



**DOCKET #:** F1310

**PROPOSED ZONING:**  
GI-S (Sanitary Landfill;  
and Construction and  
Demolition Landfill)

**EXISTING ZONING:**  
RS40 and AG

**PETITIONER:**  
Waste Management  
of Carolinas, Inc.

**SCALE:** 1" represents 1000'

**STAFF:** D. Reed

**GMA:** 5

**ACRE(S):** 186

**MAP(S):** 690890, 690894

June 14, 2000

Waste Management of Carolinas, Inc. d/b/a  
Piedmont Landfill and Recycling Center  
c/o William R. Lewis, District Manager  
9900 Freeman Road  
Kernersville, NC 27284

RE: ZONING MAP AMENDMENT F-1310

Dear Mr. Lewis:

The attached report of the Planning Board to the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners is sent to you at the request of the Commissioners.

When the rezoning is scheduled for public hearing, you will be notified by Jane Cole, Clerk to the County Commissioners, of the date on which the Commissioners will hear this petition.

Sincerely,

A. Paul Norby, AICP  
Director of Planning

Attachment

pc: Jane Cole, County Manager's Office  
Ken Crutchfield, 3303 Glenn Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27105  
Tom Ramsey, 2410 Cases Ferry Road, Suite 400, Atlanta, GA 30339  
Harvey Davis Pulliam, Jr., 415 Holt Street, Kernersville, NC 27284  
Danny Beeson, 8444 Haw River Road, Kernersville, NC 27284

**FORSYTH COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**MEETING DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:**  
\_\_\_\_\_

**SUBJECT:-**

Zoning map amendment of Waste Management of Carolinas

**COUNTY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION OR COMMENTS:-**

**SUMMARY OF INFORMATION:-**

Zoning map amendment of Waste Management of Carolinas from RS-40 and AG to GI-S (Landfill, Sanitary): property is located on the north and south sides of Freeman Road at the Forsyth-Guilford County Line and on the south side of Benefit Church Road at the Forsyth-Guilford County Line (Zoning Docket F-1310).

After consideration, the Planning Board recommended denial of the rezoning petition, certified that the site plan meets all code requirements and recommended staff conditions.

**ATTACHMENTS:-**     YES             NO

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

COUNTY ORDINANCE - SPECIAL USE

Zoning Petition of Waste Management of Carolinas,  
Docket F-1310

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING  
THE FORSYTH COUNTY  
ZONING ORDINANCE AND THE  
OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF  
THE COUNTY OF FORSYTH,  
NORTH CAROLINA

---

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of

Forsyth as follows:

Section 1. The Zoning Ordinance of the *Unified Development Ordinances* of the County of Forsyth, North Carolina, and the Official Zoning Map of the County of Forsyth, North Carolina, are hereby amended by changing from RS-40 and AG to GI-S (Landfill, Sanitary) the zoning classification of the following described property:

All that piece, parcel or tract of land lying and being in counties of Forsyth, Belews Creek Township and Guilford, Oak Ridge Township, state of North Carolina, the same being shown and delineated as Parcels A, B, C, and D, having a total of 108.81 acres on a plat for Waste Management of Carolinas, Inc. by Survey and Mapping Services of South Carolina, Inc. dated June 5, 1987, and according to said plat having the following courses and distances to-wit: From a stone located at the original southwest corner of the Barrows tract being common to lands formerly of Dwiggin, now Duke Power Co., and lands formerly of Peebles, now Duke Power Co., thence N.89°35'E. for a distance of 173.99 ft. to an iron pipe at the point of beginning, thence turning and running to an iron pipe at the point of beginning thence turning and running N. 32°29' W. along lands now of Duke Power Co. formerly Barrows for a distance of 44.85 ft. to an iron thence continuing along lands of Duke Power the following courses and distances: N 26°53' W. for a distance of 295.00 ft. to an iron thence N.05°01' W. for a distance of 171.10 ft. to an iron then N.00°30' W. for a distance of 23.71 ft. to an iron, thence N. 24°30' E. for a distance of 93.03 ft. to an iron ,thence N. 09°25' W. for a distance of 62.06 ft. to an iron thence, N. 51°02' W. for a distance of 38.20 ft. to an iron, thence N. 02°34' W. for a distance of 91.18 ft. along lands now of Duke Power Co. formerly Cole to an iron, thence N.00°10' E. for a distance of 301.94 to an iron located along lands now or formerly of J. H. Reynolds thence continuing along lands of Reynolds N.00°14' W. for a distance of 225.09 ft. to an old stone being the

