GRANVILLE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
February 3, 2025
GRANVILLE EXPO AND CONVENTION CENTER
4185 US Highway 15 South, Oxford, North Carolina

PRESENT:
Chair Jimmy Gooch
Vice-Chair Zelodis Jay
Commissioner Robert Williford
Commissioner Mark Griffin
Commissioner Tony W. Cozart
Commissioner Russ May
Commissioner Timothy Karan

County Manager Drew Cummings
Deputy County Manager Korena Weichel
County Attorney James C. Wrenn, Jr.

CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m. Chair Jimmy Gooch called the meeting to order. Commissioner Tony W. Cozart had the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Timothy Karan, and unanimously carried, Board approved the consent agenda as follows:

A. Approved budget amendment 12 for fiscal year 2024-2025.

BUDGET AMENDMENT 12
February 3, 2025
Legal Document

Be it ordained, the FY 2024-2025 Annual Budget Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:

GENERAL FUND

Expenditures	**Increase**	**Decrease**	**Total**
General Government			**$1,819**
Finance	$ 1,819	$ -	
Human Services			**($23,667)**
Social Services	$ -	$ 25,000	
Oxford Senior Center	$ 200	$ -	
Creative Lifetime Learning	$ 1,133	$ -	
Contributions to Other Funds & Contingencies			**$25,000**
Contingencies	$ 25,000	$ -	
	Total Expenditures		**$3,152**
Revenues			
Restricted and Intergovernmental	$3,152	$ -	
	Total Revenues		**$3,152**

B. Approved the following tax refunds, releases and write-offs:

- Refunds January 10, 2025 – January 23, 2025: $1,615.09
- Releases January 10, 2025 – January 23, 2025: $1,689.59
- Write-offs ($2 and less) January 10, 2025 – January 23, 20254: $4.48

C. Approved the Tax Collector's Report, pursuant to NGCS 105-369(a) and authorized the Tax Collector to advertise tax liens.

Total Amount of Unpaid 2024 Tax Bills: $2,595,557.55 (as of January 28, 2025)

Initial Billing & Adjustments

Category	Category Description	Amount ($)
Total Billed as of 6/30/2024	Total assessed tax liability before any adjustments	**48,509,389.22**
Addition: Discoveries	Total discoveries after 6/30/2024	**1,589,709.04**
Minus: Releases	Total approved corrections	**-162,064.67**
Levy	Net tax liability after adjustments and corrections	**49,937,033.59**

Payments & Balance

Category	Category Description	Amount ($)
Levy	Net tax liability carried forward from adjustments	**49,937,033.59**
Minus: Discounts	Reductions applied for early payment incentives	**-492,946.91**
Minus: Payment Received	Total payments collected from taxpayers	**-46,848,529.13**
Outstanding Balance	Outstanding balance due after payments and discounts	**2,595,557.55**

Collection Rate: 94.80% (as of January 28, 2025)

D. **Approved the reclassification of Facility Maintenance Director to grade level 74 and addition of Facility Maintenance Assistant Director at grade level 72 in the 2024-2025 Pay & Classification Plan**

E. **Approved the selection of Eagle View for aerial image services and authorized the County Manager and County Attorney to negotiate a contract, to be presented to the Board for approval at a later date.**

F. **Approved minutes:**
- January 6, 2025 Regular Meeting
- January 21, 2025 Regular Meeting

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one came forward for public comments.

FINANCE MATTERS

Board Approved Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report
Audit Presentation Overview
Hunter Wiseman presented on behalf of Thompson, Price, Scott, Adams & Co., P.A. Wiseman distributed copies to the Board of the full 'Annual Comprehensive Financial Report For Year Ended – June 30, 2024'. The presentation covered the letter to governance, audit results, and additional required communications. Regarding the letter to governance, the auditor reported that the financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024 were audited in accordance with the contract signed on April 17, 2024. The auditor noted one new adopted standard, GASB Statement No. 100, and confirmed that management's accounting estimates were accurate, with no significant estimates or assumptions identified. The disclosures in the financial statements were found to be neutral, consistent, and clear.

Wiseman walked the Board through the details of the Presentation Summary included in the agenda packet.

Commissioner Cozart inquired whether the education expenditure had decreased from the previous year, noting that he had thought the amount was in the thirties. The auditor clarified that the chart on page 13 of the summary report only reflected the current fiscal year, but a comparison on page five of the same document showed that education expenditures had actually increased over the past five years. In 2024, the amount was $21.5 million, up from $21.4 million in 2023. The auditor explained that while the percentage of total expenditures allocated to education may have decreased, the actual dollar amount had not, likely due to rising costs in other departments.

Motioned by Commissioner Robert Williford, seconded by Commissioner Timothy Karan, and unanimously carried, Board approved the Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Audit Report (Annual Comprehensive Financial Report) as presented by Thompson, Price, Scott, Adams and Co., P.A.

PUBLIC HEALTH MATTERS

Board Allocated Opioid Settlement Funding to Granville County Sheriff's Office
Cathy Hazlett, the Substance Use Prevention and Treatment Program Manager for Granville Vance Public Health, said that the funding allocations in the next three agenda items have been reviewed and unanimously approved by the Opioid Advisory Committee(OAC). Hazlett explained that the opioid settlement fund is reimbursement-based and that no funds have yet been spent from the initial allocation for the Granville County Sheriff's Office. She highlighted that any unspent funds remain available for future use. She emphasized that the strategy aligns with Option A of the North Carolina Memorandum of Agreement and is an evidence-based approach to addressing opioid addiction. Hazlett expressed excitement about the program's potential and introduced Dr. Susan Auger to explain the method for the Medication-Assisted Treatment (MAT) for opioid use disorder.

