



**PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
RESCHEDULED Monday, September 28, 2026
5:30 P.M.**

Yadkinville Town Hall
Commissioners Chambers
213 Van Buren Street, Yadkinville, NC 27055

*The meeting facility is accessible to people with disabilities. To request special accommodations please call 336-679-8732 or email planning@yadkinville.org

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

2. SWEARING IN MEMBERS

- Christy Ellington
- Walter Smith

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

- July 20th, 2026

4. NEW BUSINESS-

- Request for Alternative Design Review (ADP 26-01) of Childplex at Progress Lane and Hawthorne Avenue

5. OTHER BUSINESS-

- Staff reports

6. ADJOURNMENT - Next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting is
October 19th, 2026, at 5:30 pm



**PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, July 20th, 2026, 5:30 P.M.**

Yadkinville Town Hall
Commissioners Chambers
213 Van Buren Street, Yadkinville, NC 27055

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

(PRESENT/ABSENT):

Anna Logan Howe, Chair – Present
Virgil Dodson - Present
R.J. Speaks - Absent
Danny Coe – Present
Christy Ellington – Present
Tony Snow – Present
Steve Brown – Present

TOWN OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Meredith Detsch, Planning Director
Mike Koser, Town Manager
Alex Potts, Town Clerk

DRAFT

AUDIENCE: Applicants: Jose Arroyo & Libby Arroyo

Other attendees: Walter Smith (interested planning board member), Andrew Mackie, Bambi Mackie, and Thomas Foster and spouse.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Anna Logan Howe, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and determined that a quorum was present.

2. SWEARING IN MEMBERS:

- Virgil Dodson
- Steve Brown

Mrs. Potts administered the oath of office for both board members and had them sign the oath following the swearing in.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 15th, 2026

Mr. Dodson moved to approve June 15th, 2026, minutes as presented to the board, Mrs. Ellington seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0 unanimously.

4. NEW BUSINESS:**ZMA-26-04: Request for rezoning Parcel No. 130013, 420 Carolina Avenue from Residential Medium Density (RM) to Residential High Density (RH)**

Ms. Detsch presented to the board that this request is for a rezoning request from Libby Arroyo, associated with ARR Homes, of Parcel number 130013 with a total acreage of 2.79. The current zoning of the property is Residential Medium (RM), and they are requesting Residential High Density (RH). This is one property of two being requested before the board this evening. The developer is proposing a single-family subdivision and open space. The estimated houses proposed per their draft site plan is around twenty houses (20) on both lots. A smaller lot is being sought with this rezoning as Residential Medium Density allows for a 10,000 square foot lot while Residential High Density allows for a 5,000 square foot lot. This property is right beside our downtown district as borders an industrial site as well (Indera Mills). There is also a significant number of single-family homes in the area with some recently constructed off Carolina Avenue.

The property proposed for rezoning this evening has a large house that has been evaluated as potentially historic but has not been deemed as a significant structure by the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Mackie passed out the historic structure survey on the house to the board members to review. Additionally, the Town does not have a Historic Preservation District or Ordinances speaking to the renovations or demolitions of such structures. Individual properties would need to be petitioned as a historic site and work with the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service to secure the status of National Register of Historic Places. The developer is proposing to retain the large two-story house and renovate it. The pond and stream are on the adjacent property that is also being petitioned to be rezoned this evening in a separate hearing, ZMA 26-05. Mrs. Detsch explained the current zoning district of RM is the Residential Medium Density District is established for medium density neighborhoods in which the principal use of land is for single-family residences and typically what we see in Town. The RH district is a smaller lot, actually half the size of the RM lots and the Residential High-Density District is established as a high-density district in which the principal use of land is for single family, two-family, townhomes, and multifamily residences with a Special Use Permit sought. Municipal sewer runs through the southwest of the property and is also available to the east along Carolina Avenue.

Municipal water is located along Carolina Avenue but does not go all the way down Willow Street. Carolina Avenue is a Town owned and maintained roadway as well as W. Willow Street and South Monroe Street. Mrs. Detsch explained she pulled the current Pedestrian Plan (2010) as the one being worked on right now has not been adopted yet. Mrs. Detsch referenced the plan's map of proposed improvements with sidewalks and pedestrian paths. No watershed or floodplain is present on this property but there is a stream so an undisturbed area will be required adjacent to the stream. Mrs. Detsch noted there is a pond on site they will need to investigate for the viability of it. Mrs. Detsch noted the Comprehensive Plan speaks to this area as Medium Intensity, which is the land use classification for a variety of medium density residential uses and low to medium intensity civic, institutional, office, service, and retail uses designed to keep the impact on adjacent residential areas to a minimum. Medium Intensity designated area located in areas with easy access to transportation and utility infrastructure. Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan outlines goals and strategies to achieve them which include the following:

Land Use Goal- Establish a sustainable land development pattern that complements the

character of the Town, promotes economic development, and concentrates higher intensity uses where adequate infrastructure exists.