northwest corner of the Barrows tract thence S. 85°52' E. for a distance of 869.11 ft. to a stone, thence N.03°36' W. for a distance of 200.04 ft. to an iron located along lands now of Duke Power Co., formerly C. H. Russell thence along lands of Duke Power Co. S. 85°46' E. for a distance of 295.61 ft. to an iron, thence N. 01°41' W. for a distance of 265.19 ft. to an iron thence, S. 85°12' E. for a distance of 131.56 ft. to an iron, thence S. 85°01' E. for a distance of 8.19 ft. to an iron located along lands of Carl H. Russell and Florrie S. Russell. Thence the following nineteen courses and distances with Duke Power Company as recorded DB 1038, Page 1031 N. 84°28'15" E. 83.51 ft. to a point, thence S. 88°10'52" E. 268.27 ft. to a point, thence S. 78°22'34" E. 77.66 ft. to a point, thence S. 89°14'28" E. 75.09 ft. to a point, thence S. 63°37'52" E. 54.12 ft. to a point, thence S. 87°36'11" E. 78.52 ft. to a point, thence S. 76°35'22" E. 119.30 ft. to an EIP, thence S. 68°18'41" E. 152.37 ft. to an existing iron pipe, thence S. 82°00'35" E. 241.40 ft. to a rebar, thence N. 25°03'37" E. 21.10 ft. to a rebar, thence N. 66°31'48" W. 110.90 ft. to a point, thence N. 87°59'48" W. 139.32 ft. to a point, thence N. 72°19'44" W. 159.59 ft. to a point, thence N. 79°39'10" W. 232.30 ft. to a point, thence N. 72°48'31" W. 179.72 ft. to a point, thence N. 64°16'58" W. 304.49 ft. to a point, thence N. 35°53'58" W. 155.37 ft. to a point, thence N. 10°26'30" W. 314.58 ft. to a point, thence N. 04°22'00" E. 50.13 ft. to an EIP at the southwest corner of the Duke Power Co. property as recorded in DB 1008, Page 801, thence with said Duke Power, the following five courses and distances; N.50°25'57" E. 607.49 ft. to an existing iron pipe, thence N. 43°49'59"E. 469.42 ft. to an existing iron pipe, thence N. 49°08'53" E. 196.23 ft. to an axle, thence N. 79°00'27" E. 183.83 ft. to a concrete monument, thence N. 65°00'48"E. 693.37 ft. to an existing iron pipe to the centerline of Benefit Church Road, thence with the Duke Power Co. property as recorded in DB 1003, Page 833, N. 65°15'45" E. 190.30 ft. to a new iron pipe within the right-of-way of Benefit Church Road, said new iron pipe also being in the Forsyth/Guilford County line more or less, thence with said County line more or less S. 02°04'29"W. 2518.72 ft. to a new iron pipe, thence S. 87°0" E. 58.21 ft. to a stone at the original northeast corner of Barrows tract thence S. 05°19' E. for a total distance of 462.29 ft. to a point, thence S. 40°07' E. for a distance of 113.50 ft. to an iron thence S. 01°56' E. for a distance of 232.00 ft. to a monument located along land of the town of Kernersville, thence continuing along land of the town of Kernersville S. 02°06' W. for a distance of 831.15 ft. to a monument at the original southeast corner of Barrows tract thence N. 84°39' W. for a distance of 210.63 ft. to an iron located at the Forsyth-Guilford County line thence N. 85°15' W. for a distance of 592.34 ft. to an axle thence N. 84°36'W. for a distance of 378.36 ft. to a monument located at lands of Denver B. and Minnie A. Cottingham ,thence N. 87°28' W. for a distance of 650.08 ft. to a stone located along lands of Alexander J. and Bertha P. Cottingham, thence along lands of Cottingham N. 44°08' W. for a distance of 627.86 to an iron, thence N. 86°28' W. for a distance of 307.19 ft. to an iron located at lands of Duke Power Co., formerly W. V. Dwiggin, thence N. 86°27' W. for a distance of 302.48 ft. to a stone, thence continuing along lands of Duke Power Co. S. 01°30' W. for a distance of 70.60 ft. to a stone, thence S. 89°5' W. for a distance 134.53 ft. to an iron pipe at the point of beginning.

Also included is a +/- 3.0 area shown as Freeman Road (SR 2140) and Goodwill Church Road (SR 2027), and being in all respects that property of Waste Management of Carolinas, Inc. as recorded in DB 1663, page 1993, DB 1769, page 2308, containing 187.17 acres more or less.

