GUILFORD COUNTY
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Old County Courthouse – Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room
301 W. Market Street, Greensboro, NC 27401
July 8, 2026
6:00 PM

Call to Order

Chair Donnelly called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

I. Roll Call

The following members were in attendance at this meeting:

James Donnelly, Chair; David Craft, Vice Chair; Dr. Nho Thi Bui; Rev. Gregory Drumwright; Randy Little; Sam Stalder

The following members were absent from this meeting:

Ryan Alston; Cara Buchanan; Guy Gullick

The following Guilford County staff members were in attendance in person for this meeting:

J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Jason Hardin, Planning and Development Deputy Director; Oliver Bass, Planning and Zoning Manager; Michael Townsend, Fire Marshal; Samantha Lockwood, Senior Planner; Darby Terrell, Senior Planner; Troy Moss, Planner I; Amira Yassin-Fort, Planning Technician; Matthew Mason, Attorney; Ashton Roberts, Deputy County Attorney

II. Agenda Amendments

There were no agenda amendments.

III. Approval of Minutes: June 10, 2026

Chair Donnelly referenced the packet from the meeting, which included a copy of the minutes from the June 10, 2026 meeting and called attention to the questions and comments he had submitted. Chair Donnelly noted that he wanted to clarify the language in the motion for the special use permit at the last meeting to make clear that the Special Use Permit was approved because evidence demonstrated that the applicant met the review factors.

Chair Donnelly wanted to ensure that the minutes included language beyond the answers to the questions and that the Board had decided the evidence was sufficient to address all the review factors.

Attorney Mason asked if the requested amendment was a direct quote. Chair Donnelly said he could not recall whether it was a direct quote and noted that the language of previous motions included language indicating that the applicant met the necessary factors. Attorney Mason stated that the amendment should be added only if it was stated at the time the motion was made in the prior meeting.

Mr. Stalder moved to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2026, meeting as amended, except for the final bullet point regarding the special use permit. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Bui, Drumwright, Little, Stalder. Nays: None.)

IV. Rules and Procedures

Chair Donnelly explained the policies and procedures followed by the Planning Board.

V. Continuance Requests

None

VI. Old Business

Non-Legislative Hearing Item(s)

A. ADOPT ORDER FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE #26-04-PLBD-00017: REQUEST TO AMEND CURRENT SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR LANDSCAPE AND HORTICULTURAL SERVICES (Ref. Case #17-05-GCPL-02276): 7930 BEE JAY ROAD (ZONED AG, AGRI CULTURAL)

Mr. Bass noted that the draft order was included in the meeting packet prepared by Guilford County staff based on the findings and decisions made during the June 10th meeting. Mr. Bass asked that, if any members were not present at that meeting, they received the records and details of the hearing and verbally affirm that they had reviewed them before voting to approve the order.

Mr. Bass informed the Board that he had a copy of the order for their signatures and would pass it around pending their vote.

Mr. Little and Mr. Craft, who were absent from the June 10, 2026, meeting, confirmed that they had reviewed the materials.

Mr. Craft noted that he had known Mr. Vinroot since he did landscape for him approximately five years ago, but it would not affect his ability to make a judgment on the case.

Rev. Drumwright moved to adopt the order. The motion was seconded by Mr. Craft. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Bui, Drumwright, Little, Stalder. Nays: None.)

Mr. Craft asked whether Ms. Buchanan would be expected to sign the order and whether she remained a member of the Board.

Mr. Bell responded that they could express the concern about the vacancy to the Clerk's Office, since it had been six months since Ms. Buchanan was present. The item was addressed later in the meeting.

VII. New Business

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ITEM(S)

A. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #26-02-PLBD-00011: AG, AGRICULTURAL TO CZ RS-30, CONDITIONAL ZONING – RESIDENTIAL: 645 NC HIGHWAY 62 EAST

Chair Donnelly inquired whether the applicant, his representative, any citizens for the case, and any citizens against the case were present at the meeting. Upon learning that neither the applicant nor his representative was present, but that one citizen was present to oppose the case, he asked the Staff to attempt to reach the applicant and/or his representative. Ms. Lockwood left the meeting to attempt to contact the applicant and his representative.

