity with the *Randolph County Unified Development Ordinance*. **Austin** seconded the motion to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit.

Pell, having a proper motion and second, called the question on the motion to approve the Special Use request, and the motion was adopted unanimously.

Johnson presented the third case, site plans, and pictures of the site and surrounding properties.

REZONING REQUEST #2022-00003164

The Randolph County Planning Board will hold a duly published and notified Legislative Hearing on the request by **DIANA RARICK**, Franklinville, NC, and her request to rezone 0.85 acres out of 10.20 acres at 3264 Whites Memorial Rd, Franklinville Township, Tax ID #7784985132, Rural Growth Area, from RR - Residential Restricted and RA – *Residential Agricultural District* to RA - Residential Agricultural District. The proposed rezoning would allow any uses permitted by right in the RA – *Residential Agricultural District*.

Pell opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request to come forward and address the Planning Board.

Diana Rarick, 3264 Whites Memorial Rd, Franklinville, explained that she is requesting the Board allow her to place a single-wide mobile home as a second residence on her property in front of her existing home. She said the current zoning will only allow a double-wide home with a permanent foundation.

Johnson asked **Rarick** what would happen to her existing doublewide home on the property. **Rarick** said that her daughter and grandchildren will occupy that home and she plans to move into the proposed single-wide.

Pell asked **Rarick** if she plans to share the existing well and septic. **Rarick** answered no.

Cable asked **Rarick** if she would share the existing drive. **Rarick** answered yes.

Pell asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, **Pell** asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, **Pell** closed the public hearing for discussion among the Board members and a motion.

Johnson explained that the housing pattern back in 1987 provided the current zoning. He said there are no concerns from the community and this request is just to allow a single-wide mobile home rather than a double-wide mobile home.

With no opposition to the request, **Cable** asked if the request was advertised and properly posted. Confirmation was given by staff.

Davis expressed concerns regarding the change of existing zoning designations to allow single-wide mobile homes when the surrounding properties are zoned against it.

Johnson asked **Rarick** what age mobile home she plans to put on the property. **Rarick** said she has purchased a 1998 single-wide mobile home that will have metal underpinning.

Hedrick asked about the orientation of the home on the property. **Rarick** said it would be perpendicular to the road.

Davis asked if she would be sharing a drive with the existing home. **Rarick** answered yes and that she owns the entire property.

Austin asked if the homesite has already been prepared for the home. **Rarick** said the area is already cleared, location of the home, septic, and well have been marked and waiting on Environmental Health approval to proceed.

Johnson said the Board would not be setting precedence for other lots, they would only be approving the one site.

Cable said the request fits the area. **Hedrick** said there are surrounding tracts with the RA zoning already in place. **Cable** said he feels that the applicant has done everything she can to be close to family and help them out.

Cable made the motion to **APPROVE** the rezoning request to rezone the specified parcel(s) on the rezoning application to the requested zoning district based upon the **Determination of Consistency and Findings of Reasonableness and Public Interest** statements that are included in the Planning Board agenda, submitted during the rezoning presentation and as may be amended, incorporated into the motion, to be included in the minutes, as well as the site plan(s) with all agreed-upon revisions, also incorporated into the motion and that the request is consistent with the *Randolph County Growth Management Plan*. **Bunting** made a second to the motion to **APPROVE** the rezoning request.

Pell, having a proper motion and second, called the question on the motion to approve the rezoning request, and the motion was adopted unanimously.

Johnson explained the 15-day waiting period for a possible appeal and a permit will follow that waiting period.

Johnson then presented the last case of the night along with site plans and photographs of the request location.

REZONING REQUEST #2022-00003236

The Randolph County Planning Board will hold a duly published and notified Legislative Hearing on the request by **GREGORY R BENNETT**, Liberty, NC, and his request to rezone 5.51 acres on Andrew Hunter Rd, Franklinville Township, Tax ID #7781799897, Gregory R Bennett and Angela Leak Subdivision lot number 1, Primary Growth Area, from RR - Residential Restricted and *RA – Residential Agricultural District* to HC - Highway Commercial District. The proposed rezoning would allow any uses permitted by right in the *HC – Highway Commercial District*.