Tax Lots 300, 301 and 38, Tax Block 5243.

Section 2. This Ordinance is adopted after approval of the site plan entitled Piedmont Sanitary Landfill, and identified as Attachment A of the Special Use District Permit issued by the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_ to Waste Management of Carolinas.

Section 3. The Board of Commissioners hereby directs the issuance of a Special Use District Permit pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance of the *Unified Development Ordinances* for a development to be known as Piedmont Sanitary Landfill. Said Special Use District Permit and site plan with associated documents are attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 4. This Ordinance shall be effective from and after its adoption.

COUNTY, SPECIAL USE DISTRICT PERMIT

SPECIAL USE DISTRICT PERMIT

Issued by the Forsyth County

Board of Commissioners

The Forsyth County Board of Commissioners issues a Special Use District Permit for the site shown on the site plan map included in this zoning petition of Waste Management of Carolinas (Zoning Docket F-1310). The site shall be developed in accordance with the plan approved by the Board and bearing the inscription: "Attachment A, Special Use District Permit for GI-S (Landfill, Sanitary), approved by the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19 \_\_\_\_" and signed, provided the property is developed in accordance with requirements of the GI-S zoning district of the Zoning Ordinance of the *Unified Development Ordinances* of the County Code, the Erosion Control Ordinance, and other applicable laws, and the following conditions be met:

- **PRIOR TO THE USE OF THE ADDITIONAL VERTICAL SPACE OF THE EXPANDED LANDFILL**
  - a Developer shall obtain all required state and local permits and meet all the requirements of UDO Section 2-5.38 including the recording of a new or revised Reclamation Plan in the office of the Register of Deeds. All revisions to the Reclamation Plan must be approved by the Planning staff. Planning staff may require additional buffering which exceeds the minimum requirements.

- **OTHER REQUIREMENTS**

- a. Developer has volunteered an estimated 600,000 tons of trash per year will be accepted at this landfill. Based on this yearly acceptance of trash, this expansion will increase the life expectancy of this landfill by up to five (5) years. This is only an estimate and will not limit the acceptance per year or the life expectancy of the landfill.
- b. No construction and demolition landfill or sanitary landfill shall be permitted on the northern portion of this property across the creek.



## ZONING STAFF REPORT

**DOCKET #** F-1310  
**STAFF:** David Reed

Petitioner(s): Waste Management of Carolinas, Inc.  
Ownership: Same

### **REQUEST**

From: RS-40 Residential Single Family District; minimum lot size 40,000 sf and AG  
Agricultural District  
To: GI-S General Industrial District (Landfill, Sanitary)

Both general and special use district zoning were discussed with the applicant(s) who decided to pursue the zoning as requested.

Acreage: 186.00 acres

### **LOCATION**

Street: North and south sides of Freeman Road at the Forsyth-Guilford County Line and on the south side of Benefit Church Road.

Jurisdiction: Forsyth County.

### **SITE PLAN**

Proposed Use: Expansion of height of existing sanitary landfill on southern portion of site.

Landfill Height: 960 feet above sea level.

Bufferyard Requirements: A 100-foot type IV bufferyard is required around the perimeter of the landfill and a six-foot chain link security fence must enclose the entire site.

### **PROPERTY SITE/IMMEDIATE AREA**

Existing Structures on Site: Accessory buildings for the landfill operation.

Adjacent Uses:

North - Vacant wooded land and single family homes.

East - Vacant wooded land (Guilford County).

South - Vacant wooded land.

West - Vacant wooded land.

### **GENERAL AREA**

Character/Maintenance: Rural wooded land and well maintained single family homes.

Development Pace: Slow.

## **PHYSICAL FEATURES**

Topography: Site slopes down to the northeast.

Streams: A small tributary to Belews Lake bisects the property.

Vegetation/habitat: Site is partially wooded.

Impact on Existing Features: The overall height of the landfill would be increased by 60 feet at the western end and 100 feet at the eastern end. These increases are from the original build out height approved under the previous Special Use Permit.

## **TRANSPORTATION**

Direct Access to Site: Freeman Road.

Street Classification: Minor thoroughfare.