Strategies: Focus new development, redevelopment and infill development in areas with existing infrastructure instead of fringe areas.

Promote additional infill residential development to support existing and future commercial development.

Encourage a mix of housing types within the community to accommodate residents in different stages of life.

Encourage the revitalization and reuse of currently unused or underutilized structures and sites.

Mrs. Detsch briefly went over the steps for a rezoning request and what each board reviews. The Board of Commissioners will hear this request on August 3rd. Any development of this size will be subject to review with the major subdivision review including stormwater, streets built to NCDOT standards and greenspace. Mrs. Detsch noted also included in the agenda packet is the statement of consistency, application, deed of property, letters and proof sent to adjacent property owners, pictures of the sign posted on the property, explanation of the request, and more detailed map of area. Mrs. Detsch went over the detailed map and explained the area and required improvements. Also to note this is not a conditional rezoning, just a straight rezoning request. Mrs. Detsch noted the site layout and constraints they are navigating, and buildable acres are less than the total acres shown. Mr. Dodson asked for the lot map to be shown again and asked about the line running through the property and asked for clarification on the property lines. Mr. Dodson asked about sidewalks and Mr. Arroyo stated yes. Mr. Dodson asked for the applicant to clarify it was just a concept plan submitted, not the final subdivision and Mr. Arroyo stated an Engineer would be brought in to evaluate the land and what could be done. Mr. Dodson asked if there was a stream on site and Mrs. Detsch noted there was near the ponds and why they are required to keep fifty feet (50') of undisturbed land between the stream (perennial) and developed land. Mr. Dodson asked about the regulation on streams and Mrs. Detsch noted that depending on the classification of streams will dictate how close they can build next to them- perennial vs. intermittent streams. Mr. Dodson asked to review the numbered lots, and Mrs. Detsch noted the line on the map to the south of the property on the adjacent property with the ponds. Under 4.6.7.3 *Grading standards*

A. No grading shall take place in a stream buffer, within 50 feet of a perennial stream or 30 feet of an intermittent stream as identified by USGS.

Yadkin County GIS has the USGS streams mapped and that is what staff uses to identify the categories. Mr. Coe asked if it was not in the floodplain and Mrs. Detsch explained currently it is not based on FEMA's studied areas. Most of the floodplain is within the Town's ETJ along the South Deep Creek area and north of Town.

Mr. Mackie asked about a stream getting out of its banks and Mr. Koser explained the USGS and FEMA floodplain standards. At the federal level the velocity of the stream is considered as part of that study and mapping which is then adopted through the state to the local jurisdictions to

enforce if they have a floodplain ordinance adopted. Mr. Mackie asked about the watershed and Mrs. Detsch explained that is part of our drinking water system regulations and is for designated water intakes on streams and rivers. When you have a potable water being withdrawn, the state has put guidelines on ½ mile area around the intake to help prevent contaminants from entering the body of water. The watershed regulates how much impervious materials can be used on properties in that area and the density of houses, certain types of industries are restricted such as uses as landfills but doesn't limit agriculture. The map of the watershed was shown to the board and the extent of its coverage in the county. Discussion of sewer removal and how that is processed in Town also was covered.

Chair Howe opened the floor to the public to speak on the item. The first person to speak to the board was Thomas Foster, owned and lived at 425 Carolina Avenue across the street from the rezoning where he was born and raised. He understands growth is part of life and has serious concerns on the impact to the community from this development. He spoke of the wildlife being displaced and the loss of woodlands in the community. Replacing it with roads, traffic, and houses will destroy the habitat and those creatures will have nowhere to go. He also is concerned with the financial impact on existing homeowners in the area. With the new houses being built, their properties will also be considered with higher value and that means more taxes for the residents. Retirees and working families will be impacted the most and they are already struggling. Traffic safety is a big concern as the road is only sixteen (16') feet wide, unmarked no sidewalk roadway which was never designed to handle this type of traffic. He recommended widening the road to accommodate the traffic but that would impact his house significantly as the front door to his house is on the roadway and he is concerned he will be forced out of his home. Yadkinville has always been a peaceful rural community and safety should not come at this price. He asks the board to carefully consider these concerns before making their decisions.