Pell opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request to come forward and address the Planning Board.

Gregory Bennett, 7590 Old 421 Rd, Liberty, told the Board that he would like to develop this property for commercial use without specific conditions like the property across the street because he is uncertain what the future needs will be at this time.

Morgan asked which property across the street is zoned commercial. **Bennett** explained that it is the building on the corner of US Hwy 64 and Andrew Hunter Rd. He said it is a rental property that has been used for multiple uses such as a lawnmower repairs shop, and sweepstakes as well as other uses in the past and is not actually on US Hwy 64, there is another property owner for the lot that fronts on that road.

Johnson described the surrounding properties that have been rezoned in the past and the uses for those properties.

Pell said the property **Bennett** is referring does not touch US Hwy 64 and the adjacent rental building has been used for multiple things over the years.

Johnson asked **Bennett** how long he has owned the property. He said it has been in his family since the 1940s and passed down. He said his mother gave this and the adjoining property to his sister and himself. He said he gave the homesite to his sister and kept the pasture for himself.

Davis asked if he is asking to rezone the entire 5.51 acres. **Bennett** answered yes. He said he is currently allowing a neighbor to rent a portion of the pasture for her horses.

Pell asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, **Pell** asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the request.

Clayton Sommer, 4251 US Hwy 64 E, Asheboro, said he owns the western and southern property borders of the request and is a fifth-generation cattle farmer which has been in his family for approximately a century. He said the water from **Bennett's** property drains directly into the main watering hole for his cattle. He said the development with asphalt and roofing as opposed to pasture as it is now, has the potential to damage his creek and property from the excessive water drainage in addition to the pollutants from commercial

businesses. He said the water run-off from parking areas is higher in lead and cadmium than your average rainwater. He submitted topographical maps for the Board to see (*Exhibit 1*), demonstrating the possibilities of water drainage from the intense storms we have in this area. He said the amount of noise and pollutants is also uncertain because there is no “plan” for development at this time. He said there could be a small commercial business on the property that will cause no issues but without a known plan, there could also be a large industrial business with many pollutants.

Austin asked **Sommer** the size of his property adjacent. **Sommer** said he owns 33 acres directly adjacent to the requested property, as well as the tract adjacent to that. **Johnson** asked how long he has owned the property. **Sommer** said he purchased the property from his great-uncle in August 2022, with the understanding that he would continue the agricultural use because of the family history of the property of almost 100 years.

Johnson asked if his main concern was that there is no specific plan for the intended use of the property and there is no site plan to show the potential run-off of the property and how it will affect his farm. **Sommer** answered yes.

Susan Richards, 207 Andrew Hunter Rd, Asheboro stated that she is a northern neighbor to the request and currently rents a portion of the pasture from **Bennett** for her horses. She said she does not necessarily have objections to the development of Bennett’s property but agrees that there needs to be a specified plan.

Richards said she moved here for the rural tranquility of the area, intentionally placing herself in and around residential zoning, and even though she is not against growth, she feels there should be a more specific plan to protect the residents of the area, potentially causing harm to the value of the surrounding properties.

Richards said if this property is rezoned *HC*, especially without conditions, there are many concerns including safety, the lighting used for the business, the hours of operation, what pollutants will be present, and will there be required buffers. She asked the Board to consider their concerns and deny the request without a plan.

Having no additional opposition, **Pell** closed the public hearing for discussion among the Board members and a motion.

Johnson commended the applicants that have come before the Board with requests to comply with County policy. He said in this case, the neighbors have not said they are opposed to the development but need a planned use of the property. He asked the Board to consider if the request is an appropriate location for straight re-zoning to allow any permitted use under the *HC* zoning or a location to consider a conditional district that would require a particular land use with a site plan.

Austin said the *HC* zoning allows a very broad spectrum of uses and some of the uses are simple, while other allowable uses are complex, and he understands the neighbors’ need to have a plan for the rezoning request.