Commissioner May inquired about the role of Visions Behavioral Health in the opioid program, specifically whether it plays a part once individuals leave the program. Dr. Susan Auger clarified that Visions could be involved in reentry, serving as a bridge after individuals are released. While the primary service providers during incarceration would be Central Community Services, which offers peer support and advanced recovery services, Visions might collaborate during the reentry phase to provide ongoing support.

Commissioner May expressed concern about the scope of the program. Dr. Auger explained that tracking services would last up to six months after release, with peer support providers continuing to monitor individuals during that time. Commissioner May also asked if individuals would still be medicated after starting the tracking process, to which Dr. Auger confirmed they would. When discussing eligibility, Commissioner May questioned whether inmates from outside the county could qualify for the program. Sheriff Fountain clarified that the program would only focus on Granville County inmates who are residents and that inmates who are residents of other counties would not be included.

Commissioner Cozart expressed his appreciation for the extent of the services, noting his satisfaction with the comprehensive program that covers prequalification, jail time, and post-release support. He also expressed gratitude for the availability of funds to provide such a program.

Commissioner Karan asked whether any potential overlap between the opioid treatment program and the contract with Southern Health Partners had been addressed. County Manager Cummings responded that the issue had not yet been fully resolved, but a call was scheduled to discuss the proposed amendment with Southern Health Partners. He noted that understanding the specific services provided by the qualified professional in the opioid program would help ensure no duplication of services with the jail health contract.

Commissioner May asked whether the opioid funding would cover all obligations or if additional costs would arise from Southern Health providers or other contracts. He stressed the need for transparency to ensure the program was fully funded by the opioid settlement and that no unexpected expenses would be placed on the County's budget. Sheriff's Office consultant Robert Bailess responded that the issue had been discussed in a previous meeting with Southern Health Partners and that County Manager Cummings indicated it would be further addressed in an upcoming meeting in two weeks. He clarified that opioid funds could not cover a case manager's salary, but if one was required, it would not impose an additional burden on the County. He noted that the contract stipulated the case manager position as necessary, regardless of the opioid program, but funding was available from the settlement to support it separately.

Commissioner May emphasized that the funding should come from the opioid settlement and reiterated the importance of ensuring that all financial commitments were clearly outlined. He stressed that any additional costs should be addressed through opioid settlement funding rather than being absorbed by the County. Consultant Bailess stated that there would be no additional burden on the County for the position.

Chair Gooch asked Attorney Wrenn whether the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) needed to be modified or if the current version could be used. County Attorney Wrenn responded that the MOU would need to be modified to reflect the changes, as the performance term would be extended by two additional years, adding $252,000 per year. He noted that the original MOU was for approximately one year and that the additional funding would need to be incorporated.

Chair Gooch then asked whether the agreement modifications needed to be completed before a vote or if they could be addressed afterward. Attorney Wrenn stated that it could be done afterward, as it was not unusual to proceed in that manner. Chair Gooch acknowledged the clarification and opened the floor for a motion.

Commissioner Cozart moved to approve the recommendation as written on page 326 of the agenda packet. Commissioner Jay seconded the motion.

Commissioner May proposed amending the motion to ensure that any additional funding required would not be encumbered upon the County but instead come from the opioid settlement. Commissioner Karan raised a discussion point, questioning whether the board would need to revisit the matter if additional expenditures arose or if they could make approval contingent upon all necessary expenses being covered upfront.

Attorney Wrenn sought clarification on the motion. Commissioner Cozart clarified that the intent of his motion was that any further financial obligations would require Board approval. Commissioner May reiterated that those funds should come from the opioid settlement. Commissioner Cozart agreed and amended his motion to reflect that intent.

Motioned by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, Board approved the funding allocation of up to $504,660 from the Opioid Settlement special revenue fund to the Granville County Sheriff's Office for the Addiction Treatment for Incarcerated Persons program (Strategy #11, Option A of the NC Opioid Settlement MOA), including $252,330 for Fiscal Year 2025-2026 and $252,330 for Fiscal Year 2026-2027; the Board further approved that any additional funding must come solely from the opioid settlement funds and not from the County's general fund, with any additional financial obligations beyond this allocation requiring Board approval; the Board also authorized the County Manager to execute necessary modifications to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to reflect the funding allocation and extended funding period.

<u>Board Allocated Opioid Settlement Funding to Granville Health System</u>
Cathy Hazlett, the Substance Use Prevention and Treatment Program Manager for Granville Vance Public Health, stated that this agenda item had been presented to and unanimously approved by the Opioid Advisory Committee (OAC). She emphasized the importance of securing

funding for an additional two years, noting that it covered her salary, benefits, and appointment costs.

Hazlett further reported that no representatives from Granville Health System (GHS) were present but provided an update on the hospital's allocated funds. Of the $293,000 allocated for the first year, approximately $61,000 had been spent on purchasing a vehicle and its insurance. She noted that the contract was being amended to extend through June 30, 2025, aligning all programs with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2027.

Hazlett informed the Board that the hospital was in the process of hiring community paramedics and peer support staff. As per her understanding from GHS CEO Adam McConnell, the expected implementation date for the program was March 1, 2025.

Chair Gooch asked County Attorney Wrenn whether the Memorandum of Understanding for this contract could be amended after the Board meeting, similar to the discussion with the Sheriff's Office item.

Attorney Wrenn confirmed that there was no issue with amending it after the Board meeting.

Motioned by Commissioner Timothy Karan, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board approved the allocation of up to $482,474 from the Opioid Settlement special revenue fund to Granville Health System for the Post Overdose Response Team strategy (Strategy #8, Option A of the NC Opioid Settlement MOA), including $237,268.84 for Fiscal Year 2025-2026 and $245,204.65 for Fiscal Year 2026-2027; the Board also authorized the County Manager to execute necessary modifications to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to reflect the funding allocation and extended funding period.