Mr. Andrew Mackie introduced himself as a historian and preservation member of Yadkin County. He handed out the architectural study from 1987 which included over 700 properties in Yadkin County and Yadkinville. He is hoping the Historical Society could come before the board and discuss the historic properties in town. The rezoning request includes the Lee Mackie house which has a four-generation history in our community. The owner, as a tanner, Mr. Lee Mackie, lived in this house and was a contributing member of the community. Mr. Andrew Mackie covered the current architectural features of the house. Further the house has experienced additions over the years, and he is pleased to hear the house will remain and be renovated. The ponds and Haw Branch were preserved from a previous tenant and were once a recreation site for fishing in town. Across Highway 601 is the brother's property (Mackie) and noted other Mackie family houses in the area. Mr. Andrew Mackie is asking to protect wildlife as the previous speaker noted. Mr. Dodson asked about the booklet Mr. Mackie brought as it's a county wide book and Mr. Mackie noted he would need to cut and paste the town's homes since the book is county wide. Mr. Mackie noted Virginia Drive is the original Main Street and could qualify for a district. Mr. Dodson asked Mr. Mackie to furnish the Planning Director with a copy for her consideration.

Mr. Foster had a follow-up question about the water running off the property for the board. Mr. Dodson noted this land is medium density and Mrs. Detsch concurred. Mr. Dodson noted he hadn't gone back on the property and wasn't aware of them, neither was Mr. Coe who grew up in

Yadkinville. Mrs. Detsch noted when she rode through the sewer easement for greenway planning with the Public Services Director and noted only the large pond seemed still full of water. Mr. Brown asked Mrs. Detsch to clarify which rezoning is which for the audience. Mrs. Detsch spoke of the two rezonings and explained the layout and process for the two requests. Mr. Foster raised concerns again about traffic, sidewalks, and the small roadway. Mrs. Detsch noted the Pedestrian Plan in 2010 there were no recommendations of a sidewalk on Carolina Avenue but instead a greenway multi-use trail along the sewer easement.

The board asked staff to cover the next rezoning case before they would make a motion on either property.

The next item in New Business is public hearing for ZMA-26-05: Request for rezoning Parcel No. 130015, 125 S. Monroe Street from Residential Medium Density (RM) and Central Business District (CB) to Residential High Density (RH)

Mrs. Detsch presented the request and noted it was a very similar request to what the board just heard with a few notable changes and considerations. This property is a split zoned property requesting it from Residential Medium (RM) and Central Business (CB) to Residential High Density (RH). The request is for a smaller residential lot, there is a house along the Monroe Street portion of the property that is in rough shape, and this property empties into the downtown district. This area is a tight commercial core verses sprawling commercial as seen in other areas of Town. There are no traffic counts on town roads but there are counts on NCDOT roadways. Mrs. Detsch noted the Pedestrian Plan in 2010 there were no recommendations of a sidewalk on Monroe Street but instead a greenway multi-use trail along the sewer easement.

This property is not within the watershed or floodplain and is the south property from what the board just heard. This property abuts Indera Mills and the church across the street (Willow Street). The Town's Land Use goals discuss how to use properties appropriately and revitalization considerations. Mrs. Detsch did take this property to the Technical Review Committee for consideration and there is over seven acres which would allow for fifty homes but there is not enough buildable acres to achieve that with the easement, stream buffer, roadway, and preserving the pond and may be around five acres depending on the stormwater situation. The developer is only proposing to construct twenty-one houses verses fully building out the full density. The existing house on site is a more estate sized house and down the street is the "Sunshine House" this developer also bought from the church and restored which is also a large-scale house. Their intent was to build large sized houses along Carolina Avenue and build out as part of the neighborhood. As they worked back into the lot, the houses would get smaller and density would be greater. The proposed roads would loop through to the downtown and connect in verses cul-de-sac after cul-de-sac as recently seen in other developments. Mrs. Detsch noted the other areas in town they have been building and working on what will function well with the community verses just building to capacity and what they can fill in. Mrs. Detsch noted the stormwater would need to be evaluated on the site with different storm events our Development Ordinance requires. The major subdivision review process was mentioned and the road requirements and dedication to the Town process. Mr. Thomas asked about lot 2 & 3 would be a difficult area to turn in and out of. There have already had three houses built north of this property and discussion of the width of the roadway was brought up as a concern to be adding more traffic to it. Mr. Mackie asked if the intersection along Carolina Avenue and Highway 601 was going to be studied or changed and staff had not heard. Mrs. Detsch brought up the traffic