Chair Donnelly asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the request. One person stated that they wanted to speak against the request. The Planning Board agreed to move on to Other Business and address the Conditional Zoning Case later during the meeting.

The Planning Board returned to this item after the discussion regarding Data Centers.

Ms. Lockwood reported that the applicant would not be present and had not indicated whether or not he wanted to continue the hearing. Chair Donnelly stated that the Board could move forward with the hearing or table the case. Mr. Hardin explained that if the Board decided to continue the item, the applicant would not have to reapply. However, if the next meeting was more than 25 days out, the notice had to be re-noticed. Chair Donnelly stated that in the past, applicants had an opportunity to request a continuance at the meeting.

Attorney Mason described issues with holding a hearing and returning to it at a later meeting. One issue was that not all the same Board members may be present at the next meeting. The applicant would not be able to hear what the opposing party said and could not respond. It would also be a deviation from the general process for legislative items.

Chair Donnelly stated that if the Board were to entertain a continuance of the case that it to be no sooner than the September meeting.

Dr. Bui commented that it was the neglect of the applicant and the representative, and staff sent out notice and Ms. Lockwood called the representative. The Board had no explanation why they did not attend. Because it is a conditional zoning and the resident took time to attend the meeting, she preferred to move forward with the item during the current meeting.

Chair Donnelly noted that the applicant should have received an invitation. Mr. Hardin noted that the applicant was a design professional, not the owner.

Board members discussed whether or not to continue the case.

Rev. Drumwright moved to approve proceeding with the hearing for the Conditional Rezoning Case #26-02-PLBD-00011. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted 4-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bui, Drumwright, Little, Stalder. Nays: Craft, Donnelly)

Chair Donnelly noted that there was still an option to table the vote if that decision was made during the discussion.

A five-minute recess was taken. Chair Donnelly called the meeting back to order at 7:29 p.m.

Dr. Bui asked who could appeal the decision if the proposed conditional rezoning was denied. Attorney Mason responded that the County's Special Legislation approved by the General Assembly allowed the Planning Board to take final action on zoning matters, but the decisions were subject to a right of appeal to the Board of Commissioners under rules set by the Commissioners. He said the legislation does not specificity as to who could file an appeal.

Ms. Terrell presented the staff report on Conditional Rezoning Case #26-02-PLBD-00011. She noted that all of the lettered parcels on the map received a physical mail notice about the public hearing. The subject property is located at 645 NC Highway 62 East (Guilford County Tax Parcel #132505 in Fentress Township), approximately 7,240 feet east of the intersection of Branson Mill Road and NC Highway 62 East and comprises approximately 26 acres.

Ms. Terrell stated that the request is to conditionally rezone the subject property from AG, Agricultural, to CZ-RS-30, Conditional Zoning – Residential. There were no proposed use conditions. The proposed development conditions were that the development shall be limited to a maximum of 14 residential lots. She pointed out that there was also a utility easement which spans most of the property. Agricultural and residential uses mostly surrounded the parcel, and there was also an undeveloped parcel to the north. The property was located near the historic Hockett House, but the rezoning was not anticipated to affect the historic property. The surrounding parcels were mostly zoned AG. The property to the west was conditionally zoned RS-40, which has slightly lower density than what was requested under the CZ RS-30 district.

Ms. Terrell noted that the parcel is in the Pleasant Garden Fire District. The closest fire station was approximately 3.9 miles away. NC Highway 62 East is considered a Major Thoroughfare per the Greensboro Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (GUAMPO). The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) 2025 Annual Average Daily Traffic count was 5,260 cars. The NCDOT has NC Highway 62 East designated for improvement as a highway safety project, and it involves the installation of pavement markings. There is a regulated floodplain on-site as well as mapped streams. Ms. Terrell pointed out that the property was currently classified as Rural Living in the Future Land Use Map. The proposed re-zoning is inconsistent with the Rural Living classification, but would be consistent with the Residential classification. This change was necessary mainly due to the reduced lot size requirements and increased density. The request is consistent with portions of the comprehensive plan including the Attainable Housing Goal Statement and Attainable Housing Policy 1.