Hedrick stated that the property is in the *Primary Growth Area* and one of the responsibilities per the *Growth Management Plan* is to minimize incompatibilities by requiring buffers and screens, and the other is to use transitional development to buffer between incompatible uses and there is no plan to show the transitional buffering for the property and how it will affect the area.

Davis said he agrees with the other Board members that the request needs a plan for development because of the impact it will have on the adjoining agricultural properties. **Cable** agreed. He said this situation goes a little deeper than just having a property located on US Hwy 64 because it is also surrounded by agricultural uses.

Davis made the motion to **DENY** the rezoning request to rezone the specified parcel(s) on the rezoning application to the requested zoning district based upon the **Determination of Consistency and Findings of Reasonableness and Public Interest** statements that are included in the Planning Board agenda, submitted during the rezoning presentation and as may be amended, incorporated into the motion, to be included in the minutes, as well as the site plan(s) with all agreed-upon revisions, also incorporated into the motion and that the request is not consistent with the *Randolph County Growth Management Plan*. **Austin** made a second to the motion to **DENY** the rezoning request.

Pell, having a proper motion and second, called the question on the motion to deny the rezoning request, and the motion was adopted unanimously.

There was recognition of a group of citizens that attended the meeting for observation purposes only.

Johnson announced that he had presented a proposal to the County Commissioners to approve funding for a *Growth Management Plan* update in the northeast Randolph County area, working with the Piedmont Triad Regional Council and the municipalities being affected. He said he envisions several joint meetings within the next six to seven months between the Planning Board and County Commissioners.

Johnson said the Commissioners have authorized him to nominate a Steering Committee which will consist of several managers of municipalities and staff. He asked **Reggie Beeson**, **Ken Austin**, and **Brandon Hedrick** to become a part of the committee. All three members agreed to join the committee.

Having no further business, **Pell** called for a motion to **ADJOURN** the meeting. **Cable** made the motion to adjourn, with **Austin** making the second to the motion.

Pell, having a proper motion, and second, called the question on the motion to **ADJOURN**. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m., with 24 citizens present.

**RANDOLPH COUNTY
NORTH CAROLINA**

Chairman

Clerk to the Board

Date



Approved by Randolph County Planning Board

February 7, 2023

Risks to Creeks and Farms via Rezoning and Subsequent Development of REID 93269

Clayton Sommer



Topographical Proof of Runoff Direction and Cause for Concern



Figure 1: Topographical Map of REID 93269 in relation to adjacent farms. Yellow lines denote topographical elevations, the highest elevation being at the center bottom of the picture. Note the sharp notches along the right hand side of the farm property. The points of those lines lie along a creek that supplies the primary watering hole for the cows towards the back of the farm. That creek runs just to the inside of the property boundary, where water drains to it from REID 93269.

Coefficient of Runoff

Coefficient of runoff C is a dimensionless mathematical term used to calculate how fast runoff will from rain will flow on a given surface (4). Typical numbers given for Asphalt, Lightly and Heavily Vegetated Clay soil are 1.00, 0.60, and 0.50, respectively. REID 93269 is 5.51 acres, nearly all of which drains to my property.

This means that for a given rainfall event, the runoff from any paved or roofed area of REID 93269 will enter the creek at almost twice the rate of what it currently does. This could cause major damage to the farm topology, flooding of low areas, and represent massive costs to me, especially given that we live in an area known for intense summer storms that biannually reach 1.58"/hr (1). An acre-inch is 3630 cubic yards, about 27154.3 US gallons.

Litter and Pollution

It is well known that runoff from traffic areas contains pollutants such as Lead, Cadmium, Copper, and Zinc (3).

Citations:

1. Rainfall Intensity:
<https://www.greensboro-nc.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/4682/636510647144300000>
2. Topographical Map: <https://gis.randolphcountync.gov/randolphts/>
3. Heavy Metals: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26448594/>,
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5899753/>,
4. Coefficient of Runoff:
<https://www.ndspro.com/PDFs/Tech-Spec-Guides/definitive-drainage-guide.pdf>

Compromises:

1. Installation of a Wet pond or Wetland Mesocosm on REID 93269 that water enters before draining to my property.