counts for NCDOT roadways and explained the metrics for changing roadways. The nearest traffic counter is north of that intersection in 2024 and was around 9,900 average daily counts. Mrs. Detsch pulled the data off Highway 601 south and it's at 16,000 per day. When traffic goes through Lee Avenue north on State Street it shows a loss of 5,000 vehicles before heading downtown. Mr. Mackie noted having good sidewalks would allow for more walkability. Mrs. Detsch noted heading north through Monroe Street would yield a more walkable path through the downtown corridor and connect with existing sidewalk facilities and future improvements. Mr. Dodson asked the developer the price range of the houses and Mr. Arroyo noted the houses along Carolina Avenue would be over \$400,000 for the larger houses and the smaller homes would be \$300,000- \$350,000. Mr. Dodson asked for square footage of the houses and Mr. Arroyo said the Carolina Avenue side would be over 2,000 square feet and the homes further in would be around 1,500 square feet. Mrs. Detsch noted the houses on the outside of the neighborhood would be the larger scale to tie into the street scape and as you go into the neighborhood more modest houses like first time home buyers or starter houses. Mr. Mackie asked if any houses would be around the ponds and Mrs. Detsch noted they cannot get near the stream, fifty-foot (50') undisturbed area as well as considering the soils and existing pond. The developer is required to have an open space area, and topography also will be a factor with utilities with their layout. Mrs. Detsch pulled up the map showing the contours and how the land grade changes across the two properties being considered for the rezoning.

Mr. Dodson recommends approving ZMA-2026-04 and that the Planning Board adopts the consistency statement dated July 20th, 2026, contained in the agenda materials to approve the zoning map amendment for 420 Carolina Avenue/Parcel No. 130013, for a rezoning from the Residential Medium Density (RM) to Residential High Density (RH). Mr. Dodson noted the rezoning to stay within the conceptual plan as a condition. Mrs. Detsch stopped him from furthering the motion as it is a straight rezoning request, not a conditional rezoning request and the board cannot make stipulations on this rezoning request. Mr. Dodson withdraws his motion.

Mr. Dodson compliments the conceptual plan and is concerned about the changes if they occur. Mrs. Detsch noted the Development Ordinance gives subdivision plats approval at the staff level, not the board. To tie the proposed property development to a site plan, it would have to be submitted to the board that way from the start as a conditional rezoning request as they recently reviewed on West Main Street. Mr. Dodson will reinstate his motion; Mr. Brown seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency Statement July 20th, 2026

ZMA 26-04

Address: 420 Carolina Avenue; Parcel No. 130013

Applicant: Libby Arroyo

The Planning Board finds the proposed map amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. It is reasonable and in the public interest as it supports the Town's guiding principles and vision for the future of the community. The following goals and strategies support this amendment:

Land Use Goal- Establish a sustainable land development pattern that complements the character of the Town, promotes economic development, and concentrates higher intensity uses where

adequate infrastructure exists.

LU2. Focus new development, redevelopment and infill development in areas with existing infrastructure instead of fringe areas.

LU3. Promote additional infill residential development to support existing and future commercial development.

LU4. Encourage a mix of housing types within the community to accommodate residents in different stages of life.

LU5. Encourage the revitalization and reuse of currently unused or underutilized structures and sites.

Mr. Brown asked if they could fill the pond in and Mrs. Detsch noted they would have to probably hire a soil scientist to determine the options and how much fill, compaction, etc. would be needed for a buildable lot. If they had to cross the creek and that would trigger a different set of permits potentially with the Army Corps of Engineers, but it appears the creek is the property line and that is outside the scope. Mr. Mackie asked if the ponds are spring fed and Mrs. Detsch noted she is not a hydrologist or a soil scientist which they would need to hire to study that area for feasibility for development. Mr. Mackie asked if they would have to come back before this board for additional lots and Mrs. Detsch noted no, that is done at staff level per the Development Ordinance. Mrs. Detsch walked the plat review that is done by staff and explained the level of approvals from the Development Ordinance adopted in 2018. Mrs. Detsch explained the Technical Review Committee (TRC) is made up of Environmental Health, Public Services (water and sewer), Fire and Building Code officials, NCDOT for roads in conjunction with our town staff and other specialty staff members to review these types of plans.

The second public hearing request, ZMA-26-05. Mr. Brown recommends approval of ZMA-2026-05, and the Planning Board adopts the consistency statement dated July 20th, 2026, contained in the agenda materials to approve the zoning map amendment for 125 S. Monroe Street/Parcel No. 130015, for a rezoning from the Residential Medium Density (RM) and Central Business District (CB) to Residential High Density (RH).

Comprehensive Plan Consistency Statement July 20th, 2026

ZMA 26-05

Address: 125 S. Monroe Street; Parcel No. 130015

Applicant: Libby Arroyo

The Planning Board finds the proposed map amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. It is reasonable and in the public interest as it supports the Town's guiding principles and vision for the future of the community. The following goals and strategies support this amendment:

Land Use Goal- Establish a sustainable land development pattern that complements the character of the Town, promotes economic development, and concentrates higher intensity uses where adequate infrastructure exists.