Average Daily Traffic Count/Estimated Capacity at Level of Service D (Vehicles per Day):

Freeman Road - 870/11,000

Trip Generation/Existing Zoning: AG/RS40 - (186 ac.)202 lots x 9.55 trip rate = 1,929 trips

Trip Generation/Proposed Zoning: GI-S - 186 ac. x 6.75 trip rate = 1,256 trips

The proposed trip rate of 6.75 corresponds to the Heavy Industrial category. The Institute of Transportation Engineers does not have an impact category equivalent to landfill.

Planned Road Improvements: None.

Sight Distance: Good.

Traffic Impact Study recommended: No.

Transit: Transit is not available at this time.

## **HISTORY**

Relevant Zoning Cases:

1. F-1279; RS-40 and AG to GI-S (Landfill, Sanitary); withdrawn January 24, 2000; north and south sides of Freeman Road at the Forsyth-Guilford County Line and on the south side of Benefit Church Road; 186 acres; Planning Board recommended denial, staff recommended approval.
2. F-1213; RS-20 to IP-S (Recreation Services, Outdoor); withdrawn February 23, 1998; off the west side of Vance Road north of its intersection with Piney Grove Road; 26.6 acres; Planning Board and staff recommended denial.
3. F-759; R-6 to B-3-S (Offices); approved November 25, 1985; northwest corner of US 158 and Goodwill Church Road; 1.52 acres; Planning Board recommended approval, staff recommended denial.

## CONFORMITY TO PLANS

GMP Area (*Vision 2005*): Area 5: Rural.

Relevant Comprehensive Plan Recommendation(s): Solid waste disposal must be done in a safe and economical way with emphasis on recycling and monitoring of new waste disposal technology alternatives. A potential improvement that should be investigated would involve the convenient location of satellite solid waste collection sites throughout the county.

Area Plan/Development Guide: This site is not within the boundaries of a development guide or an area plan.

## ANALYSIS

The subject petition was submitted in an attempt to gain approval for increase in the overall height of an existing sanitary landfill and to continue use of the northern site for a borrow area in support of the sanitary landfill. A request for the same zoning change (zoning docket F-1279) was heard by the Planning Board on November 11, 1999, and was withdrawn at the January 24, 2000, Board of County Commissioners meeting. At present, the landfill is active and has not reached the originally approved height of 860 feet above sea level. The proposed increase would allow the height to be increased to 960 feet on the eastern portion of the site and 920 feet on the western portion of the site. The topography in the area is rugged with the highest nearby peaks in Forsyth County ranging from approximately 850 to 900 feet in elevation, according to United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps. Nearby in Guilford County, the maximum elevations are somewhat higher.

The sanitary landfill was originally approved through the Special Use Permit process when the land was zoned R-6 under the previous county zoning ordinance. The Zoning Board of Adjustment approved a special use permit for the sanitary landfill on August 19, 1987. A State law was also passed which required County approval of all sanitary landfills. Since that time, regulations have been changed in the UDO, with the sanitary landfill use requiring either a Special Use Permit from the elected body or Special Use District Zoning. Although the landfill (and borrow site activities on the northern portion of the site) is currently legally nonconforming, any changes such as the one proposed require approval by the Board of County Commissioners. The County Attorney is of the opinion that, if approved, the rezoning would not constitute an illegal spot zone. Guilford County, which contributes solid waste to the subject landfill, recently turned down a request to expand the landfill into Guilford County.

*Vision 2005* recommends that solid waste disposal be done in a safe and economical way with emphasis on recycling and monitoring of new waste disposal technology alternatives. Regarding the emphasis on recycling, the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Utility Commission has set a waste reduction goal of 20% through recycling by the year 2001 and 40% by the year 2006. The recommendation to dispose of solid waste in a safe and economical way relates directly to the subject rezoning. The North Carolina Department of Transportation realigned and paved

Freeman Road to accommodate truck traffic for the subject landfill. Also, all of the required environmental protections, such as the liner, the leachate collection system, and the monitoring wells, are in place for the subject landfill. To operate another landfill site somewhere else would likely require new expenditures for supportive infrastructure and site preparation.

The *Vision 2005* recommendation to investigate satellite solid waste collection sites throughout the county, in effect to disperse solid waste landfill sites, was made in 1987 prior to significant changes to State law regarding solid waste landfills. With the State's higher environmental protection standards, such as use of liners, leachate retention, and methane gas recapture, the cost of land disposal of waste increased dramatically. These fixed costs work against a series of smaller landfills, and require larger, concentrated sites. These economic factors, together with the neighborhood political opposition from surrounding property owners aimed at any landfill proposals, make the proposal for a series of smaller sites in the county unworkable.