Board Allocated Opioid Settlement Funding to Granville Vance Public Health
Granville Vance Public Health Director Dr. Lisa Harrison stated that the Opioid Advisory Committee had gained valuable insights over the past year in managing these funds and ensuring necessary resources and personnel were in place. She noted that along with the Sheriff's Office and Granville Health System, Granville Vance Public Health also requested an additional two years to continue the work while adhering to evidence-based strategies outlined in the state's Memorandum of Understanding.

Dr. Harrison explained that the request was receipts-based and would allow more time to complete the work. It would also enable Cathy Hazlett to provide consultation, technical assistance, and evaluation for ongoing projects. She expressed appreciation for the Board's consideration and acknowledged that several Opioid Advisory Committee (OAC) representatives were present.

Chair Gooch asked Attorney Wrenn whether the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Granville Vance Public Health could be amended in the same manner as the agreements with the Sheriff's Office and Granville Health System; Attorney Wrenn confirmed.

Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously carried, Board approved the allocation of up to $395,785 from the Opioid Settlement special revenue fund to Granville Vance Public Health for the Collaborative Strategic Planning strategy (Strategy #1, Option A of the NC Opioid Settlement MOA), including $77,165 for Fiscal Year 2024-2025, $157,250 for Fiscal Year 2025-2026, and $161,370 for Fiscal Year 2026-2027; the Board also authorized the County Manager to execute necessary modifications to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to reflect the funding allocation and extended funding period.

SENIOR SERVICES MATTERS

Board Approved Seniors Services In-Home Aide Contract with Avid Health at Home
Senior Services Director Kathy May mentioned that Granville County has been using the Home and Community Care Block Grant to fund personal care services for individuals with high medical needs to help them remain safely at home. Due to staffing shortages at the two agencies they currently contract with, they found a new agency, Avid Health at Home, which will provide additional certified nursing assistants and help serve more families in need.

Motioned by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board approved the addition of Avid Health at Home as a contractor for in-home aide services, with funding from grant funds already allocated for in-home aide services in the FY 2024-2025 budget; the Board also authorized the County Manager to execute the contract once finalized by the County Attorney.

Commissioner May clarified that the funding for the service is already accounted for in the budget, meaning that the request for the new agency's contract does not require additional funding beyond what has already been allocated.

When asked, Senior Services Director May explained the qualifications for the service: individuals must be over 60 years old, reside in Granville County, and have a medically unstable health condition. The service is designed to assist with personal care like bathing and dressing, and it's not meant to provide 24-hour or even eight-hour care. The decision to provide care is made on a case-by-case basis, with social workers and nurses evaluating the person's needs through home visits. Additionally, if needed, vouchers may be offered for families to hire their own care providers. The new agency, Avid Health at Home, will help address the current shortage and expand the service.

After Holding a Quasi-Judicial Hearing, Board Approved Jones Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower
Chair Gooch stated that the Board had before them an evidentiary hearing regarding the Jones Road Major Special Use Permit application for a proposed wireless telecommunications tower. He noted that the application, submitted by TowerCo 2013 LLC, was for the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility with a fenced equipment compound on property owned by Thomas Jameson, located off Jones Road in Granville County (Tax Map #194603039765). He entertained a motion to open the hearing.

Board Opened the Quasi-Judicial Hearing
Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, Board opened the hearing for the Jones Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower.

Chair Gooch stated that both proponents and opponents of the permit would have the opportunity to present evidence and arguments. He required all speakers to be sworn in before addressing the Board, emphasizing that only sworn individuals could speak.

The following individuals were sworn in by Clerk Karen Evans:

- Barry Baker, Planning Director, Granville County
- Susan Rabold, Cityscape, Granville County Consultant
- Anthony Bologna, Attorney o/b/o Tower Co and Tower Comm, William s Mullens
- David Brown, Manager, Verizon

- Michael Horowitz, Certified General Appraiser, MPB

Chair Gooch invited Planning Director Barry Baker to provide a preliminary statement.

Planning Director Barry Baker presented based on the information in the agenda packet. He also affirmed that all public notice requirements for the hearing had been met.

He then invited Susan Rabold of CityScape to present her report.

When asked by Chair Gooch, County Attorney James C. Wrenn to read the instructions to the Board.

INSTRUCTIONS TO BOARD—MAJOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT

WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

The Federal Telecommunications Act, as codified at 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7), allows municipalities (including counties) to regulate the placement of wireless service facilities. Part 2, Article 9, Chapter 160D of the North Carolina General Statutes, "Wireless Telecommunications Facilities", sets out the statutory framework pursuant to which local governments can regulate wireless telecommunications facilities. The Wireless Facility and Wireless Support Structure Siting Ordinance for the County of Granville is found in Article IX of Chapter 32 of the Granville County Land Development Code. Section 32-572(c) requires a major special use permit for all new wireless support structures.

In order to grant a special use permit to construct a new freestanding wireless support structure, the Board must find that the applicant demonstrated why a site of a higher priority was not selected. In order to find that the applicant demonstrated why a site of higher priority was not selected, the applicant must have demonstrated to the satisfaction of this board the reason or reasons why such a permit should be granted for the proposed site and the hardships that would be incurred by the applicant if the permit were not granted for the proposed site.