Ms. Terrell stated that the request to rezone the subject property from AG to CZ-RS-30 is reasonable, as it aligns with the established development pattern in the surrounding area. The subject property is contiguous with an existing neighborhood to the west that is zoned CZ-RS-40 and has a Future Land Use Map designation of Residential. The proposed condition limiting development of the subject property to 14 residential lots would result in a lower density than the adjacent neighborhood, which has 19 developed lots. There is an existing RS-30 zoning district approximately 1,700 feet to the southwest of the subject property. The proposal supports key elements of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan, including 1) Planning Theme: Attainable Housing Goal Statement: Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design, and 2) Attainable Housing's Policy 1: Enable the creation of new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents. She said staff recommended approval, and if approved, an amendment to the Future Land Use Map to the Residential classification would be required for the subject property.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was a minimum lot size within a cluster development. There was a minimum lot size for each zoning district. Chair Donnelly stated that he was trying to understand the bounds that would apply if this item were approved as is. He stated he could easily see how a cluster development would be suitable, but he wanted to understand the bounds. Mr. Hardin responded that it would require service from a public sewer.

Chair Donnelly asked whether there was any indication from the applicant regarding the area relative to the utility easement. Ms. Terrell responded that they expressed their understanding of the limitation of what could be added to the easement.

Mr. Stalder asked where the floodplain on the property was in relation to the utility. Ms. Terrell referred to the topographic map to point out where the utility and floodplain were. Chair Donnelly noted that multiple existing utility lines were within the utility easement.

Reverend Drumwright asked what the size of the easement around the power utility structures was. Ms. Terrell stated that she was not sure of the exact size.

Mr. Craft asked if the property to the northeast was a potential mining property. Mr. Bass confirmed that the special use permit was for clay mining that is not currently active.

Mr. Hardin explained that cluster developments could be used in any district that permitted single-family residential if the tract was 10 acres or more and served by public sanitary sewer. Based on that information, public sewer would be required for cluster developments.

Mr. Bass reported that the utility easement was 240 feet in width.
Chair Donnelly opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of this item.

No one came forward to speak in favor of the item.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this item.

David Robinette, 723 North Carolina Highway 62, reported that he owned property next to the parcel in question. He stated that he had lived there for 31 years and that it had been passed down through generations. He reported that there was no public sewer. The present owner of the 645 property resides in another county. Approximately half of the property was under the Duke Power easement. There was a drainage running through the property, the topography was very steep, there had been some grading activity and further clearing to the north of the property. Before purchased by the present owner, the property was for sale off and on for 20 years. The present property owner appeared to be clearing the front area to build a house and put up "no trespassing" signs. He put the parcel up for sale for several months. He noted that the future land use maps were in place to protect the land from certain types of development. The majority of properties around the parcel have four acres or more and low-density development. Mr. Robinette stated that his main concern was water use and the risk of the water running out. He asked who would provide a solution if the water ran out. He commented that Highway 62 was high traffic. He asked what the quality of life would be like, since the closest grocery store was seven miles away and there were no amenities nearby, such as playgrounds. He also asked if the lots were needed. He discussed the time invested in developing the comprehensive plan and the need to preserve agriculture.

Chair Donnelly asked whether there had been any outreach from the property owner or their representative. Mr. Robinette confirmed that there was none.

Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Mr. Little stated that he would not support the request.

Reverend Drumwright stated that it was difficult to understand how parts of the property would be developed due to the large utility structures and the stream. He stated that he was not inclined to support the request.

Dr. Bui stated that her position was not biased by the applicant or representative's absence, but that their absence showed how strongly they wanted the request to go through. She stated that she supported housing development in general but felt that the plan for the property was not in line with the neighboring agricultural uses.

Mr. Craft commented that it was not up to him to determine how the land would be developed, but whether it was a reasonable use for the land.