LU2. Focus new development, redevelopment and infill development in areas with existing infrastructure instead of fringe areas.

LU3. Promote additional infill residential development to support existing and future commercial development.

LU4. Encourage a mix of housing types within the community to accommodate residents in different stages of life.

LU5. Encourage the revitalization and reuse of currently unused or underutilized structures and sites.

Mr. Coe provided the second and the motion passed 5-1.

5. OTHER BUSINESS –

Mrs. Detsch presented Mr. Walter Smith's application to be considered on the Planning Board. She passed out his application and noted he has served and is serving on several government boards, so he brings a wealth of information. Mr. Smith introduced himself and has met most of the board members already. Mr. Smith notes he tries to be fair and make the best decision for the good of the community for the future. He now lives back in town and was offered the opportunity to join the board. At one point, Mr. Smith was the Mayor and Council member for the Town of Boonville. He is currently serving on the voluntary agricultural district of the county and active in the farming community. He retired from the USDA where he handled all the training for the new regulations. The board welcomed him and looked forward to him joining them at their next meeting. Mrs. Detsch noted the staff reports and needed to catch up on the code enforcement portion. Chair Howe asked about the upcoming text amendments and Mrs. Detsch noted the new legislation that will change the local development ordinance and explained the new requirements. One is focused on parking amounts and sizes, speed limits on local roads, stormwater review one time, and other development driven changes. Also, NC Building Code has been changed but has not yet been adopted.

Mrs. Detsch noted parking has been a big discussion on planning field and how overparking has played a factor as well as development costs for why the state moved to remove those requirements.

Mrs. Detsch noted we have payment in lieu of the sidewalk, and open spaces changes to be made to meet the auditor's recommendations. Mrs. Detsch will try to get all the changes done at once to the boards to review. Mrs. Detsch noted the last rezoning off of Taylor Street was not approved at the Board of Commissioners level and they may be back with a new request to the Planning Board as they would need to start over.

- 6. ADJOURNMENT** - Next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting is in August if they have any items. *Mr. Snow moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:48 p.m. The motion was seconded by Brown, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.*

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Detsch, CZO
Planning Director

Date

Anna Logan Howe, Chair

Date



TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Meredith Detsch, Planning Director

DATE: September 18, 2026

RE: ADP-2026-1, Alternative Design Proposal –

**Title 9, Development Ordinance, Article 2
Administration, Procedures & Enforcement,
Section 2.2 Procedures, Subsection 2.2.9
Alternative Design Proposal**

BACKGROUND

Site Information:

Applicant:	The Yadkin Economic Development NC Non-Profit Corporation
Tax Parcel No.	158281
Location:	Corner of Hawthorne Dr. and Progress Lane
Zoning:	Office Institution
Area:	1.49 acres

Proposed Development:

The proposed development plan includes developing the first Childplex in the State. The Childplex will be a collaborative daycare center with multiple providers under one roof. This is a project being led and constructed by The Yadkin Economic Development NC Non-Profit Corporation.

ALTERNATIVE DESIGN PROPOSAL GUIDELINES

The Alternative Design process allows consideration of developments that cannot fully meet the requirements of the ordinance due to unique site conditions.

The referenced ordinance provision authorizes the Town of Yadkinville Planning Board to consider creative, alternative designs that meet the intent Title 9 Article 4 and 5 for landscaping, infrastructure, parking and building design when the site does not permit adherence to these two articles as written.

The process is as follows:

- Step 1: Pre-application meeting
- Step 2: Application/proposal submitted
- Step 3: Administrator review
- Step 4: Planning Board Review

ADMINISTRATOR SUMMARY

The architecture plans do not meet all our building requirements outlined in Title 9, Article 5.4 Nonresidential Design Standards. Per the Town's Zoning Ordinance 5.4.3 *Building Modulation* it does not meet the requirement for 1' for buildings under 100'

For 5.4.4 *Vertical Articulation*, they have included heavy building materials at the bottom of the building and varying the height of different portions of a building meeting the two required techniques. Additionally, they are proposing tall shrubbery to break up the façade.

For 5.4.5, *Horizontal Articulation*, they are proposing porticos at the entrance and gables evenly distributed through the roof structure as well as awnings over the doors. As for it being 75% of the width of the horizontal wall plan for both sides, it does not meet those ratios.

For the roof, per 5.4.6 *Roof Form and Materials*, the roof shown is an asphalt shingle roof with a 5:12 pitch which does not meet our minimum requirement of 6:12 for the pitch.