The issue of accepting solid waste from outside the area has been discussed as it relates to the subject petition. At present, there is no prohibition on receiving trash and solid waste is accepted from surrounding counties as well as from at least one county in Virginia. Staff understands that local efforts to restrict acceptance of solid waste from sources outside the county may violate federal laws dealing with interstate commerce. Nonetheless, the petitioners have volunteered the following condition to address some of the concerns associated with import of waste:

- "a. Developer has volunteered an estimated 600,000 tons of trash per year will be accepted at this landfill. Based on this yearly acceptance of trash, this expansion will increase the life expectancy of this landfill by up to five (5) years to the year 2005 ."

Staff is of the opinion that allowing the proposed increase in height of the existing landfill is consistent with the recommendations of *Vision 2005* as it relates to disposing waste in a safe and economical way. The presence of the existing landfill, the continuing need for sanitary landfill sites, and the potential limits on trash received lead staff to conclude that the proposed limited expansion of the sanitary landfill (including continued use of the northern area for a borrow site) could be supported.

Site plan conditions will include planting on slopes fronting Freeman Road and developing a reclamation plan.

## **FINDINGS**

1. The subject petition was submitted in an attempt to gain approval for the increase in overall height of an existing sanitary landfill, and to allow continued borrow site activity on the northern portion of the site.

2. The proposal would allow the maximum height to be increased from 860 feet to 960 feet on the eastern portion of the site, and to 920 feet on the western portion of the site.
3. The landfill was originally approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on August 19, 1987, through the Special Use Permit process under the previous county zoning ordinance.
4. The sanitary landfill is currently legally nonconforming, and any changes as proposed require approval by the Board of Commissioners. The County Attorney is of the opinion that, if approved, the rezoning would not constitute an illegal spot zone.
5. *Vision 2005* recommends that solid waste disposal be done in a safe and economical way with emphasis on recycling and monitoring of new waste disposal technology alternatives.
6. The presence of the existing landfill, the need for such facilities, and the possible limits on the waste to be received are evidence of the reasonableness of the request to expand (vertically) the existing sanitary landfill site.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Zoning: **APPROVAL**.

Site Plan: Staff certifies that **the site plan meets all code requirements**, and recommends the following conditions:

- **PRIOR TO THE USE OF THE ADDITIONAL VERTICAL SPACE OF THE EXPANDED LANDFILL**
  - a Developer shall obtain all required state and local permits and meet all the requirements of UDO Section 2-5.38 including the recording of a new or revised Reclamation Plan in the office of the Register of Deeds. All revisions to the Reclamation Plan must be approved by the Planning staff. Planning staff may require additional buffering which exceeds the minimum requirements.
- **OTHER REQUIREMENTS**
  - a. Developer has volunteered an estimated 600,000 tons of trash per year will be accepted at this landfill. Based on this yearly acceptance of trash, this expansion will increase the life expectancy of this landfill by up to five (5) years to the year 2005
  - b. No construction and demolition landfill or sanitary landfill shall be permitted on the northern portion of this property across the creek.

[For information purposes only: The draft *Legacy* plan recommends providing landfill sites for waste generated and using new solid waste disposal technologies to reduce the amount of landfilling required.]

David Reed presented the staff report.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

FOR:

Ken Crutchfield, 3303 Glenn Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27105

Represent Waste Management.

We are increasing the buffer zone from 50 to 100 feet. We are trying to optimize the property.

Certainly there will be opposition to any landfill anywhere, but we have tried to be good neighbors and have tried to respond to the concerns we heard at the last meeting.

We visited over 240 of the 600 families in this area.

We are cleaning up Freeman Road and Good Will Church Road every day. Two other roads are cleaned weekly.

We talked with all our suppliers about having tarps over their trucks both entering and leaving our facility.

They are also trying to use the larger roads and not go through the neighborhoods.

The problem with odor has been virtually eliminated.

We have eliminated traffic by 45 trucks a day by diverting them to other locations.

We have limited the volume accepted daily.

Many large corporations, including the City of Winston-Salem, use our facility for lack of other options.

Just planning alternative methodology takes two and a half to three years, by which time our landfill and the Hanes Mill Road landfill will be at capacity and no longer usable.

We have never had a notice of violation at Piedmont Landfill.

We have a two year track record of absolutely new management.

We've had safety meetings with our trucking companies and haulers.

We're only asking for approval for you as a land use/zoning issue to go up fifty feet on our limit.

Without the expansion, there will be problems for municipalities, businesses, and citizens.