The above-referenced eight orders of priority for constructing a new wireless support structure are set out in Ordinance §32-572(a) as follows:

(1) Attached concealed antenna onto an existing structure;
(2) Collocated antenna on existing freestanding wireless support structures;
(3) Attached nonconcealed antenna onto an existing structure;
(4) Freestanding wireless support structures on a site with an existing wireless support structures or tall structure;
(5) Concealed freestanding wireless support structures on county-owned property;
(6) Concealed freestanding wireless support structures on other property in the county;
(7) Nonconcealed freestanding wireless support structures on county-owned property;
(8) Nonconcealed freestanding wireless support structures on other property in the county.

In addition to these general requirements, the Ordinance also sets out specific requirements for all new wireless support structures:

Sec. 32-573. - General requirements for all wireless support structures and broadcast facilities.

a. *Security of wireless support structures*. All wireless support structures shall be located, fenced or otherwise secured in a manner that prevents unauthorized access. Specifically as follows:
1. All antennas, towers and other supporting structures, including guy wires, shall be made inaccessible to individuals and constructed or shielded in such a manner that they cannot be climbed or run into; and

2. Transmitters and telecommunications control points must be installed in a manner to be readily accessible only to persons authorized to operate or service them.

b. *Signage*. Wireless support structures shall contain a sign no larger than four square feet to provide adequate notification to persons in the immediate area of the presence of an antenna that has transmission capabilities. The sign shall contain the name(s) of the owner(s) and operator(s) of the facility, an emergency phone number(s), and FCC registration number, if applicable. The sign shall be on the equipment shelter or shed of the applicant and be visible from the access point of the site and must identify the equipment shelter of the applicant. The sign shall not be lighted unless the board shall have allowed such lighting or unless applicable provisions of law require such lighting. No other signage, including advertising, shall be permitted on any wireless support structure, unless required by law.

c. *[Access.]* At a wireless support structure site, an access road, turn around space, and parking shall be provided to assure adequate emergency and service access. Maximum use of existing roads, whether public or private, shall be made to the extent practicable. Road construction shall at all times minimize ground disturbance and vegetation cutting. Road grades shall closely follow natural contours to assure minimal visual disturbance and reduce soil erosion.

d. *[Setbacks.]* All wireless support structures and broadcast facilities shall be set back from abutting property lines and recorded rights-of-way by the following distances: a distance equal to the height of the wireless support structure or broadcast facility tower or structure or use breakpoint technology as provided for in subsection 32-579(8)a. Any accessory structure shall be located so as to comply with the applicable minimum setback requirements for the property on which it is situated.

In making these findings of fact, the Board's decisions must be based on <u>competent</u>, <u>material</u>, and <u>substantial</u> evidence in the record. Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla. It means such <u>relevant</u> evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. It must do more than create the suspicion of the existence of the fact to be established.

The concurring vote of a majority of the members of the Board shall be necessary to grant a special use permit. Vacant positions on the Board and members who are disqualified from voting on an evidentiary matter shall not be considered members of the board for calculation of the requisite majority, if there are no qualified alternates to take the place of such member.
As always, a member of this Board shall not participate in or vote on a special use permit in a manner that would violate affected persons' constitutional rights to an impartial decision maker. Impermissible violations of due process include, but are not limited to, a member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter that is not susceptible to change, undisclosed ex parte communications, a close familial, business, or other associational relationship with an affected person, or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter. If an objection is raised to a member's participation and that member does not recuse himself or herself, the remaining members shall by majority vote rule on the objection.

Planning Director Baker requested that the County's consultant, CityScape, be allowed to enter their report into the record, answer any questions the Board may have, and review the details of the report.

Susan Rabold began by summarizing the CityScape report. Rabold explained that the applicant demonstrated the inability to co-locate on an existing facility, justifying the proposed site on private property. An independent search confirmed no suitable towers or county-owned land within the search area. While the County's code recommends a 199-foot tower, the applicant justified the need for 300 feet to prevent significant coverage loss. The proposed setback matches the tower height at 300 feet, and fencing will include landscaping with green PVC slats for screening. The applicant will provide a 30-foot-wide access easement from Jones Road with a gravel driveway and turnaround space. Rabold confirmed compliance with all relevant code standards, including RF emissions, concluding the application met the necessary criteria.

Commissioner Williford inquired if he could ask a few questions, and Chair Gooch deferred to first allow the applicant's attorney to present any evidence before proceeding.

Attorney for the Applicant, Anthony Bologna provided an overview of the project and presented visuals, including propagation maps, highlighting the coverage before and after the tower installation, demonstrating a substantial reduction in coverage if the tower height were reduced to 190 feet. He also presented coverage plots for both in-building and in-vehicle service. Bologna emphasized that the site had adequate space for setbacks and was already home to overhead power lines, making the location suitable. He concluded by introducing David Brown to discuss the propagation maps and Verizon's coverage.

Chair Gooch acknowledged the need to confer with Attorney Wrenn, who clarified that Susan Rabold was not acting as a witness but was presenting the County's report. When asked, Attorney Wrenn further stated that Commissioner Williford was entitled to ask questions at the Chair's discretion, and Chair Gooch agreed to allow questions at this time.