For 5.4.7 *Facade Materials and Color*, they have materials of a natural color- brick and split face CMU which is about 2 1/2' at the base, brick the remaining along the façade.

For 5.4.8 *Windows and Glazing*, they are not meeting the 25% required area and 10% on the secondary street frontage.

5.4.9 *Building Entrances*- they are proposing a portico and pitched roof for it meeting the required two features.

5.4.12 *Mechanical and Utility Equipment* are to be screened on the service façade.

The plans attached have many other architectural features being added that enhance the appearance and elevate the design of the proposed facility.

The site plan is also included and is being finalized by the engineering consultant for stormwater requirements. The site plan is not part of the request as it is being updated to meet our requirements and is for reference only.

PLANNING BOARD'S RECOMMENDED MOTION OPTIONS
--

A simple majority vote is needed to recommend approval, denial, or deferment of the requested action. In considering the Alternative Design Proposal, the Planning Board shall consider the following criteria:

- 1. The proposed project represents a design in site and/or architecture which will result in a development that is equivalent to or superior to that achievable under the applicable regulations,*
- 2. The proposed project will be compatible with surrounding development in materials, scale, massing, and site layout.*
- 3. The proposed project is consistent with the intent of this Ordinance and substantially meets the requirements herein.*
- 4. The proposed project is consistent with adopted plans and policies of the Town.*

Motion Examples:

Motion to Approve – I recommend approval of ADP-2026-01. This recommendation acknowledges that the Alternative Design Proposal represents a design that is equivalent or superior to one achievable under the applicable regulations, is compatible with surrounding development, substantially meets the ordinance requirements and is consistent with plans and policies of the Town.

Motion to Approve with Conditions – I recommend approval of ADP-2026-01. This recommendation acknowledges that the Alternative Design Proposal represents a design that is

ADP 2026-01

equivalent or superior to one achievable under the applicable regulations, is compatible with surrounding development, substantially meets the ordinance requirements and is consistent with plans and policies of the Town with the **following conditions**.....

Recommend Denial – I recommend denial of ADP-2026-01 because it does not meet the requirements of approval.

Defer – I recommend deferring action on ADP-2026-01 until the applicant can address the identified deficiencies and errors with the design.

See attached site plans and plans.

Town of Yadkinville

Planning and Development Department
213 Van Buren Street
Yadkinville, NC 27055
P: (336) 679-8732
planning@yadkinville.org



Alternative Design Proposal

ADP- 26-01

Receipt # 049881

Property Information

Pre-Application Meeting: _____

Zoning District: OI

Current Use: Vacant lot

Property Value: \$97,000

Any Current Conditions? Yes _____

Any Current Variances? Yes _____

Date Applied: 9-17-26 Date Issued: _____

Development Type: Institutional

Proposed Use: Child Care Facility Significant? _____

Construction Value: \$ 2Mil. +/-

No X CUP- _____ CUP- _____

No X VAR- _____ VAR- _____

Alternative Design Proposal

Property for which the Alternative Design Proposal is being filed:

Property Owner: The Yadkin Economic Development NC Non-Profit Corp

Property Address: Hawthorne Dr (currently corner of Hawthorne Dr & Progress Lane

Property Tax ID#: Parcel- 158281/ PIN 5817313579 Zoning District: OI

Aspect or feature of the proposed development for which the Alternative Design Proposal is being filed:

Exterior street elevations:

We are requesting consideration of the proposed building exterior to meet the general intent of requirements

Relevant Development Ordinance Section:

5.3.4 Windows 5.4.3 A. Modulation
5.4.5 C Articulating Features

Provide a detailed description of how your proposed development does not meet the Development Ordinances:

1. Windows for Day Care are less than 25% of entire facade.

2. Modulation of 1'-0" is not used.

3. Articulating Features have been added but not at the amounts requested.

Continued on next page

Alternative Design Proposal

Explain how the proposed project represents an alternative design in site and/or architecture which will result in a development that is **equivalent** or **superior** to that achievable under the applicable regulations:

Alternative design is appropriate for a Day Care use. Material colors and elements enhance the appearance of this building.

Explain how the proposed project will be **compatible** with surrounding development in **materials, scale, massing, and site layout**:

Adjacent properties are warehouse and commercial buildings with less articulation than what is being shown.

Explain how the proposed project is **consistent** with the **intent** of the Development Ordinances and **substantially meets** the requirements of the Development Ordinances:

Elements and design directions in ordinance being followed as much as possible.

Explain how the proposed project is **consistent** with **adopted plans and policies** of the Town of Yadkinville:

~~Most~~ Most importantly this project is a new prototype for the State of NC. It is intended for low population counties with limited resources. Excessive cost will jeopardize the ability of many counties to provide this service to their community.