Mr. Stalder commented that they were left with more questions than clarity about the property, including adding another road, the floodplains, and the number of houses. He stated that he believed RS-30 was too generous for the property.
Chair Donnelly noted that the lot size was less typical of the area and that a number of constraints impacted the development. He stated that he had no assurances because the applicant or representative was not present.

Mr. Little moved to deny the request for Conditional Rezoning Case #26-02-PLBD-00011, located at 645 NC Highway 62 East (Guilford County Tax Parcel #132505 in Fentress Township), because the amendment is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or the Future Land Use Map classification of Rural Living; additionally, the amendment was not reasonable because the change from Rural Living would increase density and affect public health and safety. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bui.

The Board voted 5-1 in favor of the motion to deny the request. (Ayes: Donnelly, Bui, Drumwright, Little, Stalder. Nays: Craft)

Chair Donnelly stated that the decision was still subject to appeal and that any appeal must be filed within 15 days with the Board of Commissioners.

VIII. Other Business

A. Draft Data Center Text Amendment for Review and Comment Only

Chair Donnelly noted that the presentation was for the Board to review and comment on but that it was not a formal text amendment requiring a public hearing.

Mr. Hardin reiterated that the Staff is providing an opportunity for review and feedback and will notify the Board on if and how/if the Data Center text amendment moves forward. There was no need for a vote at the current meeting. Mr. Bell indicated that this feedback could be given during a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Hardin presented several slides outlining theoretical development standards and regulations applicable to Data Centers. He discussed that Data Center conversations were very timely.

Mr. Hardin provided slides that defined Data Centers and outlined the different types. He stated that Data Centers were defined as physical rooms, buildings, or facilities that house information technology infrastructure for building, running, and delivering applications and services. Data centers also store and manage the data associated with those applications and services, including data processing, facilitating communications and transactions, and allowing virtual communications from e-mail to video conferences.

Mr. Hardin referred to a table in the agenda packet that outlined different types of Data Centers. Enterprise Data Centers were when companies owned and ran the building. For cell towers, a company owned them but rented the space to other companies. Managed services Data Centers were the model when a company owned all the equipment. Edge Data Centers were used for high-speed applications, processing, and connectivity. Cloud Data Centers were where data stored in the Cloud was housed, such as iCloud or Google Drive. Hyperscale Data Centers were those associated with Artificial Intelligence (AI), and they could be as large as a small town and consume large amounts of water and energy. Crypto mining Data Centers were where cryptocurrency was mined and generated.

Mr. Hardin pointed out common concerns with Data Centers. These concerns included noise from operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week; water and energy consumption; lighting concerns; and the loss of farmland and open spaces.

Mr. Hardin shared that, in response to the concerns, numerous jurisdictions have approved moratoriums, and some have opted to create standards to help Data Centers fit better into their communities or to exclude them. Mr. Hardin showed that in Greensboro and High Point, existing Data Centers were currently permitted as Warehouses with no additional use standards and shared what other counties across the state are adopting to mitigate some of the concerns.

Mr. Hardin noted that the draft text amendment would allow Data Centers as a principal use in the following zoning districts: Corporate Park, Light Industrial, and Heavy Industrial, with standards, as follows:

1. **Setbacks.**
   a. All structures associated with a data center shall maintain a minimum setback of no less than 100 feet from any lot line. Setbacks shall be increased to 500 linear feet from any lot line or interior zoning district line shared with a residential zoning district or any lot that contains an existing or approved residential dwelling unit.
   b. No structures associated with a data center shall be closer than 1,000 linear feet of an existing or approved elementary or secondary school, congregate care facility, or daycare center.
2. **Required Planting Yard.** When adjacent to a residential zoning district, or any lot that contains an existing or approved residential dwelling, this use shall maintain a Type A Planting Yard as detailed in Section 6.2 Landscaping Standards with a fully opaque fence, wall, or berm of no less than six feet in height along all lot lines abutting or adjacent to a residential zoning district or use.
3. **Maximum Noise Levels.**
   a. Through the utilization of noise dampening features or configuration methods, a data center, and all associated structures, shall be designed to maintain a maximum noise threshold of 60 dBA or less at all times, as measured at the lot line as certified by a licensed acoustical engineer.
   b. The Planning and Development Director, or their designee, may require a noise study prepared and certified by a licensed acoustical engineer at the property owner's expense upon receipt of a noise complaint, or as needed to ensure compliance with these standards is maintained.
4. **Required Utility Connections:** All facilities associated with a Data Center shall exclusively be served by public water & sewer connections.
5. **Road Access:** When located in the CP, Corporate Park Zoning District, a Data Center shall, at minimum, have direct access to a collector street or a road of higher classification.
6. **Special Use Permit Submittal Requirements:**
   a. A sketch plan showing the proposed location and dimensions of all equipment, existing and proposed structures, screening, fencing, property lines, access roads, turnout locations, ancillary equipment, and the location of any elementary or secondary school, congregate care facility, or daycare center within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of the perimeter of the facility;
   b. A study prepared and certified by a licensed acoustical engineer that describes the anticipated noise level of the facility and any proposed mitigation efforts such as sound walls, baffles, ventilation silencers, or additional separation from surrounding uses;
   c. An approval letter from the public water & sewer service provider(s).

Mr. Hardin showed an image of a hypothetical Data Center with a diagram of zoning areas and reviewed how the structure would be required to be designed. He explained that in the hypothetical scenario, there was a vacant LI parcel to the north, a vacant highway-business-zoned property to the south, and a residential parcel to the east.

The requirements would include noise suppression, a 500-foot setback for all structures that abutted residential zones, a 50’ Type A buffer yard with required canopy tree plantings and landscaping, a required solid fence or solid berm, a Type C buffer when abutting an LI district, and lighting requirements and standards to minimize light trespass. Maps were provided to give everyone an idea of where the recommended zoning districts were in the county. There was a total of 158 LI properties, 72 HI properties, and eight (8) CP properties countywide.

Dr. Bui asked about the requirements for emergency vehicles. Mr. Townsend, Fire Marshal, clarified that, per fire code, one primary access point was required at the front of the facility, but most had both a primary and a secondary access point.

Dr. Bui noted that over the course of her work in health care, she encountered situations in which emergency medical services (EMS) could not enter a facility.

Dr. Bui expressed that this should be discussed during the design phase and that the size of parking spaces, the width of emergency vehicles, and whether EMS would have a hard time gaining access should be considered. Mr. Bell noted that it was a work in progress, but circulation was one consideration, and they would add Dr. Bui's concern as a review factor.

Vice Chair Craft expressed that it would be helpful to have a column in the table showing what Guilford County currently requires of a Data Center. Mr. Hardin replied that it was still being defined. Mr. Bell reported that an existing development was applied for as a General Industrial use.

Rev. Drumwright asked what the footprint was of the Data Center that had previously been approved and where it would fit Mr. Hardin's graphic. Mr. Hardin reported that it was for American Express to store credit card information.

Rev. Drumwright noted that counties were significantly smaller than Guilford County on the comparison chart. Mr. Hardin responded that many of the larger counties did not have requirements to compare to, or were in the process of drafting them, but they could be added to the chart. It was requested to identify some cities that would mirror what was observed in Guilford County.

Rev. Drumwright asked what precipitated the agenda item. Mr. Bell discussed that this is a timely topic that many counties are considering. Rev. Drumwright asked if the text was generated in Guilford County. Mr. Hardin confirmed that staff had drafted the draft text amendment. Mr. Hardin also stated that while staff reviewed other counties, the draft amendment was composed within the context of Guilford County.

Rev. Drumwright discussed the language passed in Guilford County 2025 Comprehensive Plan and the increase in public education. He noted that it was important to consider how the text amendment would fit their plan, especially in agricultural areas. He invited staff to reflect about what Guilford County’s response will be to residents being against Guilford County moving forward by adopting language for Data Centers.

Mr. Little commented that the American Express Data Center was for their own use, but the building was also used for office uses. He asked whether a similar company in the future would meet the special-use requirement.

Mr. Hardin responded that it would depend upon the principal use of the building whether it would be considered Data Center or Office.