The following questions and answers were addressed:

- Commissioner Williford asked whether the tower met all necessary approvals due to its proximity to an airport. Attorney Bologna confirmed FAA compliance, including proper lighting and an FAA determination. Planning Director Baker added that the tower met county airport height ordinances.
- Commissioner Williford asked about the total acreage. Attorney Bologna stated the site covered 25.25 acres, with a 100x100-foot leased area and a 30-foot access easement from Jones Road. When asked about the lease duration, Bologna offered to check.
- Commissioner Williford inquired about the signal range at 300 feet versus 199 feet. David Brown (Verizon) explained that voice coverage extends 6–8 miles, with in-building coverage reaching several miles and in-vehicle coverage spanning 3–5 miles. Data coverage slows over distance.
- Commissioner Williford asked if other carriers could lease space. Brown confirmed that additional carriers, including T-Mobile and AT&T, could lease space, and Baker added that county and state agencies (e.g., VIPER) could also use the tower.
- Commissioner May asked if the tower's location was isolated and whether a collapse could impact roadways or residences. Attorney Bologna confirmed that the tower was set back beyond its height from all property lines and designed to collapse inward, eliminating risk.
- Commissioner May inquired about wind tolerance. Attorney Bologna stated the tower could withstand extreme weather exceeding 100 mph and that taller towers were more efficient in rural areas.
- David Brown elaborated on the tower's structural integrity, noting engineering analyses ensure wind resistance and weight distribution. He mentioned that tower collapses were extremely rare, with only one instance in the Carolinas and Tennessee over 20 years.
- Brown also highlighted the benefits of improved internet access, particularly for remote workers and students. He joked that lack of internet could deter grandchildren from visiting their grandparents.
- Attorney Wrenn asked if additional testimony or evidence was needed. Attorney Bologna clarified that David Brown had already addressed propagation maps and coverage.
- Michael Berkowitz, a certified general appraiser, presented an impact study. He noted that 250+ foot towers are common in rural areas to maximize coverage. His analysis found no negative impact on property values, compliance with noise limits, and that screening and vegetation minimized visual impact. He offered to answer any questions.

Chair Gooch asked if there were any questions and inquired whether any individuals wished to present evidence against the special use permit. No one came forward.

Attorney Wrenn asked Attorney Bologna to formally introduce his documents into evidence, noting they were in the agenda packet but hadn't been submitted. Anthony Bologna requested that all application documents and testimony be admitted. Chair Gooch stated that, without objection from the Board, the documents were entered into evidence.

Attorney Bologna asked if Commissioner Williford would like him to find the length of the lease, and Commissioner Williford confirmed.

Chair Gooch asked if there were any final questions or individuals wishing to present evidence against the major special use permit. Seeing none, he invited a motion to close the hearing.

Board Closed the Hearing
Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, Board closed the hearing for the Jones Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower.

Attorney Wrenn summarized that Susan Rabold, representing Cityscape, submitted a report indicating that the proposed application meets the requirements of the ordinance. Additionally, the attorney, engineer, and appraiser representing the applicant presented evidence supporting the application's compliance with the ordinance. Ultimately, it is for the Board to determine the weight of the evidence presented.

Chair Gooch asked if anyone who had been sworn in objected to the attorney's summary of the evidence. There were no objections and the floor was opened for board members to discuss the application before moving into discussions and voting on each required finding of fact.

Commissioner Williford expressed that while they were not opposing the application, they had concerns about the tower's height, specifically referencing a similar tower on McFarland Road which was 199 feet. They noted that while they understood the distance involved, the 300-foot height was a concern.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the First Finding of Fact
When asked, County Attorney Wrenn read the first required finding of fact:

Attorney Wrenn stated that for the Board to grant a major special use permit for a new freestanding wireless support structure, the applicant needed to demonstrate why a higher-priority site was not selected. The applicant had to provide satisfactory reasons and show potential hardships if the permit were not granted. Wrenn outlined the eight orders of priority for constructing such structures as specified in ordinance section 32-572(A).

When Chair Gooch asked the Board if there was competent and substantial evidence to support the required finding of fact and invited members to identify such evidence, Commissioner Cozart referenced page 380, stating that CityScape had conducted an independent verification of potential sites within Verizon’s search ring. He noted that alternative sites were identified but were approximately five miles away, leading him to conclude that sufficient evidence had been submitted.

Motioned by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, seconded by Commissioner Russ May, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the first finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Second Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn read the second required finding of fact, stating that all wireless support structures must be fenced or otherwise secured to prevent unauthorized access. This included ensuring that antennas, towers, and supporting structures were inaccessible and shielded to prevent climbing or accidental contact. Additionally, transmitters and telecommunications control points were required to be accessible only to authorized personnel.

When Chair Gooch asked the Board if there was competent and substantial evidence to support this finding, Commissioner May referenced page 384 under "Fencing and Landscaping," stating that it met the standard.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the second finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Third Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn read the third required finding of fact, stating that wireless support structures must display a sign no larger than four square feet to notify individuals in the immediate area of the presence of an antenna with transmission capabilities. The sign must include the names of the owners and operators, an emergency phone number, and an FCC registration number if applicable. It must be placed on the applicant's equipment shelter and visible from the site's access point. The sign should not be illuminated unless required by law or approved by the board, and no other signage, including advertising, is permitted.

When Chair Gooch asked the Board if there was competent and substantial evidence to support this finding, Commissioner May stated that he was unable to locate signage details in the documents and asked if another commissioner or the county attorney could provide clarification. Anthony Bologna confirmed that Susan Ray, the county's consultant, had reviewed the application and found the signage requirements sufficient in the zoning and construction drawings. Attorney Wrenn referenced page 478 of the agenda, noting that compliance signage was detailed on sheet C11 of the drawings in Exhibit F. After reviewing the documents, Commissioner May confirmed he had found the information and was ready to proceed.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the third finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Fourth Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn read the fourth required finding of fact, stating that the proposed wireless support structure site must have an access road, turnaround space, and parking sufficient to ensure adequate emergency and service access. Existing roads should be used as much as practicable, and road construction should minimize ground disturbance, vegetation cutting, visual disruption, and soil erosion.

When Chair Gooch asked the Board if there was competent and substantial evidence to support this finding, Commissioner Jay referenced page 383, which addressed site access and parking.

Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously carried, confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the fourth finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Fifth Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn read the fifth required finding of fact, stating that the proposed wireless support structure must be set back from abutting property lines and recorded rights of way by a distance equal to the height of the structure or as determined by breakpoint technology per subsection 32-579(8)(A). Any accessory structures must comply with the minimum setback requirements for the property.

When Chair Gooch asked the Board if there was competent and substantial evidence to support this finding, Commissioner Griffin referenced page 384, noting that the setback requirements were outlined in the proposal

Motioned by Commissioner Mark Griffin, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the fifth finding of fact.

Board Approved Major Special Use Permit
Chair Gooch asked if there were any further discussions regarding the application for the major special use permit.

Attorney Bologna clarified that the lease for the subject site is an easement with a 99-year term, beginning when commercial operations of the tower start. The tower is designed to withstand winds up to 113 miles per hour without ice, and 30 miles per hour with 1.5 inches of ice, following CTIA building code requirements adopted in North Carolina.

Attorney Wrenn also clarified that a previously mentioned page reference was incorrect and that the signage issue had been addressed in Susan Rabold's report and in the drawings submitted with the first application.

Chair Gooch asked if there was anything else to discuss regarding the major special use permit. After confirming there were no further topics, he proceeded to invite a motion to approve or deny the application for the major special use permit.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously approved, Board approved the Jones Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower.

After Holding a Quasi-Judicial Hearing, Board Approved Lucy Averette Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower
Chair Gooch stated that the meeting would proceed to the evidentiary hearing concerning the Lucy Averette Road Major Special Use Permit application for a proposed wireless telecommunications tower. He noted that the application, submitted by TowerCo IV-B, LLC, was for the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility with a fenced equipment compound on property owned by Allen Daniel Jr. and Carol Daniel, situated at the intersection of Lucy Averette Road and Enon Road in Granville County (Tax Map #099202650523). He entertained a motion to open the hearing.

Board Opened the Quasi-Judicial Hearing
Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart and unanimously carried, Board opened the hearing for the Lucy Averette Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower.

Chair Gooch stated that both proponents and opponents of the permit would have the opportunity to present evidence and arguments. He required all speakers to be sworn in before addressing the Board, emphasizing that only sworn individuals could speak.

The following individuals were sworn in by Clerk Karen Evans:

- Barry Baker, Planning Director, Granville County
- Carol Daniel
- Allen Thomas Daniel, Jr.
- David Brown, Manager, Verizon
- Robin Clement, Tower Comm
- George Davis, Tower Comm
- Susan Rabold, Cityscape, Granville County Consultant
- Anthony Bologna, Attorney o/b/o Tower Co and Tower Comm, William s Mullens
- Michael Horowitz, Certified General Appraiser, MPB

Chair Gooch invited Planning Director Barry Baker to provide a preliminary statement.

Planning Director Barry Baker stated that the proposal was for a wireless telecommunications tower major special use permit to construct a 199-foot monopole wireless telecommunications tower with a fenced compound on property owned by Alan Daniel Jr. and Carol Daniel. He noted that the property had frontage on both Lucy Averette Road and Enon Road, with the proposed driveway located on Lucy Averette Road. The property was zoned AR-40, Agricultural Residential 40. He said that all public notice requirements for the hearing had been met. Baker introduced Susan Rabold, who was present to present the CityScape consultant report, and then presented based on the information in the agenda packet.

When asked by Chair Gooch, County Attorney Wrenn stated that, unless there were objections, he would not reread the instructions, as they had been read in the prior hearing. Chair Gooch agreed.

Planning Director Baker asked Susan Rabold to proceed with her presentation.

Susan Rabold began by summarizing the CityScape report on the proposed 199-foot monopole, stating that the applicant demonstrated no existing facilities within their search area for co-location and that Cityscape's independent search confirmed the nearest tower and county-owned property were both outside the area. She confirmed the proposed signage met county code, setbacks exceeded the required 199 feet, and the applicant's fencing and landscaping plan, including an eight-foot chain-link fence with barbed wire and tree preservation efforts, complied with regulations. Rabold noted the applicant's 30-foot-wide access easement from Lucy Averitt Road and a designated parking area for emergency vehicles. She concluded that all relevant standards, including RF compliance and visual simulations, were met, and the application adhered to county code, pending Board approval.

Chair Gooch stated that the Board would now hear evidence from the applicant.

Attorney for the Applicant, Anthony Bologna provided an overview of the project and presented visuals, including propagation maps, highlighting the coverage before and after the tower installation. He explained that the 199-foot monopole tower on Lucy Averitt Road in Oxford, within the AR 40 zoning district, would have Verizon as the anchor tenant with space for five additional carriers. Bologna emphasized the wooded site's natural buffer, the presence of overhead power lines, and the tower's compatibility with the area. He noted support from neighboring property owners and requested that all testimony and application materials be entered into the record.