Resolution of Alternative Design Proposal

Planning Board Meeting Date: 9-21-20 Approve: _____ Deny: _____

Additional Conditions: _____

I, the applicant for this proposal, understand that my proposed project does not meet the requirements of Development Ordinances, and that proposing an alternative design, I am seeking special permission from the Planning Board to not follow the Development Ordinances in a substantive way. I understand that, if the Planning Board rejects my proposal, I am expected to follow the requirements of the Development Ordinances as written and interpreted by the Town of Yadkinville.

I understand that, if this proposal is approved, I will need to apply for Zoning Permits and Building Permits before beginning the proposed project.


Applicant



9-17-20
Date

Zoning Administrator

Date

ARCHITECTS
PA

**Wishon-Carter
Builders**
GENERAL CONTRACTOR
YADKINVILLE, NC



CHILDPLEX
Yadkinville
Childcare
Facility

Yadkinville, NC

Diagram illustrating the cross-section of a column and footing joint. The diagram shows a square column section with a central core of 12x12 column CMU reinforced with #4 bars at 16" O.C. The column is surrounded by a brick veneer. The footing is shown below the column, with corr. ties on each side at 16" O.C. vertical. The footing is grouted solid. The overall width of the column is 1'-8".

- BRICK VENEER
- 12x12 COLUMN CMU-REINF #4 (4) @ 16" TIES @ 16" O.C.
- CORR. TIES EA. SIDE @ 16" O.C. VERT.
- GROUT SOLID
- 1'-8"

ALL DIMS. ARE TO FIN. FACE OF WALL, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED (U.O.N.).


Revision	

PETERSON
/ GORDON

ARCHITECTS
P.A.

3508-A VEST MILL ROAD
WINSTON-SALEM, NC
TEL. (336) 760-1411

Wishon-Carter
Builders
GENERAL CONTRACTOR
YADKINVILLE, NC



SPLIT-FACED CMU
JOHNSON CONCRETE- 'BLOWING ROCK'




BRICK
PINE HALL- 'BLACKMOOR'



ASPHALT SHINGLES
GAF/TIMBERLINE- 'WEATHERED WOOD'



ARBORVITAE



4/A3.1 UTILITY/SERVICE ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




3/A3.1 SECONDARY ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



** DUMPSTER AND MECH. EQUIP. TO
RECEIVE BRICK SOLID SCREENING **


2/A3.1 PRIMARY ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" HAWTHORNE RD



1/A3.1 BRICK/SCREENING ELEVATION

CHILDPLEX
Yadkinville
Childcare
Facility
Yadkinville, NC

Comm. No.	26-310
Date	9-16-26
Drawn By	JES



Allied Design, Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERING
4720 KESTER MILL ROAD
WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROL
Phone: (336) 765-2377
Fax: (336) 760-8886
<http://www.allied-engrsurv.com>

FIRM LICENSE C-1891

PRELIMINARY
PLANS

NOT RELEASED FOR
CONSTRUCTION

YADKIN EDP
YADKINVILLE CHILD CARE FACILITY
PROGRESS LANE
YADKIN COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA


PROJECT NO.:	26-052
DRAWN BY:	JMN
CHECKED BY:	SMC
DATE:	08/25/2026

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	8/25/2026	ISSUED FOR PRELIMINARY SUBMITTAL

PRELIMINARY
SITE PLAN

SHEET

C1





Planning & Zoning Department Monthly Report

**AUG.
2026**

by: Meredith Detsch, Planning Director

Zoning Permits:	New Residential: 2350, 2490, 2560 Foxtail Lane, 115 & 119 Hickory St., 710 & 714 Eisenhower St. Other permits: 317 Cleary Ln.-shed; 538 Peach St.-porch addition; 520 Peach St.- porch addition Commercial: 1619 S. State Street- Goodwill; 609 Carolina Ave.-gas tanks Sign Permits: 701 S. State St.-Strickland Brothers freestanding sign; 250 Service Rd.- Daymark monument sign
Zoning Requests:	Plats: n/a Zoning Verification Letters: n/a
Board(s) Review:	Upcoming hearings: -Variance for Sinclair Landing- Progress Ln.- window requirements

Notable Events/ Projects:

- Research on single family options - new zoning district
- Draft ordinance of downtown sidewalk cafe options
- Meeting with consultant for Yadkin Co. Comprehensive Plan update- Inspire
- Technical Review Committee (2 x this month)
- Friends of Downtown Yadkinville meeting
- Work on draft "Go Yadkinville" Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan

Code Enforcement Report Attached

TOWN OF YADKINVILLE CODE ENFORCEMENT CASES

9/18/2026

	A	B	C	D
1	Case/ Open	Violation Address	Owner or Occupant	Status or Conditions
2	HOUSING			
3	MHC 25-02	303 & 304 Washington Street	Brenda Leak	Notice to Robert Torrence and Brenda Leak for Inspection on Oct. 14th; refused inspection, Administrative Warrant for Nov. 4th; inspection complete and notice sent with hearing scheduled for December 17th (no show)- resent letter for hearing new date 3.13.26. Hearing held with Calvin & Charlotte Carter- working on acquiring property, Hold additional hearing with owner/family, notice sent & posted 9.10.26 for 9.23.26-signiture confirmed 9.12.26
4	MHC 25-03	107 N. Van Buren Street	Charles Bruce Davis Museum of Art History and Science	Pending directive to issue minimum housing case - no changes witnessed
5	MHC 26-01	348 Twin Oaks Dr	Wesley Community Development Corporation	Inspection done on 7/9/26 with tenant Hardie & Keith @ Fire Marshal's Office; Fire Marshal Office conducting enforcement of sprinklers, following. Otherwise not enforceable case for Minimum Housing once sprinklers are corrected
6	NUISANCES			
7	PN- 25-09	304 Washington Street	Brenda Leak	Some cleaning done, opening minimum housing case-see MHC 25-02; abatement of property will need to include this with house case- tall grass again (9.10.26)
8	PN 26-12	712/716 Tennessee Street	Eva & Kenneth Carter	Tall grass and trash in yard, items unsecured, letter sent 8/11/26 deadline 28th - spoke with grandson and has hired Kevin Long to start maintaining property, will continue to coordinate; grass mowed and trash abated 9.9.26; need to secure properties
9	PN 26-14	409 Poplar Circle	Kathy Snow	Carport full of items again verify nuisance; letter sent 8.11.26 with a deadline 8.28.26- not in compliance, will renotify deadline
10	PN 26-15	425 E. Main Street	Barbara Brumfield	overgrown and trash outside letter sent 8.11.26 with a deadline 8.28.26/ spoke with daughter, mother passed away late July, gave 30 day extension and asked to work on making progress, will reconnect with her on September 28
11	PN 26-16	309 Locust St	Melinda Williams & Carol Hawkins	complaint on tall vegetation and property not being managed- letters bounced back, will resend to different address & post property new deadline 9.15.26
12	PN 26-17	117 Tyler Street	Christopher Tyler	tall vegetation, notice sent 8.28.26 with deadline of 9.15.26-mowed 9.9.26 CASE CLOSED
13	PN 26-18	217 E. Taylor St.	Richard Norcott	Stacking debris up around house - sent notice 9.14.26, deadline 10.2.26
14	PN 26-19	321 Virginia Dr.	Mackenie Miller	tall grass -send notice sent notice 9.14.26 deadline 10.2.26
15	PN 26-20	200 Harrison Ave	Gladys Vestal	tall grass -send notice notice sent with 10.2.26 deadline
16	PN 26-21	516 W Main St.	LC Vestal	tall grass -send notice notice sent with 10.2.26 deadline
17	ABANDONED-JUNKED-NUISANCE VEHICLES			
18				

TOWN OF YADKINVILLE CODE ENFORCEMENT CASES

9/18/2026

	A	B	C	D
1	Case/ Open	Violation Address	Owner or Occupant	Status or Conditions
19	ZONING			
20	ZV 26-05	119 Jackson Street	James Caudle	Sign painted on wall, need sign permit -contacting with courtesy letter
21	ZV 26-08	524 Peach Street	Colonial Properties Inc.	will need to cite each tenant individually per owner attorney-pending notice to tenant, sent 9.14.26 deadline 10.2.26
22	ZV 26-10	1820 Fred Hinshaw Road	Terry & Stephen Allen	complaint of camper being lived out of on the property- need to send notice
23	ZV 26-11	1145 Hoots Road	Daniel & Jennifer Harker	complaint of camper being lived out of on the property- need to send notice
24	ZV 26-12	1000 S. State St	Charles B Bush & Kimberly Bush	Lights added to structure and pointing in roadway -send notice
25	ZV 26-13	536 Virginia Drive	David William Sams & Donna Kay Sams	Shed and fence built without permits and in front yard -need to send notice
26	ZV 26-14	3013 Ashton Ct	Rafael Sanato Hernandez & Zonia Muller	Need zoning permit for garage and fence
27	ZV 26-15	1404 Shacktown Road	Emily Elizabeth Atwood	Need zoning permit for fence