The State of North Carolina oversees our day-to-day operations.

We've got to have a place to put our waste.

We respectfully ask for approval.

Competition drives the use of landfills now. There's no reason to bypass another landfill to get to another one.

Tom Ramsey, 2410 Cases Ferry Road, Suite 400, Atlanta, GA 30339

In response to a question by a Planning Board member, Mr. Ramsey stated that the 600,000 ton limit in the conditions is based on the historic use (average volume during peak usage) of the site.

AGAINST:

Harvey Davis Pulliam, Jr., 415 Holt Street, Kernersville, NC 27284

Submitted statement which he read into the record.

Businesses continue to neglect to recycle and they contribute the bulk of the trash. They don't recycle because tipping fees are cheap and recycling is more expensive.

Even the public schools won't recycle.

Reject this nonsense.

Cheap garbage rates are not forever.

Danny Beeson, 8444 Haw River Road, Kernersville, NC 27284

I'm addressing you on behalf of the neighbors who have seen their neighborhood ravaged by this landfill.

There are no industrially zoned properties within miles of this site.

The infrastructure was built many years ago and does not support the number of trucks.

This is more than a NIMBY situation.

Showed pictures.

The truck traffic causes ruts along the edges of the pavement, thereby providing safety hazards for cars.

The rural roads in this area do not meet the minimum standards required for this type of use.

A particular problem we have is the obnoxious odor from the landfill.

Reviewed reports regarding problems with the landfill facility.

This operation repeatedly ignores the rules.

Only twenty percent of their total volume was from Forsyth County.

Why should we trust the voluntary condition about volume?

Why would Waste Management request a maximum of 600,000 tons per day when a much smaller volume has been discussed?

If a transfer station is allowed here, it can function indefinitely, even when the landfill is full.

Recently the Board of Aldermen agreed to cap Hanes Mill Landfill to avoid having all the neighbors having to look up to it. That situation will be happening here. Please give us the same consideration.

Submitted petition of opposition.

## **WORK SESSION**

During discussion by the Planning Board, the following points were made:

1. A transfer station is a location where you can bring garbage locally and drop it off to be picked up and transferred to another facility. It is not currently allowed in their special use permit. It would be allowed in the proposed rezoning. Transfer station would be an accessory use to a landfill.
2. It seems that Waste Management has been responsive to neighbors concerns and possibly having the use "transfer station" deleted would make the neighbors more comfortable.
3. In response to questions by the Planning Board, Ken Crutchfield made the following comments:
  - a. We want to provide a recycling/training center to help educate people about the need for such programs and the need to minimize waste.
  - b. We have requested a transfer station as a back-up support in case of emergencies.
  - c. We need the facility and would like to have the transfer station, but that is your option.
  - d. A transfer station can continue indefinitely.
  - e. Every road out there does meet State standards. We have no objection to continue working with DOT to improve the traffic system.
4. At least now (under current limitations) the neighbors can see that at some point in the future the landfill will cease operation.
5. I think the neighbors are concerned that Waste Management is being a good neighbor while it needs something, but the support may diminish after that is accomplished.
6. Some of the desired conditions, such as picking up litter and cleaning road, can be incorporated into the State permit.
7. I am concerned about fairness to this community. When it was permitted, it had a certain term of life. That has expired. This community has suffered through the landfill long enough. I think we should find a way to bring this landfill to a close.
8. We have to do all we can about recycling, but there will still be waste. I'm concerned about a transfer station and could not support that.



9. This is a really difficult issue. I see the benefit of maximizing the use of the site, but I'm also concerned about Waste Management's responsiveness to the community. I'm concerned about a 600,000 ton per year cap. We need to go to our elected officials and indicate our concerns about waste disposal and recycling.

MOTION: Steve Johnson moved denial of the zoning map amendment.

SECOND: Terry Powell

VOTE:

FOR: Johnson, Powell, Rousseau, Schroeder, Williams

AGAINST: Avant, Bost, King, Snelgrove

EXCUSED: None

SITE PLAN MOTION: Steve Johnson certified that the site plan meets all code requirements and recommended staff conditions.

SECOND: Terry Powell

VOTE:

FOR: Johnson, Powell, Rousseau, Schroeder, Williams

AGAINST: Avant, Bost, King, Snelgrove

EXCUSED: None

According to information furnished by the Office of the Tax Assessor, the subject property was in the name of Waste Management of Carolinas as of April 3, 2000.

---

A. Paul Norby, AICP  
Director of Planning