The following questions and answers were addressed:

- Commissioner Williford asked why the proposed tower was set at 199 feet instead of 300 feet, given the large coverage gap around Lucy Averette. David Brown explained that cell towers are built on a grid system, and sites in the northeast are spaced 6–8 miles apart, requiring taller towers to fill coverage gaps. However, going too high could extend the signal too far, impacting areas like Oxford. The proposed 199-foot tower would adequately fill the gap without overshooting coverage.
- Commissioner Williford expressed concern about the lack of cell service in northern Granville County and inquired about what triggers the decision to build a new tower. David Brown explained that decisions are typically driven by input from public safety officials, complaints from residents (such as inspectors, police officers, or customers), and network performance monitoring for dropped calls or slow data speeds. Sites are prioritized based on rural area needs, coverage gaps, available funding, and the competitiveness with other providers.
- Attorney Bologna invited George Davis of Tower Comm to discuss several key points:

    - The company's goal is to build shared infrastructure to minimize the number of towers in the community.
    - The tower height was initially planned at 250 feet but was reduced to remain under 200 feet due to favorable ground elevation.
    - The tower will adhere to industry safety standards and structural integrity.
    - Existing vegetation will be preserved to reduce the visual impact, with additional landscaping in disturbed areas.
    - A community meeting was held, where neighbors expressed support for the tower, with concerns limited to preserving the design and avoiding clear-cutting.
    - The tower will improve consumer experience, enhance public safety, and provide opportunities for additional carriers.
- George Davis offered to have Michael Berkowitz discuss the property impact study, but it was noted that the information was already on record.
- When asked by Commissioner Griffin, George Davis clarified that Lucy Averitt Road intersects Enon Road just south of the church, located towards Oxford, going northeast. He also noted a power line running in the area. Just north of the power line, there is a small white house on the corner owned by the Hesters. George Davis provided further details on the property ownership surrounding the site:
    - The open fields to the south and east are owned by his sister, who was present at the meeting.
    - The property to the west and across the street is owned by the Thompsons, whose daughter plans to build nearby.
    - The Thompsons did not raise any objections during the required community meeting.

Chair Gooch invited any additional comments or objections, but seeing none, he moved on to ask the board members if they had any further questions. With no more questions or objections, he entertained a motion to close the hearing. The motion to close the hearing was made, and it appears the meeting is progressing toward that conclusion.

Board Closed the Hearing
Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board closed the hearing.

When asked by Chair Gooch, Attorney Wrenn summarized the evidence presented to the Board which included input from the County's consultant, Susan Rabold of Cityscape, as well as the applicant's attorneys and engineers. He confirmed that the application meets the requirements of the ordinance, with no contrary information presented. He left the determination to the board regarding the weight and relevance of the evidence.

No objections were raised to the attorney's summary.

Chair Gooch opened the floor for board members to discuss the application as a whole before moving into discussions and voting on each required finding of fact.

Chair Gooch thanked Commissioner Williford for their comment, affirming that the information had been presented fairly. He then moved on to the next phase, asking Mr. Wrenn to read the first required finding of fact for the board's review.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the First Finding of Fact
When asked, Attorney Wrenn summarized the first finding of fact that the Boad consider whether there are any other orders of priority or alternatives that would meet the need for the special use permit. He noted that the application involved a non-concealed, freestanding wireless support structure on property in the county.

When asked by Chair Gooch if there was competent and substantial evidence to support the first required finding of fact, Commissioner May referenced the top of page 536, where the discussion on co-location and the availability of existing structures is mentioned, stating that this paragraph, in their view, meets the requirement for the first finding of fact regarding the priority of locations.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the first finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Second Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn summarized the second finding of fact requiring all support structures, including antennas and towers, must be properly secured to prevent unauthorized access. This includes shielding or fencing the structures to prevent climbing or running into them and ensuring that control points and transmitters are accessible only to authorized personnel.

When asked by Chair Gooch if there was competent and substantial evidence to support the second required finding of fact, Commissioner Williford referred to page 5, line 39, which discusses the proposed fencing and landscaping for the tower site. The plan includes an eight-foot chain-link fence topped with three strands of barbed wire angled outward to prevent climbing and unauthorized access.

Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the second finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Third Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn summarized the third finding fact requiring that the wireless support structure had to have a container sign no larger than four feet square, with the necessary notifications and information about the materials used, as outlined earlier in the record.

When asked by Chair Gooch if there was competent and substantial evidence to support the third finding of fact, Commissioner May referenced page 478, Section 32.573, Exhibit F, subparagraph B on signage, noting that the statement of fact within that paragraph supported the required finding.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Rober Willford, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the third finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Event Supporting the Fourth Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn highlighted the board's responsibility to find that the proposed wireless support structure site has adequate access for emergency and service purposes, with minimal disruption to the land and existing vegetation. Road construction should also follow natural contours where possible.

When asked by Chair Gooch if there was competent and substantial evidence to support the fourth finding of fact, Commissioner May referenced page 539, specifically the section on site access and parking, indicating that it satisfies the required finding of fact regarding adequate access for emergency services and minimal land disturbance.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the fourth finding of fact.

Board Confirmed Sufficient Evidence Supporting the Fifth Finding of Fact
Attorney Wrenn restated that the board must confirm that the wireless support structure is set back from neighboring property lines and rights of way by a distance equal to the height of the structure itself. Any accessory structures should also comply with the required setback standards for the property.

When asked by Chair Gooch if there was competent and substantial evidence to support the fifth required finding of fact, Commissioner Griffin referred to page 539, where the setbacks for the proposed structure are detailed under the "Setbacks" section, confirming that the application meets the required setback distances.

Motioned by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, seconded by Commissioner Mark Griffin, and unanimously carried, Board confirmed sufficient evidence supporting the fifth finding of fact.

Board Approved Major Special Use Permit
Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart, and unanimously approved, Board approved the Lucy Averette Road Major Special Use Permit Application for a Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower.

BREAK

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, Board took a break from 9:28 p.m. to 9:36 p.m.

APPOINTMENTS

Board Approved Appointments to the Agricultural Advisory Board
Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board reappointed Sandy Gabel to the Granville County Agricultural Advisory Board, District 1 seat.

Motioned by Commissioner Mark Griffin, seconded Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board appointed Keith Harvey to the Granville County Agricultural Advisory Board, District 3 seat.

Board Held Appointments to Environmental Affairs
Board members expressed appreciation for the late Mike Wood who served on the County Citizens Advisory Committee for Environmental Affairs in the District 7 seat.