Vice Chair Craft asked how many acres the American Express Data Center site was and how big the general Data Center sites were. Mr. Hardin explained that the site size varies based on the scale and type of data being stored and processed. He said data centers spanned several hundred to thousands of acres, but others were very small.

Vice Chair Craft asked if Data Centers of different sizes could be differentiated. Mr. Hardin responded that regulations could be based on intensity or square footage of the Data Center.

Chair Donnelly stated that a large, thousand-acre Data Center was very different than a 50-acre Data Center. Mr. Hardin agreed that intensity was an important factor to consider.

Vice Chair Craft stated that the Board must accept that these things are important to everyone in their daily lives and that they must go somewhere. The Board must be smart and tactical about it; under certain circumstances, these can be beneficial to our daily lives, like a fire station, substation, or landscaping business.

Rev. Drumwright noted that the conversation needs to include the impact on resources, such as energy consumption, rising electricity costs, and impacts on water infrastructure. He added that Hyper Data Centers affect individuals' quality of life and cost of living.

Chair Donnelly clarified that the proposed definition was an umbrella term that included all types of Data centers.

Chair Donnelly asked if a congregate care facility included hospitals. Mr. Hardin clarified that congregate care facilities are for long-term care like assisted living and nursing homes. Chair Donnelly asked why hospitals were not included.
Mr. Hardin responded that hospitals are typically short-term stays as opposed to long-term care.

Chair Donnelly commented on the road access and the need for a collector street in the CP zoning district. He asked if the need was different for CP areas. Mr. Hardin explained that areas with existing utilities did not require collector streets.

Chair Donnelly noted that the charts in the Board packet were helpful. He asked if the only text amendment was Subsection 4, Zoning Districts, and the rest was from existing ordinances. Mr. Hardin confirmed that the other portions were included for context, and Parts 1, 2, and 3 would be added.

Vice Chair Craft asked if the street classifications in the CP district would not allow Data Centers. Mr. Hardin clarified that Data Centers would have to be located on a collector street or higher-grade road. Vice Chair Craft asked why that was a requirement, since Data Centers did not generate much traffic. Mr. Bell explained that there were areas in the county with existing decades-old infrastructure.

Vice Chair Craft suggested that the text amendment provide flexibility and require that the collector street be within a certain distance, since there was not much traffic generated by Data Centers.

Mr. Bell reported that the American Express Data Center was built in 2010, sat on 105 acres, and had a total square footage of 495,000.

Mr. Little asked whether the requirement for utility approval letters applied to any other special uses. Mr. Bell confirmed that other instances required utility approval letters to ensure sufficient capacity.

Rev. Drumwright asked whether there were any counties in North Carolina that felt they could not support infrastructure, such as water. Mr. Hardin stated that he was not aware of anything specifically, but it was a possibility.

Chair Donnelly thanked the staff for the presentation and the information. He invited any Board members to reach out to the staff with additional questions.

B. Liberty Road/Woody Mill Small Area Plan Project Update

Mr. Bell thanked Mr. Little for his participation in the RFP Evaluation Committee. He stated that the project was likely to be rebid due to actions within the General Assembly. More information would be forthcoming, and Mr. Bell would provide updates as they came.

Chair Donnelly reported that Vice Chair Craft was resigning, with his last meeting being in August 2026. During the August meeting, there would be the opportunity to elect a new vice chair. There would also be the opportunity to consider positions at the start of the calendar year. Vice Chair Craft stated that he had spoken with Ms. Buchanan and that she was under the impression she had left the Board in January 2026. He recommended finding someone else to fill that position. Vice Chair Craft stated that he had enjoyed working with everyone.

Mr. Bass noted that there are three rezoning cases and two text amendments currently scheduled for the August Planning Board meeting.

IX. Adjourn

There being no further business before the Board, Chair Donnelly adjourned the meeting by acclamation at 8:22 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Guilford County Planning Board is scheduled for September 9, 2026, at 6 p.m. in the Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room, located on the first floor of the Old Guilford County Courthouse, 301 W Market St, Greensboro, NC 27401.