Commissioner May suggested that Board recognize Mr. Wood's service to the County at a later date.

Board members echoed Commissioner May's sentiments.

Board Approved Appointments to the Granville Health System Board of Trustees
Motioned by Commissioner Robert Williford, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, Board reappointed James Lumpkins to the Granville Health System Board of Trustees, District 2 seat.

Commissioner Tony W. Cozart moved to reappointed James Cyril Blaine and later withdrew his motion.

When asked, County Attorney Wrenn advised the Board how to proceed with the following two appointments.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford that Jimmy Gooch, District 7, becomes a voting member for District 7,

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, Mark Griffin was appointed to a Granville Health System Board of Trustees Ex Officio position.

James Cyril Blaine was not reappointed.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner, and unanimously carried, Board reappointed Bobby Wheeler, District 5, to the Granville Health System Board of Trustees.

Board Approved Appointments to the Granville County Library Board of Trustees
Motioned by Commissioner Timothy Karan, seconded by Commissioner and unanimously carried, Board appointed Juanita Sue Hinman (District 3) to the District 6 seat.

Board Held District 5 appointment.

Chair Gooch said that if Commissioner Gooch were agreeable the Board could move Karen Alley from the District 3 seat to the District 7 seat as she resides in District 7, and that would leave the District 3 seat vacant for appointment; Commissioner Griffin agreed.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Robert Williford, and unanimously moved Karen Alley's appointment from the District 3 to the District 7 seat.

Board held appointment to the District 3 seat.

Board Approved Staggered Terms and Appointments to the Orange Street Community Center
Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford, and unanimously carried, Board approved the Executive Board of the Orange Street Community Center's recommendation to stagger seats as follows, with the one-year and two-year terms transitioning to a three-year renewal cycle thereafter. Additionally, the Board approved the reappointment of all currently filled seats to align with this new structure and staggered term schedule.

District 1	Dorothy Hunt	2-Year Term to Expire December 2026
District 1	Larry Downey	3-Year Term to Expire December 2027
District 1	Ronnie Norwood	1-Year Term to Expire December 2025
District 2	VACANT	1-Year Term to Expire December 2025
District 2	Joseph Blair Waldon	2-Year Term to Expire December 2026
District 3	Carolyn Heggie, District 2	3-Year Term to Expire December 2027
District 3	Paula Jones	1-Year Term to Expire December 2025
District 4	Robin Saxton	2-Year Term to Expire December 2026
District 4	Juanita Rogers	3-Year Term to Expire December 2027

Board Approved Appointments to the Granville County Tourism Development Authority
Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, Board reappointed Cynthia Ratliff, Chamber Director

Board Approved Appointments to the Granville County Veterans Affairs Committee

Motioned by Commissioner Jay, seconded by Commissioner Williford, and unanimously carried, Board reappointed Larry Hester to the Granville County Veterans Affairs Committee District 1 seat.

Commissioner May said that Charles Miller would like to step down from the Ernest F. Hart American Legion Post 90 in Oxford Representative seat.

Motioned by Commissioner Russ May, seconded by Commissioner Robert Williford and unanimously carried, Board appointed Charonica Moseley to the Granville County Veterans Affairs Committee Female Veteran seat and Matthew Dewayne Kufahl to the Granville County Veterans Affairs Committee Ernest F. Hart American Legion Post 90 in Oxford Representative seat.

Commissioner Karan noted a correction for the agenda item: David Sella lives in District 3.

Commissioner May said that the following seats remain open:

- District 7
- Spouse of a Veteran
- One At-Large
- Moses S. Cash American Legion 161

COUNTY MANAGER'S REPORT

County Manager's Report
County Manager Cummings said that he did not have any items to report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

County Attorney's Report
County Attorney Wrenn said that did not have any items to report.

PRESENTATIONS BY COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS

Commissioner May referenced the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)Blueprint for Safety and encouraged the Board to review the information that had been sent, highlighting its importance in shifting District 5's transportation approach from reactive to proactive safety measures. He reported that the newly formed Litter Task Force had a successful first meeting and showed strong momentum in addressing litter issues. He reminded the Board about the Veterans Appreciation Banquet on Saturday, March 1st at South Granville High School and encouraged attendance. He also invited Board members to attend the Fire Commission meeting, emphasizing the importance of being informed on fire-related proposals before they reached the Board. Commissioner May raised concerns about recent real estate fraud attempts and advised the public to register their properties with the Register of Deeds to receive notifications of any attempted changes. Lastly, he provided an update on school safety meetings, commending the ongoing efforts in this area, and concluded by thanking the Board for the opportunity to share these updates.

Commissioner Karan reported that the Brassfield Fire Department held a truck push-in ceremony on January 25th, during which they introduced two new fire trucks. He noted the excitement surrounding the event and emphasized that this achievement would not have been possible without the fire tax. He concluded by stating that positive developments were happening in the southern part of the county.

Commissioner Jay stated that he attended the Board Chair and Vice Chair training in Raleigh, NC the previous week; the training was facilitated by the North Carolina Association of County

Commissioners (NCACC). He noted that the first topic on the agenda was the Code of Ethics, which all boards are required to have. The next topic discussed was a Code of Order, with a recommendation for the Board to review whether they have one in place. He mentioned that some Boards have a Code of Order while others do not and emphasized the need to verify if one exists.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

County Manager Cummings said that he and Deputy County Manager Weichel would be attending the North Carolina City and County Management Association (NCCCMA)Winter Conference on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday and would be available by phone for urgent matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Motioned by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Tony W. Cozart unanimously carried, the Board adjourned at 10:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Evans
Clerk to the Board